



Twenty-second session
Agenda item 23

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION
WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO
COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

(covering its work during 1967)

Rapporteur: Mr. Mohsen S. ESFANDIARY (Iran)

CHAPTER VIII

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	1 - 10	2
II. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY	11 - 18	4
III. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE	19 - 64	6
Introduction	19 - 20	6
A. Written petitions and hearings	21 - 40	6
B. General statements	41 - 64	13
IV. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE	65 - 88	23

ANNEX: QUESTION OF EQUATORIAL GUINEA

* This document contains chapter VIII of the Special Committee's report to the General Assembly. The general introductory chapter will be issued subsequently under the symbol A/6700 (part I). Other chapters of the report are being reproduced as addenda.

I. ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
AND BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. The Special Committee first considered Fernando Póo and Río Muni in 1963.^{1/} The item was taken up again in 1964 and the Special Committee adopted a resolution which is contained in its report to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session.^{2/}
2. At its meetings in 1965, the Special Committee did not specifically consider these Territories, but included relevant information on them in its report to the General Assembly at its twentieth session.^{3/}
3. At its twentieth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2067 (XX) on 16 December 1965. In the fifth preambular paragraph of the resolution, the General Assembly noted that the Territories of Fernando Póo and Río Muni had merged and were named Equatorial Guinea. In the second operative paragraph of the resolution, the General Assembly requested the administering Power to set the earliest possible date for independence after consulting the people on the basis of universal adult suffrage under the supervision of the United Nations.
4. In 1966, Equatorial Guinea was considered by the Special Committee at its meetings both in Africa and at Headquarters. At its 451st meeting, held on 20 June 1966, the representative of Spain, on behalf of his Government, invited the Special Committee to visit the Territory so that either the Committee or a representative group of its members could ascertain the conditions in the Territory.
5. At its 454th meeting, on 21 June 1966, the Special Committee adopted a resolution on Equatorial Guinea,^{4/} the operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of which read as follows:

"1. Notes with satisfaction the open invitation made to it by the administering Power to visit Equatorial Guinea;

...

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/5446/Rev.1), chapter XIII.

^{2/} Ibid., Nineteenth Session, Annex No. 8 (A/5800/Rev.1), chapter IX.

^{3/} Ibid., Twentieth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6000/Rev.1), chapter X.

^{4/} A/6300/Add.7, chapter IX, para. 79.

"3. Decides to send to Equatorial Guinea, as soon as practicable, a sub-committee to ascertain the conditions in the Territory with a view to speeding up the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2076 (XX)."

6. The Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea visited the Territory in August 1966 and subsequently submitted its report to the Special Committee.^{5/}
7. At its 482nd meeting, on 18 November 1966, the Special Committee adopted the Sub-Committee's report and endorsed the conclusions and recommendations contained therein.
8. At its twenty-first session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2230 (XXI) on 20 December 1966, the full text of which is reproduced in the annex to this chapter. By this resolution, the General Assembly took note, inter alia, of statements by the administering Power of its intention to grant independence to Equatorial Guinea as a single entity, to accede to the desires of the people concerning the date of independence and to convene a constitutional conference early in 1967; it also noted the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people consulted that the Territory should become independent not later than July 1968. The General Assembly: (a) invited the administering Power to implement several measures, among them removal of all restrictions on political activities, institution of an electoral system based on universal adult suffrage, the holding of a general election on a unified electoral roll before independence and transfer of effective power to the government resulting from this election; (b) requested the administering Power to set a date for independence and to convene a conference of all political parties for this purpose; and (c) requested it to establish in law and in practice full equality of political, economic and social rights. The General Assembly also urged the administering Power to provide increased economic and other aid to hasten the Territory's development and requested the specialized agencies to render all possible assistance in this respect. Finally it requested the Secretary-General to take appropriate action to ensure United Nations supervision of the elections, to participate in any other measures leading towards the independence of the Territory and to report to the Special Committee on the implementation of the resolution.
9. On 16 May 1967, the Secretary-General submitted a preliminary report to the Special Committee (see annex).

^{5/} Ibid., annex.

10. In a letter dated 18 September 1967, addressed to the Secretary-General (A/6802), the Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain announced that the constitutional conference on Equatorial Guinea would commence on 30 October 1967.

II. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY^{6/}

11. Information on constitutional development as well as political, economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory is contained in the report of the Special Committee's Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea which visited the Territory in August 1966 (A/6300/Add.7, chapter IX, annex). Supplementary information which has become available since that report was issued, is given below.

Constitutional developments

12. In a letter dated 27 December 1966 (A/AC.109/217) the Permanent Representative of Spain informed the Secretary-General that the Council of Ministers of Spain in the course of a meeting held on 22 December 1966 had decided to appoint immediately an inter-ministerial commission entrusted with the task of preparing as soon as possible for the holding of a constitutional conference on Equatorial Guinea. The inter-ministerial commission was reported to have completed its work on 12 July 1967.

13. In the meantime various party leaders and officials of the autonomous régime visited Madrid for talks with Spanish Government officials on the constitutional issue. These included Mr. Bonifacio Ondó Edu, President of the Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea; and Messrs. Pastor B. Torao Sikara, Atanasio Ndong Migone and August Daniel Grange Molay, leaders of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE); and a special committee of the Territory's General Assembly headed by the Assembly's President, Mr. Enrique Gori Molubela. This special committee was reported to have drawn up draft amendments to the Basic Law governing the autonomous status of the Territory.

^{6/} This section was previously reproduced in document A/AC.109/L.422. It is based on: (a) information collected by the Secretariat from published sources; and (b) information transmitted by Spain under Article 73 e of the Charter on 29 June 1967 covering the year ended 31 December 1966.

14. The referendum on the Spanish Constitution was held on 14 December 1966 in Equatorial Guinea as in other Spanish Territories. The results were reported to be as follows: registered voters, 113,256; votes cast, 91,031; in favour, 63,521; against, 24,354; invalid, 3,156.

