

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1718th
 MEETING**

Tuesday, 14 November 1967,
 at 3.25 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 24:</i>	
<i>Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa</i>	
General debate.	233
Organization of work	243
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
Request concerning British Honduras (agenda item 23) (continued)	243

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 24

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (A/6868 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran), Rapporteur 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, presented the Special Committee's report on the 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, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (A/6868 and Add.1).
2. In adopting the recommendations of the Special Committee, the General Assembly had decided, in operative paragraph 20 of resolution 2189 (XXI) of 13 December 1966, to include that item in the provisional agenda of the twenty-second session. At the beginning of its 1967 session, the Special Committee,

wishing to help the General Assembly in its consideration of the question, had instructed Sub-Committee I to study it. The Special Committee had adopted the report of Sub-Committee I (A/6868/Add.1) and approved its conclusions and recommendations, which appeared in paragraphs 81 to 133 of that document.

3. The Special Committee had given the question particular attention when it had been considering the case of the Territories in southern Africa during the meetings it had held away from Headquarters earlier that year. On 20 June 1967 it had adopted a resolution concerning those Territories; the text of the resolution was to be found in paragraph 744 of the Special Committee's report (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. II).

4. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the role played by foreign economic and other interests in Territories under colonial domination had already been studied by the Special Committee and its Sub-Committee I. The fact that the Fourth Committee was called upon to continue the study of the question showed the importance of the subject and its relation to the struggle that was being waged for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

5. Following the studies undertaken with regard to South West Africa, the Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia, Sub-Committee I, and subsequently the Special Committee and the General Assembly, had concluded that the activities of foreign interests were indeed impeding the attainment of freedom and independence by the people of those Territories. It was of course quite legitimate to draw attention to the benefits of economic investments, but any study of the situation in southern Africa showed that if it were not for the fact that certain Western Powers had large economic interests there, it would be much easier for those Territories to attain independence. Moreover, there was no denying the fact that it was exploitation that had led to colonialism, which in the early stages had been for the sole purpose of ensuring markets for the metropolitan Powers.

6. As far as Southern Rhodesia was concerned, he had already had occasion to point out that had it not been for the financial help that the Smith régime was receiving from capitalist monopolies it would not have been able to survive for so long. That being so, it had been obvious that economic sanctions would fail, because of the activities of certain Western Powers, Members of the United Nations, in that Territory.

7. The information that the Secretariat had provided for Sub-Committee I had revealed the negative role

played by foreign monopolies in Southern Rhodesia. The working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/6868/Add.1, appendix I) reported that a United States company, the Continental Ore Corporation, had imported more pig-iron from Southern Rhodesia in 1966 than in 1965. According to the same paper, the racist minority régime expected to increase its foreign exchange by \$5.5 million a year from the exploitation of the nickel deposits. It was also of interest to note that 85 per cent of the interests in the Trojan Mine, which extracted the nickel, had been bought by the Anglo American Corporation.

8. The United Kingdom firm of Turner and Newall, Ltd., which accounted for 63 per cent of the total production of asbestos, had reported in September 1966 that its sales of asbestos had increased and now amounted to some £94.8 million. Petroleum, which was of great importance in the case in point, was still flowing into Southern Rhodesia in sufficient quantities in spite of the so-called sanctions. It was no secret that the chief suppliers of that product were such United Kingdom and United States companies as British Petroleum, Mobil, Caltex and so forth. In view of the fact that a wider study of the activities of foreign monopolies in Southern Rhodesia had already been undertaken, he would not enlarge upon that subject but would merely state his conclusion that it was the activities of such companies, which originated from States members of the Security Council, that were the major saboteurs of the weak sanctions imposed by the Security Council. Those monopolies were direct contributors to, and participants in, the exploitation of the natural and human resources of Southern Rhodesia. The overwhelming majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia had expressed, through their national liberation movement, their repudiation of the activities of the foreign monopolies and of the association of those monopolies with the forces of colonialism. The Committee could not do other than condemn the negative attitude of the various elements that were obstructing the liberation of the African people of Zimbabwe.

9. It was scarcely necessary to point out that the wages that the monopolies paid to African workers in the colonial Territories amounted to about one tenth of those paid to European workers. That in part accounted for the huge profits that those companies were making and explained why the Africans were not making the same progress as were the Europeans. Since a certain income was one of the qualifications for voting in many of the colonized parts of Africa, it was obvious that if that inequality of wages continued the Africans would be deprived of the right to vote for a long time, because of the practices of the monopolies. It was therefore easy to see how the foreign companies were impeding the attainment of freedom and independence by the African peoples.

10. Turning to the Territories under Portuguese domination, he recalled that he had already given a great deal of information on the activities of certain companies that were active in those Territories. The Gulf Oil Corporation, which had spent \$22 million on the exploitation of oil in Angola in 1966, was going to spend \$28 million in 1967 and \$76 million in 1968. It was such investments that were making Portugal in-

transigent and were obviously influencing it to intensify the war against the liberation movements. The Secretariat working paper (A/6868/Add.1, appendix III) gave any number of examples of the exploitation to which Angola was being subjected. It showed that the Angola Diamond Company, which had been given a land grant of some 1,025,700 square kilometres, had contributed some 195 million escudos to the Portuguese budget in Angola. According to an article that had appeared in the South African Financial Gazette of Johannesburg on 18 March 1966, oil production in Angola was to amount to 2 million tons a year for the next two years, to meet the growing needs of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique. Huge investments were to be made under an agreement concluded between Petrangol and the Portuguese Government; the agreement authorized Petrangol to extract oil together with eight other companies, two of them South African and the others French, Italian and Portuguese. When the production of oil in Angola reached 2 million tons a year, it would be able to satisfy about one quarter of the needs of southern Africa.

11. The same situation was to be found in South West Africa. According to Ruth First's book entitled South West Africa, Consolidated Diamond Mines of the vast De Beers-Anglo-American empire made an annual profit in South West Africa of almost double the budget of that Territory. The Tsumeb Corporation, a United States company that operated the largest lead mine in Africa, made no secret of its attachment to the South African Government.

12. All that information showed that the interests and rights of the African people were being trampled under foot in those Territories. It had sometimes been said that the colonialists should be given time to adapt themselves to the new situation, but it was clear that they would take advantage of any such respite to increase their investments and thus retain their hold on the Territories.

