

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1194th
 PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 14 December 1962,
 at 8.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:
Permanent sovereignty over natural resources
(concluded)
Report of the Second Committee. 1133

Agenda item 25:
The situation with regard to the implementa-
tion of the Declaration on the granting of
independence to colonial countries and
peoples: report of the Special Committee
established under General Assembly resolu-
tion 1654 (XVI) (continued) 1136

Agenda item 57:
Question of South West Africa:
(a) Report of the United Nations Special Com-
mittee for South West Africa;
(b) Special educational and training pro-
grammes for South West Africa: report of
the Secretary-General
Reports of the Fourth Committee and of the
Fifth Committee 1145

Agenda item 54:
Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal
with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United
Nations and with General Assembly resolu-
tion 1542 (XV): report of the Special Com-
mittee on Territories under Portuguese
Administration
Report of the Fourth Committee.

operative paragraph 9 to the vote and fourth and lastly, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee as a whole, as amended.

2. I now put to the vote operative paragraph 5. I wish to remind the Assembly that it decided this afternoon, under rule 87 of the rules of procedure, that this question, and therefore the related amendments, shall be decided by two-thirds of the Members present and voting. A roll-call vote has been requested.

Jamaica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

Abstaining: Jamaica, Liberia, Madagascar, Niger, Rwanda, Thailand, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, India, Ivory Coast.

Operative paragraph 5 was rejected by 41 votes to 38, with 15 abstentions.

3. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the request for a separate vote on the first part of paragraph 9?

4. I call on the representative of Italy on a point of order.

5. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy): I wish to state that my delegation opposes the request for a separate vote on paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

6. The PRESIDENT: An objection has been raised. I shall therefore put to a vote the motion for division. Rule 91 of the rules of procedure provides that two speakers shall be given permission to speak in favour of the motion and two against. Does any one wish to speak?

7. Since no one wishes to speak, I shall put to a vote the request for a separate vote on the first part of paragraph 9.

President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Rifa'i (Jordan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 39

Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (concluded)
 REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/5344/
 ADD.1 AND ADD.1/CORR.1)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now go into the voting on the item under consideration. The voting will take place in the following order: first, a separate vote by roll-call on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in the report of the Second Committee [A/5344/Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1], as proposed by the United Kingdom; second, I shall then put to the Assembly the request of the representative of Burma for a separate vote on the first part of operative paragraph 9, which reads: "Foreign investment agreements freely entered into by or between sovereign States shall be observed in good faith"; third, and depending on the result of the preceding vote, I shall put that of

The motion was rejected by 45 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions.

8. The PRESIDENT: As the motion for division has not been adopted, I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Jordan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United States of America, United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan.

Against: South Africa, France.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

9. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their vote.

10. Mr. EL-BANNA (United Arab Republic): We have supported and voted for the resolution, as amended, because it complies, to a great extent, with our point of view on this item. In order to have a free hand in adapting the economy, in such a way as to raise the standard of living of the people and to ensure that development proceeds and is enjoyed by them, a country may seek to remove certain elements of economic dislocation, that may seriously hamper the social and the economic targets of the development plan. It is of vital importance to the developing countries to have command over the way in which their natural resources are exploited.

11. The resolution points out that the exploration, development and disposition of the natural resources of a country, as well as their nationalization, expropriation or requisitioning, should be in conformity with the rules and conditions freely prescribed to by that country, with appropriate compensation to owners of property. These rights, it may be stressed, are in accordance with international law. It is noteworthy that the United Arab Republic, in exercising its rights of economic sovereignty, has lived up to its foreign obligations of compensation. Two important examples, in this respect, are the Suez Canal compensation and the compensation to the United Kingdom nationals, which we have paid in full, at a time when we had heavy pressure on our balance of payments, as necessitated by our comprehensive development plan.

12. Concern has been expressed about the impact of the resolution on the flow of foreign capital. This concern has, we feel, been taken care of in the resolution, since compensation for property is an important principle in the resolution. Of course, each individual country can take the necessary steps on the national plane to give concessions to foreign investment with all appropriate guarantees, on a basis of mutual benefit, not of exploitation. We should like, in this respect, to confirm the idea expounded in the fifth preambular paragraph which distinguishes between the pre-independence and the post-independence contracts conducted by different States, since full political sovereignty is a prerequisite for full economic sovereignty.

13. Colonialism and racial discrimination, which have been condemned in various forums, constitute two kinds of violating the economic sovereignty rights of the countries where they still exist, since the resources and peoples of these countries are exploited in such a way as to benefit primarily either foreigners or minorities. We would have liked that these two aspects would have been explicitly mentioned in the resolution. They are implicitly taken care of, however, in the resolution, especially in operative paragraphs 1, 5 and 7.

14. As to the suggested amendment [A/L.412/Rev.2], we voted for it because we felt that the permanent sovereignty over national resources is so important an item that it should be continuously considered and followed up by the United Nations.

15. We voted against the deletion of operative paragraph 5 of the original draft resolution since the paragraph confirms further the economic sovereignty rights of nations and considers inadmissible acts aimed at obstructing the creation, defence and strengthening of that sovereignty. We could not agree to the argument that this paragraph introduced an element of imbalance in the text of the draft, since in other paragraphs of the draft, foreign investors' rights are maintained.

16. The same consideration of affirming further the sovereignty rights of nations prompted my delegation to vote for the amendment [A/L.414]. We would have liked to include the paragraph suggested in this amendment and to maintain operative paragraph 5 in the original draft. We voted for the draft, as amended, on the understanding that the ideas contained in operative paragraph 5 in the original draft as well as in the amendment [A/L.414], are implicitly contained in the resolution, especially operative paragraphs 4 and 6 of the original draft.

17. Mr. CHOLLET (France) (translated from French): I should like to explain very briefly the reasons why we are against the text of the resolution on permanent sovereignty over natural resources.

18. Our position is based, as the French delegation has seen fit to point out on several occasions, on the fact that we do not think that the Second Committee is equipped to settle single-headed a problem with such complex and delicate legal implications.

19. We still think that, before the matter was settled, the opinion of United Nations organs competent to deal with legal questions, such as the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly or the International Law Commission, should have been sought. However laudable the Second Committee's efforts to produce compromise formulae may be when it deals

with questions within its competence, that is to say essentially economic questions, we think that it is taking the wrong road and running serious risks when it tries singlehanded to outline compromise formulae on texts which are primarily concerned with matters of law.

20. For the same reasons, my delegation abstained from voting on the thirteen-Power amendment [A/L.412/Rev.2], which in our view raises similar objections in that, instead of appealing to the legal authorities which we have mentioned, it refers continued consideration of this question to administrative or economic bodies.

21. We still think that it would be a waste of time to try to lay down definitive formulae without first requesting the opinion of those representatives who are empowered by the various States to deal with legal questions.

22. We hope, however, that when he embarks upon the study which he has been requested to make, the Secretary-General will see fit to suggest that either the Sixth Committee or the International Law Commission should be consulted.

23. Mr. BUTTI (Iraq): While explaining our vote on the resolution just adopted by the Assembly, and for which we have voted, my delegation wishes to stress the fact that Member States and all countries of the world, whose nationals and whose Governments are engaged in capital investment and the exploitation of national natural resources, keep in mind in their deliberations the interests of the developing countries who have freed themselves from political domination.

24. We have listened to some speakers in defence of further exploitation of people of the less developed countries. These speeches deserve a brief answer. It is a fact that political freedom, particularly in the second half of the twentieth century, has brought with it a new type of colonial effort in the interest of the giants of trade, the developed empires of the world. Neo-colonialism, which is so evident in all its ungraceful forms, is a measure taken by the States which were once the masters of the seas and which possessed powerful armies in all the corners of the world. Continents have suffered for ages as a result of the industrial revolution and of the expansion of trade for the benefit of only a handful of States. The giants of investment have subjugated huge areas of the world and millions of people for their own interests. This is the essence of the long debates that the Second Committee engages in concerning the development of the developing nations. It is because the colonizers had exploited, and are still exploiting, the natural wealth of many nations, in order to meet their own ends, that the United Nations is now confronted with programmes such as Technical Assistance and international financing and assistance in general, to the less developed countries. Nobody can deny the fact that many nations that have been blessed with enormous natural wealth are now referred to as, and are in fact, less developed because the colonizers made them so. It is a historical fact that the flags of empires have followed the so-called merchants, traders and investors to continents such as Africa, Asia and South America.