Economic conditions

15. Cacao and coffee remain the most important crops cultivated in the Territory. Figures for the output of cacao in 1966 were 31,223 tons (28,570 tons for Fernando Póo and 2,653 tons for Río Muni). This compared with a 1965 output of 32,499 tons (28,931 tons and 3,568 tons for Fernando Póo and Río Muni respectively). Figures for the output of coffee in 1966 were 6,400 tons, of which 5,000 tons were produced in Río Muni and 1,400 tons in Fernando Póo. This compared with a 1965 output of 6,664 tons, of which 5,336 tons were produced in Río Muni and 1,328 tons in Fernando Póo.

Budget

16. Figures available for 1966 indicate a total expenditure of 2,021 million pesetas,^{7/} of which 500 million pesetas come under the ordinary budget for Equatorial Guinea while 1,521 million pesetas represent aid from the Government of Spain. The latter is divided between the Budget of State Aid and Collaboration (Presupuesto de Ayuda y Colaboracion a la Guinea Ecuatorial), and the Economic and Social Development Plan, accounting for 1,150 million and 371 million pesetas respectively.

Health

17. Figures for 1966 indicate a total of 1,635 beds in the four principal hospitals, the leprosarium in Mícomeseng and other smaller hospitals in the Territory. The largest hospital is that of Santa Isabel which at the end of 1966 had 425 beds and was served by nine doctors, three midwives and ninety-six nurses. It was reported that the School for Nurses in Santa Isabel was making good progress in the training of indigenous nurses.

^{7/} The local currency is the Spanish peseta which is equal to \$US0.0168;
60 pesetas = \$US1.00.

Education

18. At the end of 1966 there were 147 elementary school centres and 32 primary school centres in the Territory, the corresponding figures for 1965 being 145 and 32 respectively. At the end of 1965 there was a total of 271 teachers of whom 17 were Europeans and 6 were qualified indigenous teachers. The remainder were auxiliary teachers. Information on the total number of teachers in 1966 is not available. In the secondary schools there were 31 teachers and 986 pupils during the 1965-66 school year, compared with 19 teachers and 691 pupils in 1964-65. These figures do not include the "La Salle" Professional Centre for vocational and technical education which is maintained by the Provincial Council of Río Muni in Bata. It was reported that a School for Vocational Training was to be established in Santa Isabel under the administration of the Provincial Council of Fernando Póo with aid in this respect from the Spanish State.

III. CONSIDERATION BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Introduction

19. The Special Committee considered Equatorial Guinea at its 551st to 554th, 556th and 557th meetings held at Headquarters from 5 to 12 September 1967.

20. In a letter dated 22 August 1967 (A/AC.109/259), the Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations requested that he be authorized to participate in meetings of the Special Committee at which Equatorial Guinea would be discussed. The Committee decided without objection to accede to that request.

A. Written petitions and hearings^{8/}

21. The Special Committee had before it the following written petitions concerning Equatorial Guinea:

<u>Petitioner</u>	<u>Document number</u>
General Secretary, <u>Idea Popular de la Guinea Ecuatorial</u> (IFGE)	A/AC.109/PET.578
Mr. Pastor Torao Sikara, President General, <u>Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial</u> (MONALIGE)	A/AC.109/PET.702

^{8/} The following petitions were circulated after the Special Committee had completed its consideration of Equatorial Guinea: A/AC.109/PET.702/Add.2 and A/AC.109/PET.897.

PetitionerDocument number

Mr. Saturnino Ibongo Iyanga,
Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de
la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE)

A/AC.109/PET.702/Add.1,

Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de
la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE)

A/AC.109/PET.702/Add.2

Mr. Bienvenido Abaga Ondjdigui

A/AC.109/PET.897

22. At its 552nd meeting on 6 September, the Special Committee heard Mr. Saturnino Ibongo Iyanga together with Mr. Rafael Evita, representatives of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE).
23. Mr. Ibongo, speaking on behalf of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MONALIGE), congratulated the Spanish Government on its work of decolonization in the Territory of Equatorial Guinea, which was more or less in accordance with the directives of the United Nations.
24. MONALIGE desired the independence of the Territory and, faithful to the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI), as well as to the wishes of the people of Equatorial Guinea, it would oppose, by all available political means, any result of the constitutional conference which did not provide for independence as a minimum. MONALIGE deplored the inertia shown by the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea in dealing with reports submitted by groups representing various shades of political opinion in the Territory, as well as the unwillingness of the Governing Council to accelerate the process of independence. The irresponsibility, inactivity, incompetence and unrepresentative character of the General Assembly must have been obvious to those members of the Special Committee who had visited Equatorial Guinea the previous year. There could be no justification for the delay in convening the constitutional conference.
25. A document which had arrived that morning, addressed to the Special Committee and signed by high officials in Fernando Póo and Río Muni, denounced the manoeuvres to which the indigenous and Spanish authorities in Equatorial Guinea had resorted in order to slow down the process of independence. According to that document, the Spanish Government had made no official declaration indicating that it had taken into account the wishes of the people concerning the holding of a

constitutional conference and the fixing of a date for that conference, despite the fact that the report of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea (A/6300/Add.7, chapter IX, annex, para. 292) clearly stated that the majority of the people wanted independence without delay. Moreover, although the representative of Spain had stated on 10 December 1966 (A/C.4/SR.1665, p.16), that a constitutional conference would be held early in 1967, that conference had still not materialized. According to the Spanish Press, the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations had addressed a letter to the Secretary-General in December 1966 announcing the appointment of an inter-ministerial commission to prepare for the constitutional conference, but so far nothing was known about the progress made in that preparatory work. In a statement to the Spanish Press on 3 December 1966, Mr. Ondó Edú, the President of the Governing Council, had once again requested Spain to prepare the Territory for independence. In order to divert the attention of the people of the Territory, as well as world public opinion, the Spanish Government had invited the members of the Standing Committee of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea to Madrid in March 1967 and had persuaded them to set up a special committee to consult the population on the political future of the Territory; that had been done in an attempt to avoid convening the constitutional conference which would inevitably result in the independence of the Territory. The Special Committee had not made public any conclusions although it had completed its consultations in May. It was known that the Spanish members of the Special Committee had destroyed part of the material collected, on the instructions of the Spanish Government, since the people consulted had been overwhelmingly in favour of independence. Such manoeuvres had given rise to a great deal of public indignation. It was understood that the Spanish Government had obtained the signatures of certain members of the Governing Council and the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea to a document requesting an extension of the time-limit for the submission of the Special Committee's report. It was also understood that the Spanish Government had obtained the signatures of certain members of the autonomous Government to a document requesting Spain to retain the present autonomous régime after July 1968 for economic reasons as well as on the pretext that the people were not yet ready for independence. The Spanish Government was, in the meantime, encouraging subversive activities by certain capitalist groups in Fernando Póo which were trying to separate the latter from Río Muni, in complete disregard of the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in particular resolution 2230 (XXI), operative paragraph 5. The