13. The Tanzanian delegation hoped that the consideration of the question on the agenda would throw light on everything that was impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It was now clear that colonial oppression was being perpetuated in the colonial Territories because of the enormous economic interests at stake. The Tanzanian delegation was prepared to collaborate in drawing up a draft resolution reflecting the views of the Committee on the question.

14. Miss IMRU (Ethiopia) said that the question under consideration was of great importance, for it would help the Committee to understand one of the main reasons for the maintenance of the colonial régime in certain Territories and to find solutions for that problem.

15. The tremendous resources of Southern Rhodesia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and South West Africa were not being exploited in the interest of the indigenous inhabitants; rather were they the cause of the oppression to which the inhabitants were subjected. The Members of the United Nations condemned that oppression but were incapable of putting an end to it and Portugal and South Africa

defied them with impunity. The report of Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee (A/6868/Add.1) showed the main reasons for that impotence. It was stated in paragraph 108 that an interlocking combine of South African, United Kingdom and United States interests was playing a preponderant role in the economy of the whole of southern Africa; the most important interests in that group were those of four major companies, which between them possessed assets of approximately £450 million. The report also showed that United States private investment in South Africa had grown from \$286 million in 1960 to \$528 million in 1965, while the United Kingdom direct investment in South Africa was now almost \$900 million.

16. The report also showed the considerable influence which the international monopolies exerted on the policies of the Governments of certain Western Powers. Their pressure caused those Powers, especially the United States and the United Kingdom, to take a direct interest in the maintenance of colonialism in the Territories of southern Africa. What faith could people have in the United Nations if two permanent members of the Security Council acted in that way, whilst other Members of the United Nations, in various degrees, maintained trade relations with the colonial Powers?

17. Paragraph 116 of the report showed the disproportionate land distribution as between the white minorities and the indigenous population in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, Angola, Mozambique and other Territories. The best lands had been seized by foreigners, and the overwhelming majority of indigenous peasants were obliged to lease land from Europeans on unfavourable terms. The white settlers and the foreign interests controlled agricultural production for export, while the indigenous population was reduced to subsistence farming. The separation maintained between those two sectors had impeded economic development.

18. The foreign companies were pursuing narrow material objectives and were not concerned with human advancement. The indigenous workers were reduced to the role of cheap labour and were offered no possibility of economic and social advancement. The white workers were paid five to fifteen times more than the indigenous workers. The legislation in force prevented the latter from joining trade unions or striking, and there were no social security schemes for aged or disabled African workers.

19. In the Portuguese Territories the Government had decreed that the sub-soil was the property of the State, and mining concessions were granted without the consent of the indigenous population who owned the land. It was stated in paragraphs 101 and 102 of the report that huge territories were assigned to each of the companies, which had their own police force, security service and even army, and that according to the agreements concluded between the Government of Portugal and those companies, the latter were bound to support the Portuguese Government in securing peace and order.

20. The situation was similar in the Pacific and Caribbean Territories. According to paragraph 97 of the report, in Papua and New Guinea foreign interests dominated the major sectors of the economy

(cash crops and mineral resources). In Fiji sugar and gold mining industries, the major enterprises of the Territory, were controlled by foreigners. In the Bahamas tourism, the sole industry, was entirely controlled by United States and European capital.

21. Generally speaking, it could be seen that in the colonial Territories the means of production—land, mines, factories, transport and communications—were in the hands of foreign monopolies, which made large profits while the indigenous inhabitants were excluded from participation in the economic life of their countries and were constantly humiliated by discriminatory laws. Those practices were tolerated and encouraged by the colonial Powers, which derived immense benefits themselves. Her delegation hoped that the colonial Powers and those which encouraged colonialism would at last examine their consciences, that they would not support the philosophy of racial superiority against which they had fought in the Second World War and that they would live up to their responsibilities.

22. Mr. BURTICA (Romania) stated that peoples could not constitute free and independent nations unless their economic and social progress was guaranteed; failing that, they were incapable of real liberation from colonial domination.

23. The reports of the Special Committee showed that in the past few years the role of foreign capital in the Territories under colonial domination had been growing steadily. That was a disturbing situation, for despite the assurances given that the activities of the foreign interests promoted the economic and social development of the colonies, the facts showed clearly the nature of the "civilizing" mission of the international monopolies and of the "benefits" that foreign interests brought to the indigenous peoples.

24. Surveys carried out by the United Nations and the specialized agencies had shown that the vast majority of the population of the colonial Territories were illiterate and that the number of supervisory personnel with university training was insignificant. The indigenous inhabitants were deliberately kept in a backward state so that they could more easily be exploited. Their backwardness was due not to a lack of material and human resources but to the colonial régime and exploitation by foreign capital.

25. The foreign monopolies thought only of profits. What attracted them in the colonial Territories were the potential profits, which greatly exceeded the profits they could make in their own countries, owing to the low wages paid to the indigenous workers. Moreover, they were creating a distorted economy, which was artificially concentrated on the production of agricultural and industrial raw materials designed for export and not for the satisfaction of the needs of the local population. Such a policy was a serious long-term threat to the development and economic independence of the colonial Territories.

26. The policy of plundering natural wealth, which the colonial Powers had pursued for decades and centuries, had prevented the peoples of vast areas of the world from developing their production potential, their industry, agriculture and scientific knowledge.

It had, in short, prevented them from attaining a higher material and intellectual level. It was the cause of the serious economic and social inequality, which was increasing in the world and which constituted one of the most urgent problems of present-day international life.

27. It should be added that the monopolies were directly helping the colonial Powers to maintain a system of oppression which they needed to carry on their activities. The monopolies had enabled South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia substantially to increase their military budgets despite the economic sanctions imposed by the international community. They had gone so far as to create economic alliances which, in southern Africa, actually served as a basis for politico-military alliances. In Southern Rhodesia, for instance, where 65 per cent of the investments came from abroad, it was the monopolies, rather than the settlers, which controlled the economy.

28. Ever since colonialism had begun, several centuries earlier, it had been inspired by certain economic interests of the metropolitan countries. In recent years those interests had delayed the process of decolonization and obliged the colonial peoples to take up arms to free themselves. Decolonization had made great progress, but the colonialists still wished to save what remained of their privileges and they even hoped to recover the positions they had lost. Thus it was not surprising that the colonial peoples were running into increased opposition from foreign monopolies. In their struggle the colonial peoples could count on the support of the Romanian people. He hoped that the United Nations would take more vigorous action to put an end to the intolerable situation prevailing in southern Africa and in other parts of the world.

29. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria) stated that the staunch opposition of the remaining colonial Powers to the irreversible movement of the colonial peoples towards independence had for a long time been difficult to understand. People had wondered why so much money was wasted on armaments, why so many human lives were sacrificed and why so much hatred was being engendered. In short, it had been hard to see whether the game was worth the candle. It was only gradually that the larger dimensions of the picture had unfolded. It was only gradually that the larger dimensions of the picture had unfolded. Now, thanks to the efforts of the Special Committee and those of the United Nations Secretariat, it was easier to realize the full extent of the part played in the colonial Territories by powerful material interests hiding behind apparently innocent private companies.

30. The crucial revelation to which those studies had led was that those interests had common characteristics and common goals. They were interdependent and formed a community of interests in order to acquire a powerful influence and considerable means of pressure. In some instances that co-ordination was easy, since certain of the interests involved were merely ramifications of one company which had its headquarters in one of the capitals of the capitalist world. In other instances the foreign interests had been strengthened by association with the foreign settlers.

In most cases, however, an even stronger kind of co-operation was evident: namely, direct co-operation with the colonial Powers, which was so close as to transform mutual interests of the private companies and of the Governments into identical ones.

31. Once that unity of purpose had been revealed, it was easy to understand how the activities of foreign interests in colonial countries developed, particularly in the case of the African Territories. First, the colonial Power introduced legislation enabling the foreign interests to acquire land on advantageous terms. Such land was neither abandoned nor barren but exceptionally fertile or rich in mineral resources. The indigenous inhabitants, who were the rightful owners, were unscrupulously dispossessed. In certain cases, the concessions granted to foreign companies attained vast dimensions; for example, the Angola Diamond Company alone held an exclusive concession in Angola to prospect and exploit an area of 1,025,700 square kilometres.

32. Secondly, the foreign interests exploited the resources to which they thus had access in the most intensive manner, and at minimum cost, to make the highest possible profits. It could be argued that such were the usual norms of capitalist exploitation; indeed, the representative of one Western State had told the Special Committee that all capitalist enterprises acted in that way. There were, however, special circumstances in the colonial Territories. Indigenous manpower was not equated with any other labour; the companies used it as they pleased and it was completely without protection. Some defenders of that system of exploitation had tried to justify it by invoking outmoded notions such as that of a free market and the law of supply and demand. Yet it was a fact that, in the capitalist countries themselves, the consequences of the capitalist system were restricted by legislation for social protection such as that providing for minimum wages, social security, medical insurance and so forth. The protagonists of free enterprise should ask themselves whether it was permissible for a mining company to pay an African worker a daily wage of eight escudos, or some twenty U.S. cents, when with that wage he had to feed his family—who often lived more than 500 miles from his place of work—and pay the equivalent of at least eight cents in taxes and various charges. The company which treated the African worker in that way had apologized to its shareholders for the fact that its net production in 1965 had not exceeded 928 million escudos, or some \$24 million. The unhappy lot of the African workers might have some meaning if they could count on a better future, but it was an unfortunate fact that they were deliberately kept in hopelessly subordinate positions.

33. The advocates of free enterprise knew how poignantly real the situation was but they claimed that foreign investments increased the national revenue of a Territory. He wondered what value could be attached to such notions as national revenue or per capita income in the light of the fact that the income of the Europeans was ten to twelve times greater than that of the Africans. Furthermore, the increase in revenue was essentially to the advantage of the metropolitan Power, the colonial peoples receiving

only imaginary benefits. The primary aim of the colonialists was, in fact, to increase the prosperity of the "mother country" by assuring it of imports at low cost, a sure and cheap source of raw materials, hard currency and outlets in colonial markets for its industry.

34. Having gathered information on the activities of foreign interests for two years, Sub-Committee I, which had dealt with the item, had come to the conclusion that such interests were only contributing to the consolidation of colonial rule. The Sub-Committee's recommendations (A/6868/Add.1, para. 133), which the Special Committee had adopted, had been dictated by necessity. Their adoption by the Committee was imperative if the community of nations was not to remain passive in the face of attempts to perpetuate colonial rule to safeguard the comfort of a minority at the expense of the indigenous majority.

35. Now that the United Nations was aware of the true situation prevailing in the colonial Territories, it should take swift action.

36. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)^{1/} said that the question under consideration had justifiably been accorded very great importance in the statements made by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Ethiopia, Romania and Syria, and he was confident that the same would be true of the statements to be made by the many other delegations that would most probably be taking part in the debate. The question was actually one which concerned the particularly sinister character of the activities of foreign imperialist monopolies in colonial countries. The exploitation of man by man and the appropriation of the fruits of the labour of the overwhelming majority of the people by a small group of capitalists who owned the means of production constituted a basic principle of capitalism and imperialism, and that principle had taken on truly gigantic dimensions and forms in relation to the colonial countries and peoples in particular.

37. If the question under consideration was viewed in a broader context, then it would be apparent that the agenda item before the Committee was one element of the general question of the conflict between labour and capital, the question of the struggle to eliminate the exploitation of man by man and the question of the fight against the actions of a small group of monopolists who were plundering the workers not only in the colonial countries but also in the countries whose economic system was based on the principles of capitalism and imperialism.

38. His delegation did not want to expand upon that theme, although it might perhaps be entirely appropriate to develop further the thought which had just been expressed. Thus, in the course of the following statement it would be necessary to revert to that general topic and to the principal reasons why the foreign monopolies acted as they did in the colonial countries and, indeed, in the many other countries which, after the Second World War, had also broken the chains of colonial serfdom, in so far as the plundering of their natural resources and the shocking

exploitation of their working population were concerned. However, there was now before the Committee a question that could be most aptly described in the terms in which it was stated in the agenda. Therefore, within the framework of that item and in connexion with what he had just said, his delegation wanted to emphasize that the entire history of the colonial system had from the beginning been an unbroken chain of heinous crimes against the indigenous peoples. As had been stated by the founder of the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin, the domination of the European Powers "over the hundreds of millions of inhabitants of the colonies had been achieved only through constant, continuous and never-ending wars". The supremacy of the colonizers had been consolidated by means of the most brutal slaughter and annihilation of defenceless peoples.

39. As a result of those colonial wars, the slave-trade, the systematic extermination of peaceful inhabitants by the colonizers and the ravages of hunger and disease, millions upon millions of the indigenous population had perished in Asia, Africa, North and South America, Australia and other regions of the globe.