25. In the debates on the permanent sovereignty over natural resources, my delegation's interventions were in the interests of the majority of nations striving for development. Almost all of these nations, including my

own, were previously subjugated to imperialism in one way or another. We have therefore listened with interest to the objections raised by scores of representatives of the less developed countries to the efforts which persisted for the purpose of furthering the interests of the highly developed countries at the expense of the less developed. My delegation's main objections to the Anglo-American amendments and to the principles embodied in them could be summarized as follows.

26. We regard agreements signed between companies and sovereign States as simple contracts, governed and protected by the domestic laws of sovereign States. If the word "agreements" still exists in the resolution which was just adopted and if it may refer to agreements between companies and States, we still do not see any reason for its observance in an international instrument. Such agreements have been signed over the ages between companies and sovereign States of many countries and have been subject to the national laws of these countries.

27. In operative paragraph 4 of the resolution, my delegation wishes to confirm that the expression "national jurisdiction of the State taking such measures shall be exhausted" does not mean the end of the application of national law.

28. We voted in favour of the amendments [A/L.312/Rev.2] presented by thirteen delegations, with the belief that all efforts should be resorted to in the confirmation of the rights of a sovereign State for the protection of the national interests of its people and of the principles of sovereignty. It is our hope that the States which have always talked about helping the less developed countries in their efforts for developing their economic and social conditions will let the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles embodied in the United Nations resolution on the Development Decade [1710 (XVI)] guide them in their deliberations. Inasmuch as all sovereign States wish to honour their agreements, their rights to sovereignty should not be injured. It is a well-known fact that, if the less developed countries which possess natural resources and natural wealth are helped to use the profits resulting from the exploitation of these resources by foreign capital, it will undoubtedly ease the pressures on United Nations technical assistance funds, which can then be released in the interests of the developing countries which are in need of them.

29. My delegation voted in favour of the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union delegation [A/L.414]. We did so because it contains all the confirmation required in a United Nations resolution of the inalienable right of nations to nationalization, expropriation and all measures aimed at protecting and strengthening their complete sovereignty over anything which is theirs. This is why we also voted for the retention of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. This is also why we voted in favour of the deletion of the first sentence of operative paragraph 9, as suggested by the delegation of Burma. We did that with the purpose of removing any doubt about what sovereignty is. In spite of its retention, we must keep in mind the fact that sixty nations voted for the draft resolution and only five voted against it in the Committee. It seems rather strange and if I may say so illogical, to feel the necessity in a United Nations resolution which is an international instrument to emphasize the observance of contracts between companies and States, and not to

emphasize the inalienable right of sovereign States to which I have just referred. In the view of my delegation, it is of high importance to emphasize the right of sovereignty of States in an international instrument.

30. In conclusion, political freedom of the less developed countries should not be jeopardized by the efforts of the developed nations, which expect to further their own development and increase their own wealth. The interests of the less developed countries should be protected by the United Nations in order that the principles embodied in the Charter could be fulfilled, for a better world free from ignorance, poverty and disease.

31. From today's debate it seems that there still exist in the world efforts to maintain the privileges which imperialism enjoyed for centuries. But I submit that the world of today is different from the world of yesterday. More than sixty nations have joined the United Nations since its emergence. They are mostly countries that have freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism. We look forward together with the millions of people of the world to the day when all the countries of the world will be freed from colonialism, neo-colonialism and exploitation.

32. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico): The Mexican delegation would like to explain briefly its votes on the draft resolution in document A/5344/Add.1, concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources, in order to record its position on this subject, since it did not participate in the relevant debates in the Second Committee or at the present session of the General Assembly.

33. Basing its position fundamentally and unshakeably on the political Constitution of the United States of Mexico and on the laws derived therefrom, and actuated by Mexico's traditional and faithful fulfilment of its international obligations, as also by its respect for the standards of international law which it has accepted, the Mexican delegation considers that the draft resolution originally submitted by the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources ^{1/} constitutes a balanced text which took into account various points of view and was the outcome of lengthy discussion.

34. My delegation voted in favour of the first two amendments proposed by the delegations of thirteen countries in document A/L.412/Rev.2, but abstained on the third amendment because we are not convinced that it would be useful or appropriate to continue the study of the various aspects of permanent sovereignty over natural resources. The Mexican delegation voted against the retention of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution because it considered that that paragraph had implications which could be given an interpretation running counter to the principles which my Government upholds and which are based fundamentally on the provisions of the Mexican Constitution, which, for example, states in regard to expropriations that these may be carried out solely in the public interest and with payment of compensation.

35. For similar reasons we voted against the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union in document A/L.414. As is well known, in the two most outstanding cases concerning land and oil expropriation in Mexico, my Government promptly paid the

appropriate compensation and, as always, has faithfully fulfilled its commitments.

36. Finally, the Mexican delegation voted in favour of the resolution as a whole as amended, for it considers that, although we may not find some parts of it altogether satisfactory, this document represents an important declaration on the indisputable rights of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources.

37. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania): We have just finished voting on the resolution on the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources. I cast my vote in favour of the resolution as a whole, as amended, with the following reasons in mind. First of all, we voted against the deletion of operative paragraph 5, because this, in the mind of my delegation, was the central theme for many countries, especially those developing countries who strive for some sort of international document, to define their relationships with other countries which might be interested in investing capital.

38. However, under parliamentary rules, the majority rules. Even though my delegation voted in favour of the resolution as amended, we do not consider this instrument to be final or the only guidelines at which this Assembly can arrive in the future. But my delegation, in spite of the deficiencies and in spite of the incompleteness of the resolution, believes that it offers certain principles, especially those expressed in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 6.

39. On a previous occasion in the Second Committee, I stressed the attitude of my country towards foreign capital investment, that is to say, our feeling about investment in pursuit of developing our economies. Our attempt here in the General Assembly was to obtain a well-balanced document, acceptable to all parties concerned and to those interested in the investment of capital in developing countries, especially those with natural resources.

40. We strove to make as clear as possible all involvements in the area, which the small countries might be able to see and understand, so that they would have guidelines to enable them to visualize the situation in the future, should some differences occur. However, my delegation and my Government would never anticipate that any differences would occur in this case. This is a matter of formalities.

41. We strove here to obtain the necessary safeguards. However, my delegation would like to see a better instrument, based on a serious study of international law, so that the old colonial theories, on the one hand, and the international law of the twentieth century on the other, can be compared to, and correlated with, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation, therefore, believes that the instrument ^{1/} have arrived at so far would, in the future, help us to see the areas where we can find a better understanding, among those exploiting the natural resources and those that are using the capital for the development of their economies.

AGENDA ITEM 25

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples: report of the Special Committee

^{1/} Report of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.V.6), Annex, pp. 276 and 277.

established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI)

(continued)*

42. The PRESIDENT: We will again take up the report of the Special Committee [A/5238]. The Assembly has before it a draft resolution submitted by the thirty-four Powers [A/L.410 and Add.1].

43. I give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

44. Mr. VOEUNSAI SONN (Cambodia) (translated from French): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us [A/L.410 and Add.1], which mentions all the essential provisions relating to the work of decolonization undertaken by the United Nations. It cannot help expressing its regret, however, that it cannot join the sponsors, as it did in two consecutive years in the case of resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI). This non-participation, which should not be interpreted as tacit disapproval, is due to practical considerations concerning the number of members of the Special Committee and the establishment of a time-limit for the granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples.

45. My delegation is still in favour of speeding up the work of the Special Committee, for the Government and people of Cambodia would like to see all forms of colonialism and foreign domination eliminated as soon as possible. It made certain comments to that effect in its intervention of 27 November last [1177th meeting]. Speaking about the number of members of the Special Committee, my delegation expressed the fear that too great an increase in the number might hamper the acceleration of the Committee's work.

46. With regard to the establishment of a time-limit for all territories which have not yet achieved independence, my delegation said that it was not against that principle but, having in mind paragraph 5 of resolution 1514 (XV), we think that a fixed date might be either too soon or too late, given the greatly varying circumstances.

47. We note, however, that the paragraphs of the draft resolution which refer to that aspect of the question take into account, on the one hand, the desire to see the application of the Declaration on decolonization completed as soon as possible and, on the other hand, the need to give the Special Committee an opportunity to examine all situations before making its recommendations for a time-limit to be applied to all cases.

48. I should also like to point out, in connexion with the Secretary-General's report on the financial implications of the draft resolution [A/C.5/962], that the possible dissolution of the Special Committee for South West Africa and the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration is likely to result in savings.

49. In conclusion notwithstanding the comments which it has just made in all objectivity, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the General Assembly.

50. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): First of all, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to express our appreciation for what we know have been the very extensive labours of the drafters of the resolution before us [A/L.410 and Add.1]. We know that a great deal of effort and mutual accommodation went into this work, and we compliment particularly the

Chairman for his part in bringing together many points of view and in attempting to reconcile them. We know that the group faced many difficulties in this process. At the same time, I do want to say that my delegation is disappointed in the draft resolution in some respects. First of all, there has been no effort made to correct, or to make provision for correcting, some of the shortcomings in the procedures in the work of the Committee that we commented on in our statement during the general debate [1171st meeting]. Nor has there been any effort made to make provision for eliminating the tendency towards the cold war in the Committee, which we also commented on in the general debate.

51. The major problem that we see in this draft resolution, is the reference, in the final preambular paragraph, and in operative paragraph 8 (b), to setting a time-limit for the achievement of the Declaration on the granting of independence to all territories.

52. There seem to us to be many arguments against such an idea, and we have not heard convincing arguments in favour of it. I will come back to that in a moment. But first I should like to mention briefly some other points in connexion with the draft resolution with which we have some difficulty.

53. First of all, in operative paragraph 2, my delegation assumes that the methods and procedures described as having been adopted by the Committee are those set forth in Chapter I, paragraph 112, of the Special Committee's report [A/5238]. We would have preferred, however, that the resolution state this explicitly.

54. Similarly, with respect to operative paragraph 6, we interpret that paragraph to include the idea of the exercise of the right of self-determination in all its various manifestations. We wish that this paragraph had been as complete on this point as is the Declaration on the granting of independence [resolution 1514 (XV)] itself.

55. With regard to operative paragraph 7, in the view of my delegation, no expansion in the membership of the Committee is necessary—or perhaps even desirable. We are fearful of making the Committee too large and unwieldy. If any expansion in the membership of the Committee were to be approved, we should prefer that only four members be added.

56. With regard to the distribution of the seats, if there are to be additional members, we are glad to leave that in the hands of the President of the General Assembly. We assume, of course, that he will consult wisely, and widely, with Members of the General Assembly. I am constrained to say, however, that we would not agree about the fairness of the type of distribution of seats which was suggested by the representative of Indonesia when he presented the report of the sponsors in introducing the draft resolution.

57. With regard to paragraph 8 (c), my delegation questions the wisdom of a paragraph which asks the Special Committee to submit to the General Assembly next year a full report containing its suggestions and recommendations on all the territories mentioned in operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. In the first place, we are fearful that since it is not specific territories, but categories of territories, which are mentioned, much valuable time may be lost in the Committee in an effort to determine just which

* Resumed from the 1192nd meeting.

territories are included under paragraph 5 of the Declaration. Even if that task could be accomplished, we believe that, in the time available, it would be impracticable to make an adequate report to the Assembly dealing with all the territories concerned, in any individual way.

58. I should now like to return to the matter of time-limits, which we regard as the basic flaw in the draft resolution as presented. I would restate briefly the considerations which, in our view, militate against the idea of such an over-all time-limit.

59. Principally, it seems to us that this idea represents an over-simplification of what is basically a very complex problem, with many different problems arising in each case. For that reason, we do not think it is possible to set a time-limit or a target date that can be applied to all territories. Indeed, we feel that any attempt to set such a time-limit would be so unrealistic as actually to cast discredit on the United Nations itself, and particularly on the generally laudable efforts of the United Nations in the field of decolonization.

60. I would ask this question: what sort of date is it contemplated that the Committee might set? Would it be a date several years away? I recall that at the sixteenth session [1050th meeting] the Foreign Minister of Nigeria suggested 1970 as the time-limit for the achievement of independence by all the territories in Africa. But, as I recall it, that suggestion did not receive a great deal of support. There was a widespread feeling that setting a time-limit so far away might actually provide an excuse for delay in the process of granting self-determination and independence. On the other hand, is it contemplated that a time-limit should be set at an early date—for example, in 1963, as was suggested from this rostrum earlier in the session by a very distinguished gentleman? I would submit that a date in 1963 would be wholly unrealistic and that there would not be a single representative in this Hall who would really suppose, for one instant, that all the territories could achieve self-determination and independence as early as 1963 or in the immediate future. To attempt to set such a date, or actually to set it, would be to mislead tragically the populations of the territories concerned and to raise their hopes to a degree that would be absolutely unjustified by the possibilities of achieving any such result. And what, may I ask, would happen if the date set passed without the achievement of independence? Would the United Nations then set another date, and after that date had passed still another? I submit that this would be to make this Organization seem ridiculous.

61. Now it has been said that setting a time-limit will speed up the process of decolonization, the granting of self-determination and independence. I should like to ask this question: in what specific way would it help? In what territory would the achievement of independence be advanced by setting an over-all target date? On the contrary, the setting of such a date might well interfere with the process. It might well be, as we say, counter-productive.

62. It may be said that, in the draft resolution, the Committee is not instructed to set such an over-all target date. Yet it seems to me, when one takes the last paragraph of the preamble together with paragraph 8 (b), the draft resolution as a whole must be read as an instruction to the Committee to set such a target date. It is perhaps true that, of the two paragraphs, the preambular paragraph is the one to be regretted more,

but the combination of the two leads to a result which is quite unacceptable to my delegation. It would give to the Special Committee, which has such important work to perform, an impossible task. The Special Committee would, I fear, waste a great deal of its limited time wrangling over what is really an insoluble problem: the setting of an over-all time-limit or target date.

63. For those reasons my delegation wishes formally to ask that there be a separate vote on the last paragraph of the preamble and on the following words at the end of paragraph 8 (b): "including recommendations concerning the fixing of an appropriate time-limit".

64. To conclude, I should like to address a plea to Members of the Assembly. A small number of delegations have fought very hard for this idea of introducing the time-limit concept in the draft resolution; I have in mind one delegation in particular. Those delegations are fully within their rights in fighting for such a concept, and I want to pay a tribute to them for the ability and tenacity with which they have fought for this concept through stage after stage of the drafting and presentation of this draft resolution. The heads of their Governments may well be proud of the work their representatives have done in this task. But this is not a reason for those of us who oppose, as a matter of conviction, the correctness of this concept not to vote for our convictions. Surely it shows no lack of respect for a delegation, a country, or group of countries, to vote against something proposed by that delegation or country or group of countries. Such differences indicate the vigour and health of our Organization, and it would be a sad day, indeed, for the United Nations if the time came when it would be otherwise, that it would somehow show a lack of respect for a delegation, or a group of delegations, to oppose a proposal they had made. For that reason I appeal to those delegations here—and I believe they are in the majority—who are opposed to this time-limit idea to vote against these two paragraphs, the last preambular paragraph and the last part of paragraph 8 (b).

65. Mistaken proposals cannot be dropped out of draft resolutions simply by abstentions. Negative votes are required. My delegation would like very much to be in a position to support this draft resolution. I am sorry to say that we will be unable to do so if the last preambular paragraph and the last part of paragraph 8 (b) are retained; and if that happens, I am sorry to say also that our whole attitude toward the Special Committee will be affected.

66. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan): Since November 1960 it has been a tradition in this Assembly that a large number of countries of Asia and Africa jointly sponsor an important resolution on the general principles of United Nations policy with respect to the question of colonialism.

67. I am referring to resolution 1514 (XV), which was originally sponsored by forty-three Asian and African States, and to resolution 1654 (XVI), which was likewise sponsored by thirty-eight States from the same continents.

68. The sponsoring countries are really the States which are among those most directly concerned with the problem of colonialism. By far the majority of them, at one time or another in their recent history, have experienced colonial régimes of different kinds. There is no denying that some of these countries have suffered much, but they have refused to succumb to

the temptation of an emotional approach to the question of colonialism. Instead, they have demonstrated the high order of their political wisdom by resolutely choosing a constructive approach based on respect for reality.

69. The activities of the Committee of Seventeen, established under resolution 1654 (XVI), have amply proven the rightness of this approach. Frank and open discussion among the members of this Special Committee, which represents all the shades of opinion existing in the Organization, have helped us acquaint ourselves better, not only with the actual situations obtaining in various parts of the world, but also with the diverse and equally weighty views of different nations sharing the same convictions. My delegation believes that the entire Assembly owes a vote of warm thanks to the Special Committee for the spirit in which it has approached its tasks and the excellent work it has done.

70. Following through in this tradition, we, the countries of Asia and Africa have again this year undertaken the task of drafting a resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1]. My delegation has again had the privilege and honour of working through all the stages of this joint enterprise. And I can assure the Assembly that all of us involved in this task have been engaged for several weeks in the most serious discussions, extending over long hours.