Spanish Minister of Industry had visited the Territory from 27 July to 2 August 1967, but the reasons for his visit were not yet known. In paying tribute to him, the Vice-President of the Governing Council had reaffirmed the statement he had made to the Spanish Press on 16 May 1966, but the Spanish Minister of Industry had made no reference whatsoever to its contents. The document had gone on to say that the people of Equatorial Guinea were more than ever convinced that the Spanish Government, despite its promises to the contrary, did not wish to grant independence to the Territory and was using every means available to evade its responsibilities, although it was clear that the overwhelming majority of the people of Equatorial Guinea wanted independence. The Spanish Government would no doubt try to justify its position and would probably submit false testimony to the United Nations General Assembly signed by Guineans who had been paid vast sums of money to do so or perhaps, as it had done before, would bring some of them to address the General Assembly in terms dictated by the Spanish Government, while claiming to be the true representatives of the people of Equatorial Guinea. Such manoeuvres had to be prevented. Negotiations with the Spanish Government were impossible in practice, and the only recourse left open to the people of Equatorial Guinea was to appeal to the United Nations, in the hope that independence could be achieved by peaceful means.

26. Another document had been received, signed by all the members of a commission from Fernando Póo. They rejected those representatives in the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea who claimed to represent the people of Fernando Póo, but acted under the orders of the Spanish Government, and they denied the assertion that Río Muni wished to separate from Fernando Póo. The authors of the document claimed that their highest aspiration was that Equatorial Guinea should become independent immediately as a single and sovereign State, and they expressed implicit trust in the Special Committee to help them achieve that aim by July 1968.

27. Since the autonomous Government and the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea were subordinate to the Government of Spain, it was up to the latter to invite the various political groups to send their representatives to the constitutional conference. MONALIGE would be ready to participate by sending a delegation as soon as the date of the conference was announced. He invited Spain to set a date for the constitutional conference; to declare categorically that the conference

would only decide upon the final date for independence, which should be not later than 1968; and to announce to the Special Committee that it would dissolve the present autonomous Government and allow the democratic election of a Government truly representative of the people. He appealed to members of the Special Committee to exert pressure on the administering Power to grant independence to the Territory.

28. In reply to a question, the petitioner said that the autonomous Government and Assembly were not representative. First, the political situation in the country when the Basic Law had entered into force in January 1964 had been very different from the present situation. At that time many of the country's leaders had been outside the Territory. They had now returned but were no longer members of the Government. Secondly, the electoral machinery employed at the time had not been truly democratic, as was clear from the report of the Visiting Mission.

29. The parties currently allowed by Spain to engage in political activities were MONALIGE, MUNGE and IPGE. Although all three parties advocated independence, only the President of the Governing Council and the Vice-President, a member of MONALIGE, had spoken out in favour of independence.

30. Many members of the Special Committee had visited Equatorial Guinea and knew that the Governing Council and almost all members of the Assembly were against independence although the population was for it. Consequently, the Government did not represent the wishes of the people.

31. Speaking as a member of MONALIGE, he added that, although the members of the autonomous Governing Council, who were inhabitants of Fernando Póo (Mr. Enrique Gori, President of the Governing Council and Vice-President of the General Assembly, Mr. Gustavo Watson, Minister of Health, Mr. José Luis Maho, Minister of Information and Tourism, Mr. Ramón Borico, Minister of Industry and Mining, and Mr. Aurelio Itoha, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs) might claim to be the legal representatives of the people of Fernando Póo, they were merely individuals carrying out the orders of the Spanish Government, which had appointed them and was maintaining them in office against the wishes of the people, who had often sought to remove them. That could readily be proved, since none of them had been elected by the people of Fernando Póo.

32. In answer to a question concerning the representation of MONALIGE in the Governing Council or in the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea, Mr. Ibongo

said that MONALIGE had no representatives as such in the Assembly or in the Governing Council. At the time of the elections, the party had not been officially recognized or allowed to present candidates. The present Vice-President of the Governing Council was a member of MONALIGE. With regard to other parties, he said that one member of the Governing Council was a militant member of the Movimiento de Unión Nacional de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MUNGE). Before becoming a Council member he had been Chairman of the political junta. To the knowledge of the petitioner, there were no members of MUNGE in the Assembly. The elections had not been conducted on a party basis. According to the Spanish principle of organic democracy, they had been conducted on the basis of representation of economic, social and professional groups. Political ties had only been taken into account later, when the political climate had changed. Any member of the Assembly who belonged to MUNGE did so by choice and not from expediency.

33. Replying to a further question on the subject of the alleged plan to separate Fernando Póo and Río Muni, the petitioner said that the manoeuvres for their separation dated back to 9 March 1965, when the present chairman of the Fernando Póo delegation had visited United Nations Headquarters and drawn up a ten-point document, demanding the separation of the two Territories. The document was probably in the hands of the Special Committee, since it was mentioned in that body's report. It was possible to believe that Spain would respect the unity of the Territories; however, the ten-point document had been written before the representative of Spain had made his statement. That time lapse might explain the doubts concerning current manoeuvres. Those manoeuvres existed, but were the work of certain members of the Governing Council from Fernando Póo, whose positions had been made clear. He noted that according to a statement made by the representative of Spain, the separation of Río Muni and Fernando Póo was not official Spanish policy because the unity of the Territory was recognized from the geopolitical standpoint. However, in Equatorial Guinea there were individuals and groups possessing certain interests, and the socio-economic realities of the country also had to be taken into account.