40. During the so-called discovery and settlement of the American continent by the European colonizers, a total of almost 30 million of the American Indians had been annihilated. In the African continent, more than 60 million persons had died at the hands of the British, Spanish, Portuguese, Belgian, German and other colonizers who had seized their lands. Whole tribes and national groups had been wiped from the face of the earth. Tens of millions of slaves had been carried off to America alone. During the period from 1884 to 1960, the population of the former Belgian Congo had declined from 30 million to 14 million. Hundreds of thousands of persons had been annihilated by the German colonizers in their African colonies. During the suppression of the national uprising in the Philippines by the United States in the 1890s, more than 600,000 of the local inhabitants had perished.

41. Tens of millions of the inhabitants of India, Indo-China, Indonesia and other former Asian colonies had perished as a result of the ravages of unending wars, hunger and disease.

42. The criminal nature of capitalism and its offshoot imperialism had not changed. Imperialism, being compelled to manoeuvre under the powerful pressure of the national liberation movement, attempted to conceal its exploitative nature; imperialism occasionally had to retreat and to alter the form and method of its struggle for domination. In essence, however, it remained unchanged, and in order to retain its domination, it resorted to the same crude and cruel methods of suppression and plunder; it resorted to wars and aggression in order to continue the colonial exploitation of people. That, as he had already pointed out, was especially evident in the colonial Territories.

43. Today, in the colonial Territories, the national liberation movement was encountering increasing resistance from the imperialist monopolies. They went to any and to the most cruel lengths in order to preserve the colonialist and racist régimes. They

^{1/} This statement was originally issued in provisional form as document A/C.4/SR.1718/Add.1.

acted in that way because those régimes enabled them to continue their predatory exploitation of the natural and human resources of the colonies and to obtain excessively high profits.

44. As had already been pointed out in the Committee, the alliance of the colonial Powers with the foreign monopolies had become the basis and the principal support of the remaining colonial régimes. As had already been shown in the discussion of the questions of Southern Rhodesia, the Portuguese colonies, South West Africa and other colonial Territories, it was that alliance which stood in the way of the complete liquidation of colonialism and was hampering the implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

45. That was why the Soviet and other delegations considered the question of the criminal character of the activities carried on by foreign imperialistic monopolies in the colonies to be one of the most important aspects of the general problem of the final abolition of colonialism—and of racial discrimination and apartheid as its baneful consequences.

46. His delegation had already pointed out that the activities of the imperialistic monopolies in the colonies represented only one element in the struggle being waged by those monopolies in various continents with the aid of ruling circles that were subservient to them in many imperialistic countries and provided support for corrupt unpopular régimes in such countries as South Viet-Nam and South Korea as well as in many other areas of the world.

47. In considering the item before them, delegations must bear in mind that the monopolies of the United States of America that were active in the colonial Territories were at the same time the instigators and organizers of the sordid war of aggression in Viet-Nam. With the collaboration and direct support of the imperialistic monopolies, so-called local wars were being started and punitive expeditions were being organized against the forces of the national liberation movement in many countries of the world, including, as the events of recent days had shown, the countries of the Near East. There, too, the principal moving force was the desire to reinforce at any price the influence of imperialism, to resist the mighty movement of the people against capitalist enslavement, the powerful striving of the peoples of the world for peace, freedom and national independence and for socialism.

48. With a view to emphasizing how far the concentration of production and capital had proceeded, he recalled that, according to the figures for 1964, there were seventy-six industrial companies in the capitalist world having an income exceeding \$1,000 million a year. According to authoritative information for the year 1963, the total sales in that year of the General Motors Corporation alone had equalled the budget of the Federal Republic of Germany and had exceeded the national income of the Netherlands by 10 per cent.

49. Although such examples could be multiplied, it was already apparent from those which had been given that the financial and industrial monopolistic groups of the present day did not represent individual em-

pires but were alliances of powerful millionaires and multi-millionaires who were united by common interests. Among the objectives of the agreements concluded within the framework of those alliances were the combined efforts to win foreign markets and to further foreign economic expansion, as well as the exploitation of the colonial Territories.

50. The drive for super-profits, which had become a basic law in the development and activity of the imperialistic monopolies, was, in the final analysis, hampering the elimination of colonialism and thwarting the national liberation of peoples, and it ultimately represented a threat to world peace and security. That activity was in sharp contradiction with the basic provisions and tasks of the United Nations Charter and with a number of important decisions previously adopted by the United Nations and more particularly the basic provisions and principles proclaimed by the United Nations in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

51. If the activities of the monopolies in the colonial Territories were traced back over a period of time, it would become clear that monopolistic capital represented a reactionary movement in every sense of the term. The pressure of the monopolies was especially severe for the colonial peoples. In the economic sphere it signified the plundering of the national resources of a country with the result that the economic development of the colonial Territories was many decades behind what it should have been. It signified severe economic backwardness and a lop-sided economic structure. It signified economic dependence on the imperialistic countries.

52. In the political and social spheres, it signified a complete absence of rights. It signified a system of shameful racial discrimination and the existence of apartheid, and the debasement of the indigenous inhabitants of the colonial Territories to the status of slaves devoid of any rights by which they might better their lot. It signified hunger, poverty, disease and extinction; it signified educational and cultural backwardness.

53. His delegation fully agreed with the conclusion of Sub-Committee I that the foreign monopolies in colonial countries had played and continued to play "a reactionary role in the fields of economic, political and social development" (A/6868/Add.1, para. 90). Their baneful influence also made itself felt through their activities in the southern part of the African continent, which now constituted the mightiest bastion of colonialist-racist régimes. That bastion could not have held out for any length of time without the support of international monopoly capital. Consequently the Special Committee was fully justified in expressing serious concern at the continuing penetration of foreign capital and the consolidation of its positions in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa and the Republic of South Africa.

54. It was of interest to note that the total volume of foreign capital investment in the countries of southern Africa, according to available data, now exceeded \$10,000 million—a tremendous sum, especially if it was remembered that it was larger than the State budgets of many independent developing countries.

The lion's share of that capital was held by the monopolies of the United Kingdom, the United States and other NATO countries, in particular the Federal Republic of Germany.

55. Foreign monopolies owned over two thirds of all capital invested in Angola and Mozambique, and over 80 per cent of the capital invested in Southern Rhodesia. The capital investments of the United States and the United Kingdom alone in the Republic of South Africa, the most powerful economic entity in the region, amounted to about \$5,000 million.