71. The main difficulty, as can easily be understood, centred around the question of a time-limit for the complete implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. There is no doubt, as has always been the case in our discussions, that a great degree of compromise was necessary on the part of all the delegations concerned, and a large measure of agreement was achieved on almost all points except this one question of a time-limit. The draft resolution now before the Assembly is the result of this work.

72. The Japanese delegation has always held an objection against the idea of fixing a time-limit with respect to the process of decolonization. We have expressed our view on this matter each time the occasion required. In short, the basic position of my delegation is that the fixing of a time-limit by the Assembly is clearly not in consonance with the high political functions proper to this organ. By indulging in such an effort, the Assembly would dangerously be encumbered with and, in the end, be left at the mercy of, all the fluctuations of fast-changing internal politics in a given territory. Some of my friends here seem to believe that the fixing of a time-limit can constitute a powerful political pressure against retarding Administering Powers. I am sorry to say that I must disagree. The making of a nation or the attainment of full self-determination is a serious affair. We think that we cannot afford to pursue an uncertain political gain, at the risk of most serious difficulties and dangers, to which all concerned, including the Organization, would most certainly be exposed by fixing a time-limit—although the Japanese delegation fully appreciates the genuine motives of those of our friends who advocate such a time-limit.

73. I have set forth the reasons why my delegation has strong reservations with respect to the seventh preambular paragraph and the last phrase of operative paragraph 8 (b) of the draft resolution before us. We feel constrained to oppose these parts of the draft

resolution if they are put to the vote separately. Otherwise, this document represents the results of a fair and general agreement among a large number of African and Asian delegations. Although many of us might not feel entirely satisfied with certain wording, it is not difficult to subscribe to the general content of the resolution.

74. Perhaps we need not emphasize here the necessity of a very careful and reasonable interpretation of any written document, and particularly of a resolution of the General Assembly on a matter as important as this question of colonialism. The fine work of the present Special Committee has been, I submit, largely due to the high degree of discretion which all of its present members have displayed in the interpretation of both resolution 1514 (XV) and resolution 1654 (XVI), and, in particular, with respect to the scope of the competence of the Special Committee itself. The draft resolution before us is also, when it is adopted, going to constitute an important basic document for the Committee. Some of its stipulations require, as my delegation sees it, the most careful interpretation and implementation on the part of all concerned.

75. I am particularly referring here to operative paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs (a) and (c). With respect to sub-paragraph (c), for example, I am sure that all of us here cannot fail to see the serious implications which a haphazard interpretation of such words, as "all the territories mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Declaration" could most certainly entail.

76. Before concluding, I would like to point out that the increase in membership of the Special Committee from seventeen to twenty-four might create new problems. However, we are confident that the President of the Assembly, with his usual wisdom which all of us here have had ample opportunities to admire, will so reorganize this important Special Committee that the good working conditions of the present Committee will be maintained and, if possible, even improved.

77. Mr. Taleb SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): The Tunisian delegation has already had an opportunity to give the Assembly [1181st meeting] its views on the report submitted by the Special Committee of Seventeen [A/5238] and will therefore not revert to all the points raised by the thirty-four Power draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1]. We should simply like to express our gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolution for the work they have done.

78. With regard to the text as a whole, my delegation, which took part in the consultations prior to the preparation of the draft resolution, is in favour of the text proposed. We know that that text is the result of negotiation and compromise and we cannot expect it to fit in perfectly with our views. It is for that reason that, although the draft resolution omits, *inter alia*, any reference to the important question of the list of territories within the competence of the Special Committee, we are prepared to vote in favour of it.

79. There is one other point, however, on which my delegation, which is a member of the Special Committee, has serious reservations: I am referring to paragraph 7, which would enlarge the membership of the Special Committee by the addition of seven new members. We should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the danger that this amendment represents to the delicate balance established by the present membership. The present distribution of seats is

certainly not ideal, but in practice it has proved to be fairly representative of the trends of opinion in the Organization on the problems of colonialism and decolonization. We understand, of course, that in view of the increase in the number of Members of the United Nations, it may be necessary to make some small change in the composition of the Special Committee. In that connexion, it may be recalled that of the six newest Members of the United Nations four belong to Africa and two to Central and South America. We think that within the present balance the addition of two members might have been sensible and useful. In fact, a brief survey shows that the African continent has a slight advantage in the present composition of the Special Committee, an advantage which is readily understandable in view of the fact that the colonized territories of Africa are the largest and most thickly populated of any of the territories still under the colonial régime. All those who believe in decolonization can consider the representation of Africa only in the light of future prospects.

80. There is no doubt that it is the African States which are increasing most rapidly in numbers in the United Nations as decolonization continues. We are therefore convinced that the present balance in the membership of the Special Committee should be maintained. In our opinion the addition of two, three or even four members might be accepted without absolutely destroying the present balance. That would not be the case if the number of members was increased by seven, as the draft resolution proposes, because that would not only threaten the balance in the Committee but might dangerously hamper the effectiveness of its work.

81. The effectiveness of the Special Committee's work is something, I am sure, to which the members of the Assembly attach as much importance as we do. Moreover, one of the reasons most often put forward in favour of such an expansion of the Special Committee's membership is the possible dissolution of other committees responsible for dealing with questions which are within the Special Committee's competence. This very day, however, the Fourth Committee has recommended the continuation of the principal organ whose competence extends to most of the Territories within the purview of the Special Committee, which destroys the foundation of the arguments in favour of such a large increase in membership.

82. That is why my delegation would vote in favour of any amendment reducing the proposed increase in membership to four at the most. As no amendment to that effect has been submitted, we request a separate vote on paragraph 7 of the draft resolution and we shall vote against the paragraph. If it is retained, my delegation will none the less vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

83. Mr. DEMETROPOULOS (Greece) (translated from French): The Greek delegation will be happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1] as a whole.

84. Our policy has always been based on the principle that all dependent peoples must exercise their right to self-determination within as brief a space of time as is historically possible. Since the end of the Second World War, the need for attaining this objective has been accepted and understood by nearly every colonial Power, and in recent years the United Nations has

helped, through its pronouncements and the means available to it, to accelerate this process.

85. As the Trusteeship Council draws near to the completion of its mission, the functions it has been performing have devolved, within a wider field of action, upon the Special Committee of Seventeen.

86. We find ourselves unable to give our wholehearted support to each and every point made in the report of the Special Committee of Seventeen [A/5238] or even to every paragraph and sub-paragraph of the draft resolution on which we are called upon to vote. In a field in which so many tendencies and so many prejudices are found, so much idealism and so much deep-rooted resistance, so many misconceptions concerning the objectives and the most effective means of attaining them, it would perhaps be too much to expect that an endeavour in which all the Members of the United Nations have wished to collaborate should be free of all defects and should enjoy unanimous and wholehearted support. We should like, however, to pay a tribute both to the members of the Special Committee of Seventeen and to the sponsors of the draft resolution for the spirit of realism which has enabled them, in such a vast and complex question, to produce a broadly acceptable document.

87. We share the conviction of the sponsors of this text that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and the establishment of the Special Committee have made an invaluable moral contribution to the decolonization effort. We congratulate the sponsors of the draft resolution on the moderation with which they have tried to redefine the Special Committee's terms of reference. We are convinced that the members of this Committee, drawing their inspiration from the spirit which prevailed in the drafting of this text, will be able to perform their responsible task successfully by interpreting their terms of reference with all the necessary restraint, given the complexity and diversity of the problems before them and the legal limitations they will have to observe.

88. At a time when the Trusteeship System is drawing to a close and the end of colonialism is already in sight, our thoughts turn to the peoples whose self-determination is not yet on the United Nations agenda and to all those whose independence is still purely nominal, limited as it is by authoritarian political régimes or by constraint imposed by alien will.

89. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia): The delegation of Yugoslavia will vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1], such a vote being in accordance with the well-known position of Yugoslavia on the problem of decolonization.

90. The draft resolution is, in our opinion, the result of very hard work during which the authors have tried to reconcile many different points of view. Generally speaking, we believe that they have succeeded and we congratulate them on their achievement.

91. There is one remark which I should like to make regarding operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, which provides for the enlargement of the membership of the Special Committee by the addition of seven new members to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly.

92. The Yugoslav delegation did not, and does not, have any major objection to the enlargement of the

Committee, but we should like to state our belief that the nominations should be made on the same basis as they were made when the Special Committee was established, in order to preserve the balance which exists in that Committee. We believe that it is necessary to make a very careful selection in that respect in order to maintain the delicate balance, as the representative of Tunisia has just said.