34. Asked for further information relating to alleged efforts to dismember the Territory, Mr. Evita said that the document he had submitted earlier stated that the people of Fernando Póo had no doubt whatever that the manoeuvres were ordered

/...

and directed by the Spanish Government, hiding behind the Union of Cocoa Growers, a capitalist group to which all business firms in Fernando Póo belonged and among which, as the main ones most dedicated to these stratagems, were Frapejo, Mora, Vivanco, Amilivia, Cunha Lisboa, Potau, and so on. Those firms, under the protection of the Spanish Government, were endeavouring to transform Fernando Póo into another Rhodesia.

35. Commenting on the remarks of the petitioners, the representative of Spain observed that one of the petitioners, Mr. Evita, had been somewhat separated from the realities of Equatorial Guinea because he had lived outside the Territory for eight years as a student. That doubtless explained why he had made an unacceptable comparison between Equatorial Guinea and Southern Rhodesia. His delegation categorically rejected that accusation and all others tending to discredit the autonomous authorities of the Territory because they were not supported by facts. Those members of the Special Committee who had visited the Territory were in a position to evaluate such accusations.

36. He was surprised at the flippant assertion that nothing but obstacles were being placed in the path of the people of the Territory to prevent their stating their views freely. The petitioners themselves had recognized that there were political parties; indeed, they had claimed to represent them, although his delegation maintained that they were acting as individuals. It was difficult to understand how, during an election, the people of Equatorial Guinea could be unaware of who was to represent them or how to make a choice between candidates.

37. The petitioners had described the Assembly and Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea in very harsh terms. That attitude was hardly in accord with their statement that both the President and Vice-President of that Council had publicly declared their support for the Territory's independence, and had been reported in the Spanish and local Press. It was difficult to understand how the President and Vice-President could be accused of dubious manoeuvres at the behest of the Spanish Government when they had defended points of view similar to those of the petitioners. Furthermore, some of the people to whom the petitioner had referred had previously appeared before the Committee as petitioners. That proved that his Government had not placed obstacles in the path of any political leader from Equatorial Guinea coming to the United Nations to express his views. As he had stated at an earlier meeting, his Government considered that, at the Fourth

Committee's next meeting, a group composed of official persons and other political figures not members of the Assembly or Council should be invited to attend as representatives of Equatorial Guinea. He had expressed no reservations as to the number or nature of the persons composing such a group. That was apparently not the attitude of the petitioners, who had repeatedly said that they were the only true and valid representatives of the Territory.

38. The insinuation that the delay in holding the constitutional conference was an integral part of Spanish stratagems to prevent the people of the Territory from expressing their desire for independence, was a further blatant contradiction. If such was the case, why should the conference be delayed? His Government had repeatedly stated that it would abide by the decisions of the people of the Territory and had stressed that it did not intend in any way to oppose their independence.

39. The petitioners had said that the Spanish Government had unilaterally created the autonomous régime in 1963. Yet, it had been created to ensure that the people of the Territory would be properly represented and its existence must be recognized since it had been approved by 62,603 votes to 29,986 in a popular referendum. As to the alleged manoeuvres to dismember the Territory, he had already explained to the Special Committee that his Government's policy was precisely the opposite. He had been gratified by Mr. Ibongo's explicit recognition of that fact.

40. The petitioners had received a letter dated 1 September 1967, posted in Equatorial Guinea and obviously intended to be read out to the Committee. That proved that there was no censorship and that the Territory's postal services were efficient.

B. General statements

41. The representative of Spain said that he wished to inform the Special Committee of the latest steps taken by Spain with a view to the holding of the constitutional conference which was to decide the future of Equatorial Guinea. In 1963 the Guineans had approved the autonomous régime which was now in effect and which formed part of the process leading to independence, and General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) had recalled the administering Power's intention to grant independence to the Territory as a single entity. He reminded the Committee that, once the Spanish Government had endorsed the idea of a constitutional conference, it had decided to set up an inter-ministerial commission to formulate the Spanish

Government's position for the purposes of the conference and to hold talks with the elected representatives of the people of Equatorial Guinea and with the opposition leaders in the Territory. The Spanish inter-ministerial commission had completed its work on 20 May. The Standing Committee of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea had set up a special committee to consult the population and the political organizations in the Territory and to prepare a report, so that the Assembly would be in a position to give instructions to the delegations to the constitutional conference. The Guinean special committee had been unable to complete its work by the dead-line which had been set, because so many people had had to be consulted and so much documentation had had to be studied. It had therefore requested a new dead-line, to which the Spanish Government had agreed.

42. His delegation acknowledged that there had been some delay in comparison with the original plans, but it felt that that did not affect the substance of the problem and that it was better to take some time, in order to allow certain Guinean leaders to spell out and reconcile their ideas, rather than to rush those concerned into taking positions which might run counter to the objectives set out in General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI).

43. The Spanish Government would set a date for the constitutional conference as soon as the official delegation of the Territory was ready to participate and would submit a detailed report to the Special Committee or to the General Assembly after the conference. If it had not been found possible to hold the conference by the time the Fourth Committee met, the Spanish Government hoped that a Guinean delegation would be allowed to explain to the Fourth Committee why the constitutional conference had been delayed, so that its members might have some objective information concerning the situation in the Territory.

44. He reaffirmed his Government's intention to hold the constitutional conference. There was lively political activity and free expression of opinions in Equatorial Guinea. Spain maintained a balance between the Provincial Council of Fernando Póo and the Provincial Council of Río Muni, in order to avoid tensions which might divide the Territory. Measures had also been taken on 31 January 1967 to increase social and trade-union benefits for workers in the Territory, and the Spanish Government was trying to create conditions which would enable Equatorial Guinea to take over its own future in conformity with United Nations guidelines.