56. He felt that the world must be told which particular monopolies in the colonies were the strongest enemies of the independence of African peoples. It was not enough to refer, as a number of preceding speakers had rightly done, to an anonymous foreign capital which was causing incalculable harm to the peoples of colonial Territories; he would make an effort to follow the example set by several representatives and designate those monopolies by their names.

57. Foremost among them were the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa, Ltd., and Charter Consolidated, which, together with their subsidiaries, held capital investments amounting to over \$1,000 million and controlled the key branches of the economy of the entire region.

58. In Angola, the list was headed by the Angola Diamond Company, which specialized in diamond mining; next came the mining concerns Lobito and Lombige and the oil companies Petrofina and Cabinda Gulf Oil Company, which were controlled by United States, West German and Belgian monopolies.

59. In Mozambique, the largest firms were the Mozambique Gulf Oil Company, the Mozambique Pan-American Oil Company, and the Companhia Carbonifera do Moçambique, in which again the major share was held by United States and Belgian monopolies.

60. Of greatest importance in Southern Rhodesia were Lonrho, Ltd., Selection Trust, Ltd., three subsidiaries of the Union Carbide Company of the United States, the Rhodesia Vanadium Corporation, and a few others. There again, as had been brought out during the discussion of the question of Southern Rhodesia, the leading part was played by United Kingdom and United States monopolies.

61. The principal firms in South West Africa were the Tsumeb Corporation, the Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd., and the Marine Diamond Corporation, Ltd., in which South African, United Kingdom and United States monopolies held a controlling interest.

62. He had not listed those foreign monopoly firms out of pure love of economic research, although such research was always useful in seeking to ascertain the real mainsprings and causes of a policy which ran counter to the principles and interests of progressive nations. He was convinced that the responsibility for crimes against humanity and against the freedom and independence of peoples should be laid at the door of the particular foreign monopolies which were directly engaged in plundering, ravaging and laying waste the colonial Territories, and of

the ruling circles of the imperialist colonialist Powers—also clearly designated—which did their bidding.

63. A legitimate question, which had been raised at the very beginning of the debate, was: why did those and other representatives of imperialism actively support the colonialist-racist régimes? That question had been answered, and he wished to associate himself with the conclusion drawn at the time. The answer was that the colonialist-racist régimes were especially attractive in that they constituted a guarantee of fabulous profits to the imperialist monopolies, deriving from the rich natural resources of the southern African countries in conjunction with cheap labour. It was, of course, clear to everyone that the labour was cheap not because of special economic conditions prevailing in the areas in which it was so monstrously exploited. The so-called cheapness of labour was due to extra-economic compulsion, which took the form of racist regulations and discrimination, and the unrestrained exploitation and direct repression of the local population. By using cheap labour, the imperialist monopolies were able to reap fantastic profits, double and triple the returns in the developed capitalist countries, where under normal conditions annual profits did not exceed 7 or 8 per cent. He was not referring at the moment to the super-profits garnered by those imperialist monopolies which were interested in the continuation of the armaments race and the maintenance of international tension and which thereby reaped such fabulous profits even in the developed capitalist countries as no apologist of the capitalist system of economy could ever have dreamed of. By their own admission—according to data compiled by the foreign monopolies themselves—they were able to obtain a full return on their capital investments in the colonial Territories, in the form of profits, in a mere four or five years.

64. That explained, among other things, why United States and West German investment had grown especially fast in recent years. West German investment had increased tenfold over the past ten years (1956-1966).

65. Gold, diamonds, petroleum, cotton and other property of the African peoples, like their very lives, served to enrich foreign monopolists and in part also to bribe the upper level of the working class in the imperialist countries. What those crimes brought to the Africans was a miserable existence in virtual slavery, hunger, disease, an early death, illiteracy and cultural backwardness.

66. Obviously, no amount of statistics could convey the full tragedy of the African peoples in southern Africa. Yet even the figures were striking. The Angola Diamond Company, which he had mentioned earlier, had earned about \$70 million in profits from the export of diamonds in 1961-1965. The manner in which the profits had been distributed was not without interest: \$27 million had gone to the individual stockholders in the metropolitan country, and about the same amount to the Portuguese Government. In addition, during that period the Portuguese Government had received about \$3 million from the company as its contribution towards the "defence of the fatherland", a term which obviously meant support of the armed

forces of the colonial order; and the local colonial authorities had received \$8 million in loans from the company for that same purpose, support of the colonial order.

67. He further noted that the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa garnered profits of that order of magnitude not in five years but in one year.

68. The principal imperialist monopolies in South West Africa were the Tsumeb Corporation, the Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd, and the Marine Diamond Corporation, Ltd., which he had mentioned before. Those were the very same monopolies in which the controlling interest was held by United States and United Kingdom capital. They were part of the international conspiracy of the imperialist monopolies, aimed at strengthening the colonialist régime, offering organized resistance to the national liberation movements in the Territories, and creating a threat to international peace and to the security of the peoples of Africa and other parts of the world as well.

69. It was also known that part of the conspiracy was the fact that the colonial administration, acting on behalf, and against the interests, of the indigenous population, granted privileges to the foreign monopolies which would have been out of the question in independent countries. Those privileges increased the super-profits even more and made it easier to take possession of them. In the Portuguese colonies, the foreign monopolies were exempted from taxes and duties, vast tracts of land were placed at their disposal, and they were allowed to maintain their own police and even military forces, which were used to support the colonial régime and suppress the popular struggle. Nearly half the Territory of South West Africa had been granted as concessions to the foreign monopolies.

70. A representative of the Newmont Mining Corporation, which operated in the Republic of South Africa and in South West Africa, had stated that the profits of his company, like those of a number of others, averaged 27 per cent of the capital invested. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had said earlier in the meeting, the annual income of Consolidated Diamond Mines was almost double the budget for the whole Territory of South West Africa. The average rate of profits in the Portuguese colonies amounted to not less than 18 to 20 per cent and was often as high as 45 per cent for individual large companies.

71. For that reason, even if the situation which had developed was analysed from the point of view of those who were in favour of preserving the capitalist system of production and economy, even from the point of view of the apologists of that capitalist system, the facts which had been adduced, now as well as in the past, and which were contained in the report of the Special Committee and elsewhere, were an indictment of the international conspiracy of the imperialist monopolies against the peoples of the colonial Territories and against the cause of national liberation and the attainment of independence by those countries.

72. Thus monopolistic capital was intensifying its penetration of Africa in the remaining colonial Terri-

tories, as had been rightly said, not for any charitable purposes, not in order to assist the economic development of those Territories, but in order to plunder them.