93. We shall, of course, support the paragraph concerning the fixing of an appropriate time-limit because we think that a time-limit could be set, provided that the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories are consulted; and this is, I think, one of the main requirements. The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories are the best judges of the time for their accession to independence. Neither the colonial Powers nor the General Assembly can fix the time without ascertaining the express wishes of the populations, and the Special Committee, or whatever it may be, must arrange the necessary means and procedures to ascertain the wishes of the people. Those wishes must be taken into account before anything is decided about the time-limit. I would, however, stress once more that the idea of the time-limit is closely linked with the express wishes of the populations, which must be taken into account, during the last stage of the process of decolonization.

94. The PRESIDENT: Three representatives have requested permission to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I call first on the representative of Guinea.

95. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): The compromise text which has now been submitted to the General Assembly for approval has caused us so much anxiety and has called for so much effort and so many sacrifices from all those who took part in its drafting that my delegation came here firmly resolved not to intervene in the discussion. A number of statements have, however, been made from this rostrum which call for a brief rejoinder by the Guinean delegation. Despite the fact that we should have been fully within our rights in making an appropriate reply to one statement which has greatly distressed us, we shall endeavour to make our rejoinder very brief and to confine ourselves to two appeals.

96. Our first appeal will be addressed to our Tunisian brother, Mr. Taieb Slim, who knows perfectly well, indeed far better than many other representatives, the circumstances in which the members of the Committee of Seventeen were appointed last year, for it was the Tunisian representative who had the privilege of presiding over the General Assembly at that time who appointed the members of the Committee. To this brother of ours we say that we should dearly have liked his statement to come from a different delegation.

97. Mr. Slim, our brother, who worked with us on the draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1], is aware of all the efforts made on all sides and, indeed, he has acknowledged them from this rostrum. Since he knows full well how delicate is the balance that has been achieved, since he knows that the text now before the General Assembly does not represent the specific views of any one person, we should merely like to urge him not to press his proposal for a separate vote on operative paragraph 7.

98. We do not want to dwell on the merits of an enlargement of the Committee's membership for much

has been said on this subject both here and elsewhere. We should merely like to appeal to Mr. Slim, in the name of the solidarity to which we ourselves have sacrificed so much and which is the cornerstone of our relations, and through Mr. Slim to all our African and Asian brothers, not press for a separate vote or for any amendment whatever, since the text before the Assembly is truly a compromise text, a fragile compromise the least change in which might destroy the entire structure which has been erected so laboriously.

99. With reference to the statement by the United States representative, I am compelled to say, with a frankness which is justified by the links of friendship between the Republic of Guinea and the United States, that it has caused us a great deal of unhappiness. I must say very clearly and unambiguously that we should have preferred to deal with a genuine representative of a colonial Power. What is at issue? It is the question of the time-limit.

100. This problem has been raised twice at this session, first by our own Minister for Foreign Affairs (1131st meeting) and then by the Guinean Chief of State [1148th meeting] whom, until such time as I receive instructions to the contrary, I believe to be a Head of State friendly towards the United States Government, a fact which I am sure is known to the United States representative who has laid so much stress on the desirability of not insulting anyone.

101. The least I can say—and I shall not hesitate to say it—is that some of these statements sound like open insults to the Republic of Guinea.

102. What have we said? What are we saying and what are we determined to go on saying? In resolution 1514 (XV) the General Assembly decided that immediate steps—and I repeat the word immediate—shall be taken to enable all peoples which have not yet attained independence to do so without any conditions or reservations.

103. Moreover, up to that time all the colonial Powers, no matter which, had always sought to justify the continuation of colonialism by the need to ensure the progress of the peoples concerned. Resolution 1514 (XV), however, established a principle of prime and crucial importance, which we must not forget, when it denounced that argument formally and categorically. This denunciation appears in operative paragraph 3, which I shall quote merely as a reminder. The paragraph reads as follows:

"Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence."

104. It is now my turn to ask a question: why do they want to prolong colonialism when this Assembly almost unanimously declared that immediate steps should be taken to confer independence and automatically ruled out inadequacy of preparedness, as a completely false pretext? I should like to know why anyone should want to go on practising colonialism.

105. Harsh words were spoken just now and allusions were even made to irresponsibility and lack of realism. If colonial realism is meant, then we agree, for we shall never submit to that kind of realism. I should like to point out, however, that we are speaking here solely on behalf of the people who have sent us here and on behalf of our brothers still under the colonial yoke, and it would be well to inform those who are still

ignorant of the fact that all the living forces of the African continent have already spoken clearly and unequivocally in favour of independence in 1963. Whether at meetings of Heads of State, regardless of their political convictions, or at meetings of political organizations, of our youth organizations, our trade-union organizations or our women's groups—and I shall not weary the Assembly by giving the dates of those meetings—all the living forces of Africa have already called for independence in 1963. And speakers now come to this rostrum to level accusations of lack of realism at those who have been expressing the feelings, yearnings and ideals of these people!

106. We could have said much more but we shall not reply, at least not publicly and from this rostrum, to statements which we consider offensive. On the contrary, our reply will be an appeal and this appeal will be addressed to the United States representative.

107. We were greatly struck by the major inconsistency in the first part of the United States representative's statement, in which he dwelt on the hard-won compromise reached in the working group and in the Afro-Asian group. I should like to point out that, in so far as Guinea is concerned, the text now before the Assembly is far removed from our original position, which was that 24 October 1963, the eighteenth anniversary of the United Nations, should be set as the time limit, not for the attainment of independence by one territory or another but for the compliance by the colonial Powers with all their obligations under resolution 1514 (XV). Although the present text deviates so much from our position, we have accepted it out of solidarity for we have always thought—and we still think—that solidarity among the African peoples in the first place and then among the peoples of Africa and Asia is the fundamental condition, the *sine qua non*, for the liberation of our peoples. It was in the name of this solidarity that we made all these sacrifices and agreed to a text which differs so appreciably from our initial stand.

108. I should therefore like to appeal to the United States representative and to ask him, in the name of the realism of the oppressed, in the name of the realism of the colonized and the African peoples whose friend his own people claim to be, not to press this matter. We have achieved an extremely fragile balance. We should therefore like to urge him not to maintain his proposal for a separate vote. I am asking him this on behalf of my delegation, on behalf of my Government and on behalf of the African peoples who are still enslaved.

109. With regard to the question of a date, all the discussions that have been embarked upon in this Hall should not have been, for they are altogether premature. I should like to tell the United States representative and those who are now rubbing their hands but no longer dare to speak from an official rostrum here or elsewhere that they will have an opportunity to discuss this question at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. What are we actually asking for? We are inviting the Committee of Seventeen to study this question, to seek out all the relevant facts and to submit recommendations to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session so that the latter can take a decision on the subject. And this is what is described as absolutely unrealistic!

110. In many respects it would seem that very definite progress has been made at the seventeenth session with regard to the problem of decolonization.

Let us recall the decisions already taken by the competent organs—particularly the Fourth Committee—concerning South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and, quite recently, all the Territories under Portuguese administration. All these decisions represent definite progress. The concept of a date is one of the few new ideas in the draft resolution. The rest is merely a reminder of what has already been done. While I am ready to discuss the matter for as long as necessary, I should like to say—and this will be my conclusion—that the General Assembly has already ruled out inadequacy of political, economic or social preparedness as a pretext for delaying independence. The General Assembly has decided that immediate steps must be taken by the colonial Powers to transfer all powers to the colonial peoples. It has thus been recognized by one and all either that the process has been slow or that, in certain cases, no steps have been contemplated. Indeed, certain colonial Powers have not even agreed to apply resolution 1514 (XV) to their colonies.

111. The representatives present in this Hall will undoubtedly notice that the statements made this evening from this rostrum by the United States representative bear a singular resemblance to the warnings and prophecies of disaster voiced from this very rostrum in 1960, when the immediate independence of all the colonial territories was discussed for the first time. In any event, we remember the day in 1959 when President Sekou Toure for the first time spoke in this Hall of "immediate liberation". We remember the jibes with which this proposal was greeted.

112. We remember full well the debate on the Soviet Union's proposal for the immediate granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples,^{2/} and the sarcastic comments which, at that time, greeted a proposal which is today hailed throughout the world as one of the United Nations masterpieces.

113. With reference to what has been said today about the setting of a time limit, I am convinced—and it is a hope I am expressing—that tomorrow the United States representative will be one of the first to admit that the General Assembly will have accomplished a great deal at its seventeenth session by adopting the provisions of the draft resolution before us.

114. May I renew my appeal to my brother Taleb Slim and to the United States representative not to press their requests for separate votes. If this appeal is not heeded, I shall ask for the floor again in order to make another specific proposal.

115. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): I have asked for the floor in order to add a short word to the very eloquent defence of my colleague from Guinea with respect to our draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1]. In the first place I should like to give my observations in answer to the views that have been expressed here by the representative of the United States. I am afraid that what he has said would have great influence on some of our colleagues, and that is why I will try to neutralize this.

116. The most important objection that has been made by the representative of the United States concerns the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 8 (b) of our

^{2/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4502.

text. I should like to read these paragraphs. The last paragraph of the preamble reads as follows:

"Considering that, in order to accelerate the process of decolonization, it is necessary to fix an appropriate time-limit for the full implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples." [A/L.410 and Add.1]

I realize that the most important objection that has been expressed here is the fact that we are asking for the fixing of a time-limit. So, it is supposed that we are asking for a blanket time-limit especially. In the final paragraph of the preamble there is no question of asking for a blanket time-limit. Otherwise, we would have mentioned it in the preambular paragraph. We have asked here to fix an appropriate time-limit that can be the time-limit for any individual territory that is not yet independent. We have worked it out in paragraph 8 (b). There, the Assembly can know what we want and what we wish.

117. We have drafted this paragraph deliberately in the following way:

"To propose specific measures for the complete application of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including recommendations concerning the fixing of an appropriate time-limit."

As I stated this morning, the word "recommendations" has been used deliberately because we want to open the possibility of fixing time-limits for any dependent territories and also the possibility of fixing a blanket time-limit.

118. Now who is going to fix the time-limit or the time-limits? It is not the Special Committee. The Special Committee will make recommendations to the General Assembly, which will accept or reject them. The Special Committee must thoroughly study the conditions in the dependent territories. On the basis of this study, which of course includes knowledge of the desires of the population and of the leaders of the political movements, and on the appraisal of the views of the colonial Powers, the Special Committee will make recommendations to the General Assembly.

119. If these recommendations are going to be made—and I think they will be made—then it would not be very difficult to fix a blanket time-limit because it would most likely be the time-limit for the territory last on the road to independence. Therefore, the fear that the time-limit will be set, as my country hopes it will be, within two or three years, is not necessarily justified. In fact, knowing the Special Committee, on which members of the colonial Powers are represented, I am afraid that the blanket time-limit will not be what my delegation wishes it to be. I hope that the Special Committee will give a recommendation in accordance with the desires of my delegation. However, it is up to the Special Committee; it is up to the Special Committee even to decide whether it is going to give a blanket time-limit.

120. Therefore, on that basis, I would like to suggest that the fear expressed by the representative of the United States is not justified. On that basis, I would like to appeal to him to reconsider his stand. If he does not reconsider his stand, then I would like to follow the example just given by the representative of Guinea and to say that I would like to make another proposal.

121. Also, I would like to appeal to the representative of Tunisia. We know that he has done his utmost to have the ideas of his delegation accepted in our drafting committee. However, I hope that the representative of Tunisia, who is a personal friend of mine, will reconsider his proposal. If he cannot reconsider it, I shall be compelled to take a position which has to be expressed in a proposal that I may make later.

122. Mr. ADEYINKA (Nigeria): It was not the intention of my delegation to intervene in the debate on this draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1] of which Nigeria is a co-sponsor. However, since the representative of the United States, in his explanation of vote, referred to the statement made by my Foreign Minister at the sixteenth session on the question of a time-limit, my delegation feels in duty bound to intervene at this stage in order to set the record straight and to eliminate any misunderstanding in the minds of Members.

123. The representative of the United States said that last year my Foreign Minister suggested a target date of 1970 for the liquidation of colonialism. This is not a correct quotation, and neither is it a correct interpretation. Therefore it leaves room for misunderstanding that Nigeria does not support the granting of immediate independence to colonial countries and peoples and that Nigeria is a neutralist on this question. This we reject entirely. Nigeria was a co-sponsor of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

124. The correct position is that, at the sixteenth session, my Foreign Minister raised [1050th meeting], for the first time, the idea of a target date as a stimulant and catalyst to decolonization. He subsequently canvassed the idea of the specific date of 1970, taking all the factors and problems involved into consideration, before which, by which, but not later than which, the job of decolonization should be completed. I wish to repeat this because it is extremely important—before which, by which, but not later than which, the job of decolonization should be completed. It is not something that is static. It is something that is changeable.

125. Having raised the issue of a target date, my delegation is really happy that the idea has gained ground in the United Nations, and we do not therefore have the fears and the misgivings which have been expressed by the United States delegation. The question of a time-limit is designed to give an added impetus to the movement for decolonization, since the word "immediate" seems to have lost its meaning for the colonial Powers.

126. Since I have the floor, I wish to state that my delegation regards the views expressed by the United States delegation with very serious misgivings, especially the request for a separate vote on this important draft resolution, which is the result of a delicate but balanced compromise and should now be adopted unanimously. My delegation believes that in order to retain the full weight of the United Nations behind the movement for decolonization already expressed in the two previous resolutions [1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI)] on decolonization, the third resolution on this subject should not acquire a less stature than the previous two resolutions. We believe that the delegation should be satisfied with expressing their reservations, which will be fully reflected in the verbatim records of this Assembly.

127. For these reasons, my delegation will be compelled to resist the appeal for a separate vote made by the United States representative. We feel that this

is an attempt to whittle down the importance and the significance of this third resolution on decolonization. We appeal very seriously to the United States delegation and to the representative of Tunisia that their suggestion for a separate vote should not be pressed.

128. However, we also associate ourselves with the appeal made by the representative of Guinea. I believe that the representatives here have accepted this appeal in good faith, and we believe that after listening to the various speakers on this rostrum on the question of granting independence to colonial peoples and having realized that all the peoples in Africa should be made free, they will also join us in voting for this great draft resolution which is now before the Assembly.

129. Mr. Taleb SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): I should like to thank Mr. Diallo Telli, our brother from Guinea, for his eloquent plea to me that I should not press my request for a separate vote on paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. I should like to assure him that the Tunisian representative could not remain deaf to his appeal were it not for one small detail: I should like to remind the Guinean representative that on this particular point there is a difference of opinion which is of considerable importance to my delegation, whose opinion is moreover shared by several of our friends in this Assembly and in our various groups.

130. I should like to tell my Guinean brother that the balance in the Committee of Seventeen is certainly more important for decolonization than the balance of the draft resolution, which in my delegation's opinion will not—I repeat, will not—be jeopardized by the separate vote we are requesting. I might add that this text includes several points which do not reflect our views but that, out of solidarity, we have stated that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

131. This is why I have said and I repeat that if paragraph 7 were amended by the replacement of the word "seven" by the words "four or less", it would be a compromise which might secure unanimous support for this paragraph. I regret to note that our own appeal for such a compromise has not been heeded. This is why, with apologies to my brother Diallo Telli, I must tell him that I am obliged to press for a separate vote on paragraph 7.

132. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Afghanistan on a point of order.

133. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): My delegation is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/L.410 and Add.1], and that is enough to explain what our position is on this matter and what our ideas are. On the other hand, keeping with the traditions of my delegation, when we make a suggestion or sponsor a draft resolution, we always do this with an open mind and reflect upon it in the light of the discussions that take place in the Assembly. With all respect to the views which will be expressed by others, this evening a very constructive debate has taken place on this draft resolution, and we have listened very carefully to all sections of opinion that have been expressed on it. At this stage, my delegation has only one request to make to the Assembly. As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and I am speaking only for my own delegation, I believe that we need time to reflect on the views expressed on this draft resolution, and I am very happy to say that we do have that time at our disposal after the debate has taken place.

134. I am sorry I have detained the procedures of the Assembly by asking to make this point of order, but I would propose formally that any vote or procedure on substance should be postponed until a time not later than Monday afternoon, so that the sponsors of the draft resolution can enter into consultations with other delegations and come back and report the results of those consultations. That is my proposal, and I hope that this proposal is an acceptable one. I hope that my fellow representatives will agree with me.

135. The PRESIDENT: The representatives have heard the proposal of the representative of Afghanistan. I do not take it that it is a motion for the adjournment of the meeting or the adjournment of the debate. The representative of Afghanistan proposed that the voting on the draft resolution be postponed until Monday afternoon. The Chair is now in the hands of the meeting.

136. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I have no objection to the motion and I beg the indulgence of the Assembly for a very brief word by way of reply. I simply want to say that I was deeply troubled by the manner in which my earlier remarks were interpreted by the representative of Guinea. I can assure him that the last thing that I intended to do was to give any offence to him or to his country, which is indeed a friend of my country. Since my words apparently did convey offence, I can only say to the representative of Guinea, whom I greatly respect and whom I consider my friend, that I feel the deepest regret and that I convey to him humble apologies.

137. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): I note with pleasure the statement just made by the United States representative and am glad that he has understood Guinea's reaction so well. I in turn should like to assure him that I regard him as a friend and to say on behalf of my country, that the Republic of Guinea regards his country as a friendly country.

138. Our dearest wish, however, is that through Guinea, the United States should be the friend of Africa and of the African peoples who are still bowed under the colonial yoke. I am convinced that he will understand what I mean and that there is no need for me to labour this point.

139. I appreciate the good intentions underlying the Afghan representative's proposal, although my delegation would have preferred the vote to be taken this evening since the situation is perfectly clear. Out of solidarity, friendship and the particular esteem in which I hold the Afghan representative, I can but accede to his proposal. We know from past experience, however, that for us, the small and the lowly, rare indeed are the occasions when time is on our side. I hope to see an exception on Monday.

140. In any event, the General Assembly already knows—and as Guinean representative I should like to reaffirm this—that we regard the adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence as a great enterprise of peace for the African continent. Last year we regarded the establishment of the Committee of Seventeen responsible for the implementation of this declaration as a new act of peace in Africa, and all the steps we are requesting today are for that same purpose. The African peoples are resolved to free themselves, come what may. The only question that arises is whether their liberation will be peaceful, which is our dearest wish and in which we know we can be greatly assisted by the United Nations, or whether, against our wishes and in spite of our efforts,

it will have to be achieved in bloodshed, I hope that every representative in this Hall, and first and foremost my friend the United States representative, will try to ensure that Africa's inevitable liberation will come about in peace.

141. The PRESIDENT: Since there has been no objection to the proposal of the representative of Afghanistan, we shall come back to the vote on the draft resolution [A/L.410 and Add.1] on Monday afternoon, as proposed.

It was so decided.

142. We are ready now to take up the remaining parts of the report of the Special Committee. Before doing so I call on the representative of Syria for a statement on the conduct of voting.

143. Mr. RIFAI (Syria): I thank the Chair for calling on me, but I think I have already made it clear that the statement I had intended to make on procedure would be made after the Assembly had decided on the draft resolution now under consideration. I do not think this is the time for me to make these proposals concerning the procedure to be followed regarding the various draft resolutions that are still to be considered and that are contained in the report of the Committee. I think we might adjourn that until Monday afternoon.

144. The PRESIDENT: Under the circumstances, I propose now to adjourn the meeting. The General Assembly will meet tomorrow morning to take up the agenda items which are the subject of the reports of the Fourth Committee.

145. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana): I am sorry to intervene at this stage, but I should like to bring the following matter to the attention of the President. A meeting of the Fourth Committee is scheduled for tomorrow morning. We had hoped that it would be possible to proceed now to the consideration of the reports of the Fourth Committee. I see that the Rapporteur of that Committee is here, and I think that the members of the Fourth Committee who are present will agree with me that it would facilitate our work if the Assembly could proceed now to discuss these reports instead of adjourning.

146. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has heard the proposal of the representative of Ghana. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to continue the meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 57

Question of South West Africa:

- (a) Report of the United Nations Special Committee for South West Africa;
- (b) Special educational and training programmes for South West Africa: report of the Secretary-General

REPORTS OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/5310)
AND OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/5340)

AGENDA ITEM 54

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General

Assembly resolution 1542 (XV): report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/5349)

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.

147. Mr. IBE (Nigeria), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I wish first to introduce the report of the Fourth Committee on the question of South West Africa [A/5310]. The Committee adopted overwhelmingly—by ninety-six votes to none, with one abstention—a substantive draft resolution, which is annexed to the report as draft resolution II. The overwhelming support for this draft resolution is undoubtedly a matter of gratification to the Committee, as justifying the great effort expended on the item.

148. The other two draft resolutions which are recommended for adoption by the General Assembly deal with the petitions and communications examined by the Special Committee for South West Africa and with the dissolution of the Special Committee.

149. At this stage I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the last part of paragraph 5 of the report, in which mention is made of the presentation to the Fourth Committee by the Reverend Michael Scott, on behalf of the Africa Bureau, of a bust of Chief Hosea Kutako, a highly respected leader in South West Africa. The Committee was glad to recommend the acceptance of the bust to the Secretary-General, and it has since been informed that the gift has been accepted.

150. With those few remarks I should like to recommend for unanimous adoption by the General Assembly the three draft resolutions contained in the report on the question of South West Africa.

151. I come now to the report [A/5349] of the Fourth Committee on the item entitled "Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV)".

152. This report is being presented directly to the General Assembly, on the basis of the decision of the Committee. It is likely that Members will find certain errors and omissions in the report, and I wish to state that the Rapporteur will be only too glad to have his attention drawn to any such errors so that they may be corrected.

153. Before formally introducing the report, I myself should like to make a few corrections and one addition. Since the completion of the report, the representative of the Ivory Coast has approached the Rapporteur to say that his delegation would like to be listed among the co-sponsors of the draft resolution [A/C.4/L.759/Rev.1] referred to in paragraph 6 of the report.

154. Furthermore, in paragraph 26 of the report the name of Nigeria was included by mistake in the list of sponsors of the draft resolution [A/C.4/L.761]. The representative of Nigeria pointed out this mistake to the Fourth Committee at its meeting yesterday [1421st meeting], and the correction will be made in the final text of the report.

155. As I have stated, with a view to expediting its work the Fourth Committee requested the Rapporteur to report directly to a plenary meeting of the General

Assembly. Like the report on South West Africa, this report is primarily of a procedural nature, its objective being to report to the General Assembly on the action which the Fourth Committee has taken in regard to the recommendations and observations made by the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration [A/5160 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2].

156. To the report which I now have the honour to submit are annexed three draft resolutions which the Fourth Committee has recommended for the approval of the General Assembly.

157. Draft resolution I contains a number of recommendations to which the Fourth Committee devoted a good deal of time, in particular the Fourth Committee's discussion on this draft resolution as set out in the seventh paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 7.

158. As regards draft resolution II, the Fourth Committee had before it a statement by the Secretary-General [A/C.4/593] on the financial implications of the draft resolution. The General Assembly has before it a report [A/C.5/964] submitted by the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee after the draft resolution was adopted in the Fourth Committee.

159. Draft resolution III recommends to the General Assembly the dissolution of the Special Committee on Territories Under Portuguese Administration.

160. In view of the lateness of the hour, with these few remarks I commend the reports of the Fourth Committee on the two items under discussion to the approval and adoption of the General Assembly, and it is my hope that this will be done by a great majority.

161. The PRESIDENT: Interventions will be limited to explanations of vote. We will first take up the question of South West Africa. Members who wish to explain their vote may, if they desire, refer in one intervention to any of the three recommendations of the Fourth Committee on this question.

162. We shall now proceed to the vote. We shall vote on the draft resolutions contained in the Committee's report [A/5310]. Draft resolution I was adopted without objection by the Fourth Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it?

Draft resolution I was adopted.

163. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with draft resolution II the Fifth Committee submitted a report [A/5340] on the financial implications of this draft resolution. I put this draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

164. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III was recommended without objection by the Fourth Committee. May I take it that the Assembly also adopts it.

Draft resolution III was adopted.

165. The PRESIDENT: The second report of the Fourth Committee [A/5349] refers to the report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration regarding non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV). Does any Member wish to explain his vote?

166. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): The draft resolution contained in the report [A/5349] has already been com-

mented upon by my delegation in the Fourth Committee, where the draft originated. My delegation now reaffirms its position and desires that the clear statements it made in that Committee should be considered as reproduced here. We would, however, like to make a few further comments.

167. The methods adopted to arrive at this draft resolution have not only slighted the Charter, but have further underlined the attempt of a certain section of the membership of this Organization to dictate to my country details of internal administration, and to force a denial of its traditional political evolution, which has taken place through the centuries by the process of history and is fully sanctioned by international law. Though in view of the tendency prevailing here it seems almost anachronistic to talk to the majority about the Charter, my delegation vehemently protests against this illicit procedure and denounces once again a draft resolution which falls outside the scope of the basic law of the Organization.

168. Viewed from another angle, this draft resolution also underlines an attempt to form nations by dictation, irrespective of the traditional structures of the territories involved and of the political, economic and social conditions of the human aggregates concerned.

169. The very concept of a nation, which has always been understood to be an organic and historical growth brought about by the cohesive action of purely internal forces, and that undefinable creation of a collective soul, is sought to be distorted. Thus we now have attempts to create nations by artifices which, disregarding reality, do not seek the well-being or progress of peoples; rather they seek to implement slogans, or else, as has unfortunately proved to be the case, they hide thinly disguised purposes of political power or territorial ambitions.