45. The representative of Venezuela said that his delegation had supported resolution 2230 (XXI) in the General Assembly and had been convinced that efforts would be made to establish a favourable political climate for democratic elections, as the administering Power had promised, and that power would be transferred to the Government which was thereby elected. According to a document submitted to the Spanish Government in January 1967 by the leaders of MONALIGE (A/AC.109/PET.702, annex C) the people of the Territory were unanimously in favour of attaining full independence as soon as possible, but at the same time hoped that the ties between Spain and Equatorial Guinea would be strengthened; they wished to form a single unitary State in which the natural aspirations of the different ethnic groups would be respected; and they requested the administering Power to convene the proposed constitutional conference without delay. The people of Equatorial Guinea had expressed a desire to attain independence not later than July 1968 and his delegation, which had always defended their right to self-determination and independence, deplored the fact that resolution 2230 (XXI) had not yet been implemented. He urged the administering Power to do everything possible to set an early date for the convening of the promised constitutional conference. Although he recognized the good faith of Spain, which had repeatedly expressed its readiness to allow the people of Equatorial Guinea to exercise their rights to self-determination and independence, he believed that it should take dynamic action in order to arrange for true representation of the people and should not wait patiently for the report of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea on that subject. If by the beginning of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly a date had still not been set for the constitutional conference, he suggested that representatives of the people of the Territory should be invited to appear before the Fourth Committee. It was imperative that the economic, social and educational development of the country should be encouraged, but their political progress towards self-determination and independence was the paramount concern.

46. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that his delegation had always believed and still believed that the people of Equatorial Guinea, like any other people still under the colonial yoke, had the right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). According to that resolution, all colonial peoples should

be granted independence immediately without any conditions or reservations. Seven years had elapsed since the adoption of that resolution and yet the people of Equatorial Guinea had still not attained independence, despite the repeated assurances of the representatives of Spain that independence would be granted if the people wished it. From the report of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea, which had visited the Territory in 1966 (A/6300/Add.7, chapter IX, annex), it was clear that all political parties and all sections of the population contacted by the Sub-Committee in the Territory were unequivocally in favour of independence. There were some differences of opinion as to the date on which independence should be granted but no political party, no section of the population and no official representative of Equatorial Guinea had felt that independence should be delayed beyond July 1968. The wishes of the population had been noted in the penultimate **preambular** paragraph of resolution 2230 (XXI), in operative paragraph 6 of which the General Assembly had requested the administering Power to set a date for independence and for that purpose to convene a conference in which the various political parties and sections of the population would be represented. The responsibility for setting a date for independence therefore lay solely with the administering Power and that date should be not later than July 1968. The Committee had now been told that the people of Equatorial Guinea were not ready to discuss the matter and that their so-called representatives had asked for the conference to be postponed sine die. That could only result in the postponement sine die of the granting of independence to the people of Equatorial Guinea who had already declared themselves to be unequivocally in favour of independence not later than July 1968. The explanations given by the administering Power for the delay in convening the conference were not convincing and it was clear from the statement made by the petitioner at the previous meeting that MONALIGE was opposed to Spain's delaying tactics. His delegation fully shared that view and was opposed to any manoeuvres designed to delay the granting of independence to Equatorial Guinea. The Special Committee should ask the administering Power to implement General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) unconditionally and to set a date immediately for the granting of independence not later than July 1968.

47. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania said that his delegation, and indeed the Special Committee as a whole, had always striven to ensure the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) but all efforts

in that direction had so far met with very little co-operation, and in some cases with complete defiance, on the part of the colonial Powers.

48. The Spanish Government's announcement in 1966 of its intention to convene a constitutional conference had been welcomed as a positive move, but the Committee's expectations had been short-lived. There still appeared to be no possibility that specific terms of independence could be settled or even defined in the near future. Before the Territory had been visited by the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea in August 1966, the Spanish Government had given the impression that all was well and that the people were content with the existing state of affairs. The Sub-Committee had found, however, that there was virtual unanimity among the people in favour of independence without delay. The reason why operative paragraph 7 had been included in General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) was simply that Equatorial Guinea was a colony and that, as the Sub-Committee had ascertained, the people did not enjoy freedom of political activity. In some cases, fines had been imposed for displaying placards demanding independence, and it was clear that political activities along party lines were being strongly discouraged by the colonial authorities.

49. The autonomous Government of Equatorial Guinea had already been condemned by his delegation and others as unrepresentative of the people, and the petitioners who had appeared before the Special Committee at its 552nd meeting had confirmed that it was so. In a country where there were not more than three African lawyers and five African doctors, it was an insult to the Africans to say that there was an elected member of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea to represent the interests of lawyers and another to represent the medical profession. As stated in the report of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea (A/6300/Add.7, chap. IX, annex, para. 289), the electoral system limited participation to only a small minority of the adult population in the election of representatives to governmental organs. It was distressing, therefore, to be told that the autonomous Government represented the masses of the people of the Territory, and at the same time it was understandable that some members of that colonial institution should try to impede the holding of a constitutional conference which might lead to independence. According to the representative of Spain, it was the autonomous Government, rather than Spain, which was delaying the holding of the conference.

His delegation agreed with the petitioners that the autonomous Government should be dissolved, as it did not represent the people and was incapable of bringing about changes that could lead to independence, even though there were certain elements within it which were determined to serve the true interests of the people of the Territory as a whole.

50. His delegation had welcomed the attitude taken by Spain when it had invited the Special Committee to send a visiting mission to Equatorial Guinea and had later announced the convening of a constitutional conference which would lead the Territory to independence. Yet, seven years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Spain had still not decolonized a single territory in Africa. It would be in Spain's interests to ensure the peaceful decolonization of the Territories under its domination. Spain should remember that the autonomous Government did not represent the masses of the people, but rather the interests of Spain; consequently, the contention that the conference could not be convened because the autonomous Government had been slow in responding to the Spanish proposal was unacceptable. It was for the administering Power to set a definite date for the constitutional conference and to invite representatives of all political parties, as well as the autonomous Government, to participate.

51. It was doubtful whether Spain would in fact grant independence to Equatorial Guinea by July 1968, as had been requested. The people of Equatorial Guinea had their own political parties to represent them and they were dedicated to the cause of freedom. He appealed to Spain not to make the struggle for liberation a bitter one, but to implement the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) without further delay and set an early date for the convening of the constitutional conference, which should fix a date not later than July 1968 for the independence of the Territory.

52. The United Republic of Tanzania would continue to support the people of Equatorial Guinea until final victory had been achieved, and he hoped that they would work towards that goal without fear or intimidation.