73. In addition to the facts he had adduced, he would mention that Charter Consolidated earned almost 40 per cent of all its profits in southern Africa, while it earned only 12 per cent in the independent African countries and less than 20 per cent in the United Kingdom itself. It was therefore understandable that, like other monopolies, it should fight vigorously for the retention of colonialism.

74. As Sub-Committee I had pointed out (A/6868/Add.1, para. 85), the basic means of production in the colonial Territories in southern Africa, namely, the land, mines, plants and factories, and transport, were in the hands of foreign capitalists and local settlers, while the indigenous population were deprived of all opportunities to take part in the economic life of their countries.

75. That situation was characteristic not only of the Territories in southern Africa; it was typical of all the colonial possessions of the imperialist countries. He had drawn attention to the situation in Africa because a bastion of colonialism existed there which, it was clear to everyone, the colonialists had no intention of leaving without a struggle. He had drawn special attention to those facts because that bastion represented a permanent threat to the independent African States.

76. The activities of the foreign monopolies had had, indeed, terrible economic and social consequences.

77. As the report of Sub-Committee I stated, the best lands had been seized by foreigners and the overwhelming majority of peasants were obliged to lease land from European landlords and foreign companies or unfavourable terms. Those conditions were essentially no different from serfdom or slavery. The peasants cultivated only those crops which were needed by foreign concessionary companies. They sold them to the foreign companies at prices which were arbitrarily determined by those companies and which assured the monopolies of a high profit from the export of valuable crops.

78. The region had a developed market economy on lands held by foreign companies and large social colonialist landowners and a backward and primitive subsistence economy on the small amount of poor land which the indigenous population still possessed. That situation hampered the general economic development of the Territories, and the peasants, i.e., the indigenous population, lived in conditions under which they were deprived of the most elementary means of existence.

79. It was known, for example, that in the Republic of South Africa the indigenous population, which represented considerably more than two thirds of the total population of the country, had the right—and he would place that word "right" in inverted commas, because it existed only in theory—to only 13 per cent of the land. The same general picture was to be observed in Southern Rhodesia.

80. The representative of Syria had just pointed out a very significant fact, that the Angola Diamond Company had exclusive rights over a territory of

more than 1 million square kilometres, whereas on the remaining territory each African had an amount of land that was on the average one fiftieth of that of a Portuguese farmer. In his view, no more eloquent figures were needed.

81. The income of African farmers in Angola, for example, as was pointed out by the Special Committee in its report, at best amounted to only 2 per cent of the income of white farmers. In Southern Rhodesia, according to data in the same report, the average per capita income of African farmers in 1965 had amounted to only £10.

82. His delegation considered the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee to be correct, since they pointed out that the alienation of land from the indigenous African population was inadmissible and criminal, and his delegation supported the recommendation that called for a halt to that practice.

83. His delegation also wished to draw attention to the fact that the indigenous population of the colonial Territories had been deprived of the right to form trade unions and thus of the right to organize in defence of their interests.

84. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had already pointed out in the Committee, the monopolistic position of foreign companies in respect of the marketing and pricing of export crops was based on the virtually unlimited racial discrimination against African workers in industry with regard to working conditions. The average annual per capita income of the so-called European population in the Republic of South Africa was higher than the average annual per capita income of the population in the United Kingdom. That situation should be compared with the fact that the incomes of the Africans were at the same time considerably lower than those in the independent countries of the African continent. That alarming disparity between the average incomes of Europeans and Africans in the Republic of South Africa which, as had already been pointed out, amounted to a ratio of 10:1, was steadily growing. In Southern Rhodesia, in 1965, the difference between the average annual wage of an African labourer and that of a white labourer had also been of the order of 1:10 (£128 for an African and £1,284 for a white labourer). That difference was even greater in South West Africa, where it amounted to 1:12 or 1:13 in the mining industry. That was the basis for the fabulous riches and the monstrous plunder which resulted from the activity of foreign monopolies in those areas.

85. That criminal activity of the monopolies in the southern part of Africa also constituted a threat to the security of the independent African countries. It should be pointed out, however, that the monopolies of the Western countries also ruthlessly exploited the so-called small colonial Territories.

86. Peoples under colonial domination in the Near East, Asia, Oceania and other regions were suffering from the activities of foreign monopolies, just like the peoples of southern Africa.

87. One generally known fact clearly demonstrated how tenaciously the colonizers were holding on to

their possessions in the Near East. It was well known that the oil monopolies were deriving immense profits from the extraction of Near East oil. The importance of the colonial system for profit-making on that scale was perfectly clear, if only from the fact that the taxes paid by the oil monopolies in the Arab sheikdoms, which were divided and under colonialist oppression, were only a fraction of what they were in the independent Arab States.

88. A similar situation existed in the Australian possessions in Oceania. In the Territory of Papua-New Guinea, new investment was increasing by about £5 to 6 million sterling each year, while the profits exported annually (excluding reinvestment and other local expenditure) ranged from £3 to £5 million sterling. In the exploitation or—as it would be truer to say—the plundering of that Territory, the administering Power itself was taking a direct part side by side with private companies, as it owned a substantial proportion—sometimes more than 50 per cent—of the shares of some of companies concerned.

89. The position was similar in the United States possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific as well. In Puerto Rico the annual profits derived by United States monopolies, which owned 80 per cent of all industry, were of the order of 28-30 per cent. The position was exactly the same on the island of Guam, which was virtually dominated by a single monopoly, Jones and Guerrero Company, and where foreign capital was exempted from taxation altogether for the first ten years. The list or examples of that kind could be continued indefinitely.

90. The monopolists, the true masters of the capitalist countries, were directing the activities of ruling circles in those countries and mobilizing the whole State apparatus in defence of their interests in the colonies. They were using foreign policy and armed force to serve their own selfish interests. Therein lay the true explanation of the political line which certain major Western Powers had taken at the current and earlier sessions on the question of decolonization, when the Committee had been discussing the situation in specific colonial Territories. Though in their statements they recognized the right of peoples to self-determination, the representatives of the major colonial Powers were in fact doing everything to preserve the bastions of colonialism both in southern Africa and in the so-called small colonial Territories. That policy was also directly and very closely linked to the fact that the colonialist countries, particularly the United States, were holding on so firmly to their chain of military bases which were scattered throughout the world and acted as springboards for aggression and for fighting the national liberation movement.