170. Not only is this draft illegal and unrealistic, as I have briefly demonstrated, but it is in direct opposition to what is otherwise said to be a necessity of modern times—the creation of large economic and political areas, as exemplified in the creation of common markets and in the vigorous advocacy, observed in certain quarters, of the idea of political unifications, federations and confederations, even of territories whose populations are widely separated by geography, history, race and culture. Since such efforts are considered legitimate, it is difficult to understand the legitimacy of the efforts made in the opposite direction by those who seek to break up the centuries-old family ties which bind together the various parts of the Portuguese community. But such efforts are made in this Organization and, given the processes used to carry them through, they can be ascribed only to motives which have nothing to do with the trends of the present-day world. These motives are too thinly concealed to escape attention. They are the ambitions of those who seek to derive profit from a breakdown of the steady rhythm of evolution of our peoples towards the achievement of the highest human values. If evidence of such motives were needed, it is to be found in the blatant aggression committed against Portuguese territory by a country which has been one of the protagonists of the anti-Portuguese campaign in this Organization and which, as early as 1957, took the initiative in introducing the item under discussion.

171. From all the facts I have stated, the conclusion has necessarily to be drawn that this draft resolution will serve to promote certain ambitions camouflaged

under the hypocritical pretense of upholding principles which have, in any case, always been operative in all Portuguese territories.

172. If there had been the slightest sincerity in the zealous talk heard here about otherwise highly respectable principles, this Hall would have resounded with a solemn protest, which the draft resolution would have reflected, against incitements to subversion, armed infiltrations, support and encouragement of terrorist movements, establishment of bases and training of so-called patriotic fighters—although of different nationalities—in foreign countries, open threats of aggression; indeed, against the subjugation of populations by means of an armed invasion in defiance of the most sacred principles which are the very *raison d'être* of this Organization.

173. All this has happened and is currently happening. But since nothing of this sort has been recognized in the course, or in the conclusions, of the debates, my delegation feels fully justified in denouncing the insincerity which lies in the minds of those who have inspired this draft. An additional argument is thus being given to those who accuse this Organization of having a double standard.

174. Another fundamental aspect of this draft resolution calls for serious attention. One of its preambular paragraphs refers to petitioners. Now, the Special Committee had before it information which, though of relative merit, would lead to certain conclusions in favour of Portugal. The Committee, however, did not adopt those conclusions but adopted others, sometimes in a directly contradictory sense, exclusively on the basis of statements made by petitioners heard illegally, as far as the Charter is concerned. And who were these petitioners? Individuals who were expected to be anti-Portuguese, whatever their personal antecedents; individuals gathered by public advertisement; individuals mostly with scant culture but advancing opinions even on highly technical problems of public administration; individuals some of whom are not Portuguese nationals and have never set foot on Portuguese territory; individuals, all of them residing abroad and some of them formerly known as admirers of the Portuguese administration but who changed their opinions overnight; individuals, known to be leading terrorist movements; individuals who, above all, were not sworn before any spiritual or temporal authority to speak the truth as in a court of law and who spoke from hearsay without providing any proof, but whose statements were accepted as reliable evidence.

175. Thus, in effect, the conclusions of the Special Committee are for all purposes those made possible by the statements of a nondescript crowd of petitioners who not only did not offer the slightest guarantee of adequate knowledge and personal honesty, but who were not even pledged to speak the truth and never furnished the slightest corroboration of their hearsay stories. It is on conclusions arrived at in this manner that this draft resolution is fundamentally based.

176. Incidentally, it should be noted that, to carry out designs that are in themselves illegitimate, the person chosen to preside over one of the relevant bodies of this Organization was the very one who had said, "Charter or no Charter, Council or no Council", in an attempt to justify annexation of territories by means of armed aggression, while later another relevant body sought to explain away that annexation by describing the territories involved as "nationally united" with the aggressor countries.

177. It has been held, however, that the sources utilized were the only ones available. This my delegation disputes. There are, in the first place, scores of testimonies given by independent foreign personalities who visited the territories in question and later made their views widely known through the international Press and other media of information. None of this has been mentioned, let alone quoted. Nevertheless, they all contradicted and denied allegations current in this Organization, such as those referring to anti-Portuguese feelings on the part of the populations and to the existence of a significant and genuine movement of political unrest. What has mostly struck these observers, who freely met all sectors of the population and thus could form an objective judgement, is that the fact that people in the territories they visited go about their peaceful occupations as usual, living contentedly in an atmosphere of perfect racial harmony, proud and happy members of the Portuguese community—contrary to the propaganda so cunningly spread in many parts of the world, including this Organization. It is a matter of regret that none of this testimony has found its way either into the reports or into the debates which are at the basis of the present draft.

178. In the second place, there are the various new measures of very wide scope taken by the Portuguese Government in the recent past further to promote the well-being and all-around progress, including the political progress, of the overseas populations.

179. In the third place, there is the co-operation which the Portuguese Government has sought from the specialized agencies of the United Nations in important fields of public administration.

180. Though these are all matters of public domain, they are totally ignored in the draft, obviously so that not even the slightest impression may be created in favour of the Portuguese administration. Partisanship could not indeed make a better exhibition of itself, and it is deeply to be regretted that such lurid exhibitions are possible in this Organization dedicated to international understanding and harmony.

181. It is therefore clear that the present draft resolution does not correspond to an objective evaluation of the problem which this Organization decided to treat in debates. While these debates were, since the very beginning *ultra vires* of the Charter, it is also clear that the draft resolution has even overtaken the chain of illegalities behind them. Indeed, although the draft is presented under the heading of Chapter XI of the Charter, its clauses bear no relation whatsoever to the provisions of that part of our basic law; furthermore, the conclusions arrived at by the Special Committee do not correspond to the actual findings as contained in its report; and finally, the draft goes even further than the conclusions of the report itself.

182. Most of the attacks and accusations made against Portugal arise from the idea, considered as axiomatic, that our policy does not recognize the needs and aspirations of modern Africa. My delegation has on several occasions proved that such ideas are untenable if an unbiased analysis of our policies and practices is undertaken. We aim at the steady and well-founded progress of all our peoples in all fields of political, social and educational activities; we aim at the formation of a multiracial society, on a basis of equality for all, meaning not only the coexistence of different racial groups, but the absence of racism—a feature of which Africa is in great need, if it is to make progress and gain the place to which its human and material

resources entitle it in the world. In this context we greatly regret that, today, emotional factors prevent a clear understanding of the high objectives which we are pursuing with all our efforts and devotion. We have shown our desire to co-operate with international organizations for the furtherance of these aims. For the same purposes, we have offered our co-operation to all, and especially to the neighbouring countries, hoping that when emotion gives place to realism, they will come to recognize that our aims are not different from their own in so far as spiritual and material progress is concerned. We expect that the wide range of common interests will prevail over the differences, many of which are not inspired by purposes which may be said to be in any way connected with the real needs of the African people.

183. But as against our sincere intentions and efforts we find ourselves faced with an atmosphere of misunderstanding and misinterpretation, artificially created. We regret to say that the present draft resolution is an instance in point as it contains accusations which my delegation rejects with indignation. I refer particularly to the charge of oppression which we regard as unworthy of any serious-minded study or consideration of the subject. It is a sad commentary on the psychology prevailing in a large sector of this Organization that such a charge should be made at all against my country. It is also indicative of the total inversion of the truth which has, regrettably, become a programme of action in certain quarters.

184. Another example of this inversion is the allegation that "the policy and acts of the Portuguese Government ... have created a situation which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security". My delegation submits that what does constitute a threat is the unfortunate campaign of vilification and other illegal efforts made against Portugal, and the collective aggression to which they can lead, even as they have already led, to implicit approval of terrorism and to silence in the face of acts of open aggression.

185. For all the reasons which I have stated, and without further considerations which do not seem to be necessary, my delegation expresses its most formal reservations, on behalf of the Government of Portugal, to the provisions contained in this draft resolution.

186. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further speakers on the list, the Assembly will proceed to the

vote. We shall vote on the three draft resolutions contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/5349].

187. I put to the vote draft resolution I. A roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call. Jamaica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Nigeria, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast.

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

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Turkey, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Greece, Iceland, Italy.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 82 votes to 7, with 13 abstentions.

188. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II, on the financial implications of which the Fifth Committee has submitted a report [A/5357].

The draft resolution was adopted by 96 votes to 2.

189. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution III.

The draft resolution was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose on Saturday, 15 December, at 12.10 a.m.