53. The representative of Chile said that there were no economic, social or educational obstacles to the early attainment of independence by Equatorial Guinea, but there were certain political difficulties. His delegation hoped that Spain would implement the provisions of operative paragraphs 4 and 6 of General Assembly

resolution 2230 (XXI) as soon and as fully as possible, so that the people of Equatorial Guinea would be able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

54. In his statement (see para. 41 above), the representative of Spain had indicated that some progress had been made towards the convening of a constitutional conference with the establishment of an inter-ministerial commission, but the results had not been as positive as might have been desired. No date had yet been set for the convening of the conference, which was so urgently necessary. He appealed to Spain to do everything in its power to ensure that the conference was held as soon as possible, since it was only in such a forum that all differences of opinion could be discussed to the benefit of the Territory.

55. As for operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2230 (XXI), his delegation was gratified to note that to a large extent sub-paragraph (a) had been implemented, since there were practically no restrictions on political activities in the Territory and a number of political leaders who had been living in voluntary exile had returned and were now participating in political activities. He deplored the fact that, because the constitutional conference had not yet been convened, it had not so far been possible to institute an electoral system based on universal adult suffrage, in accordance with sub-paragraph (b) - a step which was essential before sub-paragraph (c) could be implemented.

56. The petitioners had said (see para. 27 above) that the sole purpose of the constitutional conference should be to set a date for independence; however, he did not think that that was realistic. The Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea had found during its visit to the Territory that there were many different opinions concerning the purpose of the constitutional conference. In addition to setting a date for independence, it should draw up an adequate constitution for Equatorial Guinea and work out an electoral system in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly. The conference should bring together all sections of the population and should include in its agenda all questions relating to the political future of the Territory, as the leaders of MONALIGE had stated in a document addressed to the Head of the Spanish State (A/AC.109/PET.702).

57. The representative of Mali recalled that, when the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea had visited Madrid, the Spanish Government and Press had made much of the fact that the administering Power, on its own initiative, was inviting a United Nations body to co-operate with it in promoting the independence of a people under its rule. Following the Sub-Committee's visit to the Territory, it had seemed that Equatorial Guinea was well on the road to independence. The administering Power and the people of the Territory had stated their agreement that a date should be fixed for independence; the people had seemed to favour July 1968, and the administering Power had expressed no objections.

58. It seemed from the statement made by the representative of Spain (see para. 41 above) that the administering Power was more concerned about certain supposed difficulties faced by the population in assimilating documents than about its own responsibilities. The administering Power should take steps to carry out the undertakings it had made. Certain divergences of views among the population were not a reason for delaying progress towards independence and postponing the convening of a constitutional conference. The problems which faced the political leaders of a Territory during the period immediately preceding independence were minor, the major problem being that of accession to independence. Such problems could be resolved after Equatorial Guinea had become a sovereign nation. The administering Power must not encourage internal controversies in order to delay independence. It was the responsibility of the administering Power to take the initiative in convening a constitutional conference, while the people of the Territory must make whatever preparations were necessary for their participation in the conference.

59. There were other questions which might be raised, such as the administering Power's obligation to restore political rights and allow all opposition leaders to return to their country. With regard to designation of the delegations to a constitutional conference, the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea had made specific recommendations. New methods of popular consultation must be used to ensure that the inhabitants were genuinely represented. He wished to assure the people of Equatorial Guinea of his country's support in their struggle for independence.

60. The representative of Uruguay said that the representative of Spain (see paras. 41-44 above) had attempted to justify the delay in convening a

/...

constitutional conference in pursuance of operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI). He had described the difficulties which had arisen and had suggested that representatives of the people should be allowed to explain the situation to the Fourth Committee. He had also mentioned efforts to avoid tensions between Fernando Póo and Río Muni.

61. Other speakers had referred to the political advances that had been made in the Territory, and he did not think that the Spanish Government could be accused of trying to delay independence. What it had been doing was to consult the people and, having found differences of opinion among them, it was faced with the question what action to take when political, economic or social reasons hindered progress to independence. The administering Power was aware of its responsibilities under the United Nations Charter. Spain could not be condemned for acting as it had done, even though it might be thought to have made mistakes. The explanations given should be recognized as valid; however, that did not affect the responsibilities of the administering Power vis-à-vis the United Nations, including its obligation to grant independence as soon as possible, even under conditions that were not perfect.

62. The administering Power had perhaps refrained from telling the Special Committee the whole truth out of an understandable desire to avoid aggravating the differences in the Territory. It was possible that some of the divergences of view reflected antagonisms between Fernando Póo and Río Muni, which could create difficulties for the emerging nation. Despite that, his delegation considered that Spain had an overriding responsibility to ensure the Territory's accession to independence, and he appealed to the administering Power to fix a date for a constitutional conference as soon as possible with that end in view.

63. Important political progress had been made and, now that a stage of political maturity had been reached, the Territory should receive its independence.

64. The representative of Mali noted that the representative of Uruguay had referred to differences between Fernando Póo and Río Muni. As a member of the Sub-Committee which had visited the Territory, he could state that no such differences existed. The unitary nature of the Territory was established in the Basic Law. The Sub-Committee's discussion both with political leaders and

with the people had shown that the people of Equatorial Guinea wished to achieve independence as a single entity. While there might be certain factions within both the recognized political parties dominated by one ethnic group or another, that did not affect the basic principle of the national unity of Equatorial Guinea.

IV. ACTION TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

65. At the 556th meeting, the representative of Mali introduced a joint draft resolution (A/AC.109/L.427) co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia.

66. The representative of Mali speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution was largely a reiteration of General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI), taking into account the views expressed during the debate. The dominant concern of members of the Committee was that the administering Power should be firmly committed to a continuation of the normal process of liberating Equatorial Guinea, and the stage had now been reached where independence was the immediate, short-term goal. The Committee was therefore entitled to expect the administering Power to take such practical steps as the convening of the constitutional conference referred to in resolution 2230 (XXI), and the main purpose of the draft resolution was to help Spain to take that essential step.

67. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

68. In operative paragraph 3 the Special Committee expressed regret that the constitutional conference called for in General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) had not yet been held and that, contrary to the expectations of the majority of delegations, and especially the members of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea, the administering Power had not followed up the welcome initiative it had taken in asking for the co-operation of the United Nations with a view to hastening Equatorial Guinea's attainment of independence.