91. All those aspects of the problem, as he had already stated, were closely linked. The hand of the monopolies of the imperialist countries was evident in everything—the economic exploitation of colonial Territories, the political support given to decaying colonial régimes and the military suppression of the heroic struggle of the peoples for their national liberation. It was completely obvious to any attentive and unprejudiced observer that the United States base on Guam, which was being used against the peace-

loving people of Viet-Nam, the United Kingdom bases in the Arabian peninsula, which were helping to suppress the struggle of the peoples of Southern Arabia, the West German base in Portugal, which enabled the Portuguese colonizers to send additional troops to Angola, and the United States base at Guantánamo, which was threatening the independence of Cuba—all those and many other bases were in fact serving one and the same purpose of strengthening the position of imperialism and its monopolies and repressing the national liberation movement.

92. A specially important role in that conspiracy was being accorded to the so-called small colonial Territories. As well as directly exploiting the natural and human resources of those Territories, the imperialist monopolies and their Governments were using the Territories as springboards for aggression and for fighting the national liberation movement.

93. A single glance at a map was enough to indicate the importance of that chain of bases stretching from the Marshall and Marianas Islands through the islands of the Indian Ocean, Arabia, and southern Africa right across to the Caribbean. Those bases, as many delegations had repeatedly pointed out, were a serious threat to the security of peoples.

94. The situation could not be tolerated any longer. The General Assembly should categorically demand that the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the other colonial Powers should comply with its decisions calling for the elimination of foreign bases in colonial Territories. Implementation of those decisions would be a valuable step in the campaign against the crimes being committed by foreign monopolies in colonial Territories. It would contribute considerably to the success of the struggle for national liberation, and open up prospects for the final eradication of colonialism.

95. The report of the Special Committee and other sources of information showed that foreign monopolies in the colonial Territories were pursuing policies that were in conflict with the fundamental interests of countries and peoples fighting for their national liberation. The General Assembly should therefore condemn those activities by international monopolies which were a threat to peace and were one of the main factors impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

96. His delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee to the General Assembly in their entirety. It considered that those conclusions and recommendations could provide a useful and appropriate basis for a decision at the current session of the General Assembly. That decision, in the Soviet Union's view, should cover not only the situation in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa, and the Portuguese and other colonies, but should apply equally to the Republic of South Africa and to the other colonial Territories.

97. His delegation was naturally ready to consider any constructive additions to the recommendations submitted by the Special Committee and to the conclusions and proposals it was now presenting.

98. The Soviet delegation also considered it essential that the General Assembly should decisively condemn the criminal activities of foreign monopolies directed towards supporting colonial régimes, and their greedy exploitation of the natural wealth and of the peoples of colonial countries. It considered it essential that the Assembly should demand the cessation of those criminal activities, which were a serious obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the final elimination of colonialism and its consequences.

99. It was also important for the General Assembly to condemn the support given to international monopolies by the colonial Powers—in the first place Portugal and the Republic of South Africa, and also the United States of America and the United Kingdom—to the detriment of the indigenous populations of the colonial countries.

100. The General Assembly should call upon all States whose monopolies were participating in the plundering of colonial peoples, and particularly the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, to take steps, by legislative and other action, to put an end to the criminal activities of their monopolies in the colonies. In his delegation's view, the Assembly's decision should require the States concerned, at long last, to take effective measures to limit substantially the transfer of profits out of colonial Territories by foreign monopolies, and to adopt legislative measures to enable the greater part of those profits to be used in order to promote the economic and social development of the colonies, raise the level of living of the indigenous people and improve health services and public education.

101. The General Assembly should also, in his delegation's view, instruct the Special Committee to continue to consider the problem and formulate measures to combat the harmful activities of monopolies in the colonies. He agreed with the Ethiopian delegation which, in its statement at the same meeting, had emphasized the importance of the fact that the question of the activities of foreign monopolies in colonial Territories was being considered for the first time in the United Nations as a separate and independent item of the agenda. His delegation shared that view. He considered it extremely important, in view of the significance of the problem, that the question under consideration concerning the activities of monopolies should be included as a special item in the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly to allow consideration of a report, by the Special Committee on the results of the implementation of the decisions taken by the United Nations at the current session.

102. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) said that the question that the Committee was now studying lay at the very heart of the problem of the achievement of independence by the indigenous peoples of southern Africa. It was therefore vital that the true enemies of African independence should be exposed and their activities studied. It was already apparent that many countries which had repeatedly declared their support for the liberation movements were actually opposed to the avowed objectives of the freedom fighters.

103. It was a simple matter for a representative to appear before the Committee to deny that his country was co-operating with the minority régimes and to assert that it supported the principles of decolonization and majority rule. The truth must be told and that was what the representative of the Soviet Union had done when, in his statement, he had dealt with the complex problems encountered by the indigenous peoples of southern Africa in their struggle to shake off the colonial yoke.

104. He therefore asked that the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union should be reproduced in extenso in the summary record of the Committee's debate.

105. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee accepted the proposal made by the representative of Zambia.

It was so decided.

Organization of work (A/C.4/698)

106. The CHAIRMAN said that, following his suggestions concerning the order in which the various items should be considered (A/C.4/698), the Committee should have taken up the item now before it on 9 November, completing its consideration on 14 November. Only at the present meeting, however, i.e., three working days late, had it taken the item up.

107. To expedite the progress of the Committee's work, he suggested that the list of speakers wishing to take part in the general debate on the item should be closed at 6 p.m. on 15 November.

It was so decided.

108. The CHAIRMAN said that he intended to close the general debate on the item under consideration on 17 November, and asked for the co-operation of all delegations to that end. Two meetings had been cancelled to enable members of the Committee to prepare their statements.

109. With regard to the two items which the Committee would then take up, one on the "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations" (item 97), and the other on the "Question of Oman" (item 70), he pointed out that the Committee was due to take them up between 16 and 22 November. He therefore asked members of the Committee to be ready to make their statements in good time in order to obviate the need for night meetings.

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING BRITISH HONDURAS (AGENDA ITEM 23) (continued) (A/C.4/694)

110. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 1699th meeting the Committee, having heard the reservations expressed by the delegation of Guatemala and the explanatory comments of the Chairman, had decided to grant the request of Mr. Philip S. W. Goldson (A/C.4/694) for a hearing concerning British Honduras. That petitioner was at present in New York

and would like to be heard before 19 November, when he had to leave the city.