69. Since resolution 2230 (XXI) laid down what was virtually a step-by-step procedure for the administering Power to follow - including the institution of an electoral system based on universal adult suffrage and the holding, before independence, of a general election for the whole Territory on the basis of a unified electoral roll - operative paragraph 3 contained an appeal to the administering Power to comply with that resolution without further delay. While

/...

he recognized that Spain had begun to put some of the practical provisions of that resolution into effect, the time factor was all-important.

70. In view of the imperative need for the Committee to ensure that a constitutional conference was held, operative paragraph 4 urged the administering Power to convene such a conference immediately. In view of the sponsors, the steps taken so far by the Spanish Government which had been described by the representative of Spain in his statement (see paras. 41-44 above) (such as interministerial meetings and the preparatory activities already under way) should be integral parts of the process of convening the conference and not preliminaries to it. Such activities could very well continue after a date had been set for the convening of the conference.

71. Operative paragraph 5 set July 1968 as the latest date for independence. The Sub-Committee's consultations and hearings of petitioners in the Territory had seemed to indicate that that date had been agreed upon by all strata of the population and by the administering Power itself.

72. Lastly, operative paragraph 6 would maintain the item on the Special Committee's agenda because the Committee was the United Nations organ primarily responsible for decolonization and was in duty bound to follow developments in the Territory very closely as decolonization proceeded.

73. The representative of Yugoslavia said his delegation believed that the draft resolution took fully into account the actions previously taken by the Special Committee and the General Assembly, the Committee's debates and the views of the petitioners and of the administering Power. The people of Equatorial Guinea, like all other peoples still under colonial domination, had the right to self-determination and the speedy attainment of independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Unfortunately, certain measures which the General Assembly had requested in its resolution 2230 (XXI) had not yet been taken, and the explanations given by the administering Power for the delay were unsatisfactory. The Committee should therefore make every effort to ensure that the people of the Territory would be able to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, and that was the purpose of the draft resolution.

74. The representative of Spain said that his Government had always given ample proof of its desire to co-operate with the Committee. It had, on its own initiative, granted the people of Equatorial Guinea an autonomous régime enabling them to prepare for political evolution; it had invited a Sub-Committee of the Special Committee to visit the Territory; and it had announced to the Committee its intention of convening a constitutional conference to examine the aspirations of the people and prepare the way for free and democratic elections on the basis of adult suffrage. There was no justification, therefore, for calling his Government's intentions into question because of the delay in convening the conference. The obstacles which prevented Spain from opening the conference on the date originally scheduled had been noted by the representative of Uruguay. There were differences of opinion in Equatorial Guinea regarding the Territory's future and the way to prepare for it; to bring those differences into the open might make the positions of the political groups at the constitutional conference more inflexible. His Government had therefore preferred to seek some agreement among Guinean leaders before the conference, in order that positive and constructive results might be achieved at the conference itself.

75. The Committee had recently heard petitioners claiming to represent MONALIGE, a political party which had addressed a communication signed by 30,000 persons (A/AC.109/PET.702, annex C) to the Head of the Spanish State. That document had stated the gratitude of all Guineans for the understanding shown by the Spanish Government concerning the people's desire for independence, expressed a desire for the maintenance of close ties between Equatorial Guinea and Spain in the future, and acknowledged that the autonomous Government set up by Spain, although not accepted as representing the entire people of Equatorial Guinea, was part of such representation and should participate in the constitutional conference along with representatives of MONALIGE, the MUNGE-IPGE coalition and other economic and cultural organizations. The opposition group therefore recognized the Spanish Government's good faith and regarded the procedure which had been set for holding the conference as adequate. There was no conflict of principle between the Spanish Government and the different political groups in Equatorial Guinea regarding representation of the people at the proposed conference; there were only differences of opinion. He could not agree with the position adopted by some

delegations, which seemed to be asking the Spanish Government to overlook those differences of opinion and to convene the constitutional conference unilaterally, even at the risk of confronting the conference with extremely difficult situations.

76. It was worth noting that the Territory of Equatorial Guinea did not in any way benefit the Spanish economy or the Spanish State; on the contrary, it constituted a considerable financial burden which Spain was willing to bear because it was aware of the grave responsibility it had assumed towards the people of the Territory.

77. Having received no instructions from his Government with regard to the draft resolution, he reserved his delegation's position except to state that, in his Government's view, the date to be set for the independence of Equatorial Guinea was a matter for the constitutional conference to decide.

78. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania said his delegation continued to believe that the Spanish Government had the responsibility to convene a constitutional conference regardless of the differences existing among the people; those differences represented non-antagonistic traditions and could be overcome only when the Territory's colonial status had been ended. The document cited by the representative of Spain indicated the people's anxiety for the early convening of a constitutional conference by the administering Power. He hoped that the Spanish Government would show its spirit of co-operation by accepting and implementing without further delay whatever resolution the Special Committee might adopt for the elimination of colonialism from Equatorial Guinea.

79. The representative of Iraq said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which constituted a fresh attempt to promote the aims of previous resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI). His delegation had noted the Spanish representative's statements of Spain's goodwill, co-operative spirit and desire for a peaceful and just solution to the problem of Equatorial Guinea; it therefore hoped that Spain would do its best to implement the provisions of the draft resolution.

80. The representative of India recalled that, ever since its independence, his country had consistently supported colonial peoples in their aspirations to freedom and independence. It was in that spirit that India had co-sponsored the

draft resolution before the Special Committee. His delegation appreciated the co-operation extended by the Spanish Government to the Committee, by inviting it to send a visiting mission to the Territory, and extending all facilities to the Mission during its visit.

81. He had noted with satisfaction the Spanish Government's declaration recognizing the right of colonized peoples to self-determination and independence. It was precisely because of the expectations roused by that declaration that his delegation was disappointed to learn that the constitutional conference planned for early 1967 had not yet been convened, and that there had not been any tangible progress towards independence for the people of Equatorial Guinea. Since the purpose of the conference had been to set a date for the independence of the Territory, it was very disappointing that it had not been possible to convene it for various reasons. His delegation had considered carefully the reasons given by the administering Power which were somewhat different from the reasons given by the petitioners who had appeared before the Committee. He hoped the would be convened without any further delay. The Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea had recommended that the Territory should become independent by July 1968 since this was the desire of the overwhelming majority of the population. He hoped that the Spanish Government would render every possible assistance to enable the people of the Territory to achieve their cherished goal within the time-limit they themselves had set.