111. Mr. PINTO ACEVEDO (Guatemala) said that the reason that his delegation had made a statement at the 1699th meeting, pointing out that the dispute between his country and the United Kingdom concerning the Territory of Belize had been submitted for mediation by the United States Government, had been to ensure that the Committee, made aware of the relevant facts, could take an informed decision concerning Mr. Goldson's request for a hearing.

112. Despite the reservations expressed by his delegation, the Committee had decided to grant the petitioner's request for a hearing. The Committee was master of its agenda and, bearing in mind the Chairman's remarks concerning the order in which it had been decided to take up the various items, the most logical course, now that the Committee had granted the request for a hearing, would be to hear Mr. Goldson only when it took up an item under which the question of Belize would normally be considered—for example, item 23, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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 (chapters relating to all other Territories)", or item 63, "Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations".

113. The CHAIRMAN said that he had not made a formal proposal; it was ultimately for the Committee to decide how it wished to proceed.

114. He merely wished to point out how matters now stood, namely that there was only one speaker on the list for the single meeting scheduled for 15 November, and that Mr. Goldson was at present in New York and wished to be heard. The Committee would have to decide whether or not it wished to hear the petitioner at the meeting to be held on 15 November.

115. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in his opinion, the Guatemalan representative had not raised a formal objection and his reservations were prompted solely by the desire not to upset the order of priority which had been established. Since there was only one speaker on the list for the next meeting, the order of priority would not be affected in any way if the Committee heard the petitioner after the speaker made his statement.

116. Moreover, apart from the fact that it wished the Committee to hear Mr. Goldson ahead of schedule because the latter's activities would take him far from New York after 19 November, his delegation subscribed to the principle that petitioners should be heard as quickly as possible since it was important for financial reasons that they should not be forced to spend too much time in New York.

117. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) said he agreed that the Guatemalan representative had no reason to fear that the order of priorities established for consideration of the agenda items would be upset; since there was only one speaker on the list for the next meeting,

there was nothing to prevent the Committee from hearing the petitioner after the speaker. If it postponed the hearing, the Committee might well be forced, for lack of time, to schedule a night meeting in order to hear Mr. Goldson.

118. Mr. PINTO ACEVEDO (Guatemala) said that, in the case of the Territory of Belize, what was involved was basically a question of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guatemala rather than a typically colonial question; that was the reason for the reservations expressed by his delegation.

119. Moreover, quite apart from the fact that the financial considerations cited by the Tanzanian representative were not relevant in the present instance inasmuch as Mr. Goldson lived in New York, the latter's qualifications to appear before the Committee as a petitioner were open to challenge and there was some question as to whether it was the interests of the people of Belize or his own interests that Mr. Goldson was concerned with defending.

120. He urged the Committee to begin by taking up its own programme of work and to direct its attention first to everything relating directly to the item under consideration.

121. Mr. CUEVA TAMARIZ (Ecuador) said that it would be more logical to hear the petitioner when the Committee took up the matters which might be of interest to Mr. Goldson. The Committee should devote its attention now to the item under discussion and complete the consideration of it before going on to the next item. Any other procedure would merely cause confusion in the debate.

122. Mr. ESTRADA (Argentina) said that while the Committee obviously would have to hear the petitioner, it could do so at a more opportune time. He thought that the objections voiced by the representatives of Guatemala and Ecuador were perfectly valid.

123. As to the financial considerations cited by the Tanzanian representative, he did not think that they were decisive in the present case, since Mr. Goldson was a member of the National Assembly and was therefore not lacking in resources. It should also be noted that the only reason there was but one speaker on the list for the next meeting was that the delegations were preparing their statements.

124. Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica) said that he wished to associate himself with the remarks made by the delegations which were in favour of granting the petitioner a hearing. A decision to do so would not in any sense disarrange the order of priority established by the officers of the Committee; on the contrary, the Committee would be even better able to abide by its priorities, since it would avoid the necessity of hearing the petitioner at a time when that might hold up its work.

125. Mr. COLERIDGE-TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) said he thought it would obviously be best if the Committee could hear the petitioner when it took up item 23 (chapters relating to all other Territories), which was the item under which the question should logically be discussed and was to be considered by the Committee between 1 and 12 December. The Tanzanian delegation, on the other hand, felt that since the Com-

mittee had some time available, it would be advisable to make use of it in order to hear the petitioner as soon as possible. Those two positions were based on the assumption that the petitioner would not find it possible to be in New York between 1 and 12 December. However, it was not certain whether that was the case, and the Chairman might question the petitioner in that regard; if the latter did not think he could be in New York during the period in question, consideration could then be given to another date for the hearing.

126. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania), addressing himself to those delegations which had challenged the financial argument he had put forward to justify granting the petitioner a hearing, said that that was only one of the factors which made it desirable to hear Mr. Goldson at once; the decisive argument was the point of principle which his delegation had emphasized in stating that petitioners should always be heard as quickly as possible.

127. In any event, the problem was a practical one; there was only one speaker on the list for the next meeting, and the Committee should make use of the remaining time in order to hear Mr. Goldson. That was a very simple matter which should not give rise to controversy.

128. He did not feel that he could agree to the compromise proposed by the delegation of Sierra Leone, which would make it necessary for the petitioner to return to New York in order to be heard by the Committee.

129. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had consulted the petitioner, who had informed him that he could not be in New York between 1 and 12 December.

130. Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) proposed that the meeting should be suspended so that the delegations concerned could reach an agreement on the matter.

131. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said he thought that the Committee should take a vote on whether it should hear the petitioner at the next meeting or should postpone the hearing.

132. The CHAIRMAN said that he had intended to make a proposal to that effect before the Venezuelan delegation had made its motion to suspend the meeting.

133. In accordance with rule 119 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he was required to put the motion to the vote as a matter of priority.

By 23 votes to 16, with 34 abstentions, the Committee decided to suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 6.25 p.m. and resumed at 6.40 p.m.

134. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, after holding consultations, the delegations concerned had agreed to ask the Committee to hear the petitioner at the next meeting.

135. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, the Committee could hear the petitioner at the next meeting after any members who wished to make statements on the item under consideration had spoken.

It was so decided.

136. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said he wished to point out, in connexion with the documentation, that the report now before the Committee had not been made available to delegations ten days before the item to which it related was taken up and it was therefore difficult for the delegations to give proper study to the item. He hoped that, in their consideration of the next item, delegations would receive the

relevant document in advance so that they would have sufficient time to study it.

137. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had taken note of the Somali representative's request and that his observations would be brought to the attention of the Special Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.