82. The representative of Italy said that he was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, with regard to operative paragraph 5, he was of the opinion that it was for the people themselves to set the date of their independence.

83. At the 557th meeting, the joint draft resolution (A/AC.109/L.427) was adopted by a roll-call vote of 19 to none, with 3 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, Ethiopia, Finland, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Poland, Sierra Leone, Syria, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

84. The representative of Australia, explaining his vote, said he regretted that his delegation had been unable to support the resolution because of its operative paragraph 5 which set the target date of July 1968 for the independence of Equatorial Guinea. No United Nations body could arbitrarily set a date for the independence of a non-self-governing people; that must come as the result of a decision by the people of the Territory in co-operation with the administering Power.

85. The representative of Spain thanked the Special Committee for having allowed him to participate in its deliberations, and took note of the voting and of the draft resolution that had been adopted.

86. The representative of Mali said that his delegation had not been able to take part in the voting for reasons beyond its control and would like the summary record to indicate that it would have voted for the draft resolution.

87. The text of the resolution (A/AC.109/270) adopted by the Special Committee on the question of Equatorial Guinea at its 557th meeting on 12 September 1967, reads as follows:

"The Special Committee,

"Having considered the question of Equatorial Guinea,

"Having heard the statement of the petitioner,

"Having also heard the statement of the administering Power,

"Recalling the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,

"Recalling further the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) of 20 December 1966,

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"2. Regrets that the constitutional conference as provided for in paragraph 6 of resolution 2230 (XXI) has not been convened;

"3. Requests the administering Power to implement without further delay the provisions of resolution 2230 (XXI), in particular, paragraph 4 thereof;

"4. Urges the administering Power to convene immediately the constitutional conference referred to above;

"5. Further requests the administering Power to ensure that the Territory accedes to independence as a single political and territorial entity not later than July 1968;

"6. Decides to maintain the question of Equatorial Guinea on its agenda."

88. At the 564th meeting, on 27 September 1967, the Chairman drew attention to a letter dated 18 September 1967 (A/6802), in which the Deputy Permanent Representative of Spain informed the Secretary-General that on 15 September 1967 the Spanish Government had decided that the constitutional conference to determine the future of Equatorial Guinea would convene on 30 October 1967.

ANNEX*

QUESTION OF EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Report of the Secretary-General

1. Resolution 2230 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 on the question of Equatorial Guinea, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-first session, reads as follows:

"Question of Equatorial Guinea

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of Equatorial Guinea,

"Having heard the statement of the petitioner,

"Having also heard the statement of the representative of the administering Power,

"Having considered the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Equatorial Guinea, a/

"Recalling its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2067 (XX) of 16 December 1965,

"Recalling the Basic Law of 1963 which recognized Fernando Póo and Río Muni as one entity thereafter to be called Equatorial Guinea, and the declaration by the administering Power of its intention to grant independence to Equatorial Guinea as a single entity,

"Taking into account the declarations of the administering Power that it would accede to the desires of the people of the Territory for independence whenever they so requested,

* Previously reproduced under the symbol A/AC.109/237.

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6300/Rev.1), chapter IX.

"Noting the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people consulted that the Territory should become independent not later than July 1968,

"Having noted the statement of the representative of the administering Power that a constitutional conference will be convened early in 1967,

"Recognizing the need for further measures to promote the economic, social and educational advancement of the people of the Territory,

"1. Approves the chapter of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples relating to Equatorial Guinea, and endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein; b/

"2. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"3. Expresses its appreciation to the Government of Spain for having invited the Special Committee to visit the Territory and for the co-operation rendered to the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea of the Special Committee during its visit to the Territory;

"4. Invites the administering Power to implement as soon as possible the following measures:

"(a) Removal of all restrictions on political activities and establishment of full democratic freedoms;

"(b) Institution of an electoral system based on universal adult suffrage and the holding, before independence, of a general election for the whole Territory on the basis of a unified electoral roll;

"(c) Transfer of effective power to the government resulting from this election;

"5. Requests the administering Power to ensure that the Territory accedes to independence as a single political and territorial unit and that no step is taken which would jeopardize the territorial integrity of Equatorial Guinea:

b/ Ibid., chapter IX, annex, paras. 286-310.

"6. Requests the administering Power, in accordance with the wishes of the people of Equatorial Guinea, to set a date for independence as recommended by the Special Committee and, for this purpose, to convene a conference in which the various political parties and all sections of the population would be fully represented;

"7. Further requests the administering Power to establish in law and in practice full equality of political, economic and social rights;

"8. Urges the administering Power to take effective measures, including increased assistance, to ensure the rapid economic development of the Territory and to promote the educational and social advancement of the people, and requests the specialized agencies to render all possible assistance towards this end;

"9. Requests the Secretary-General to take appropriate action, in consultation with the administering Power and the Special Committee, to ensure the presence of the United Nations in the Territory for the supervision of the preparation for, and the holding of, the election envisaged in paragraph 4 (b) above, and to participate in any other measures leading towards the independence of the Territory;

"10. Further requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present resolution to the administering Power and to report to the Special Committee on its implementation;

"11. Decides to maintain the question of Equatorial Guinea on its agenda."

2. By letter dated 19 January 1967, the Secretary-General transmitted the text of the resolution to the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations. This letter is reproduced below:

"I have the honour to transmit herewith, for the attention of your Government, the text of resolution 2230 (XXI) on the question of Equatorial Guinea, adopted by the General Assembly at its 1500th plenary meeting on 20 December 1966.

"In this connexion I wish to note that operative paragraphs 3 to 8 are addressed to your Government as the administering Power for the Territory in question. I wish also to refer to operative paragraph 9 by which the General Assembly requested me to take appropriate action, in consultation with the administering Power and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to ensure the presence of the United Nations in the Territory for the supervision of the preparation for the holding of a general election and to participate in any other measures leading towards the independence of the Territory.

/...

"I note that, as you informed me in your letter of 27 December 1966, the Spanish Council of Ministers has decided to appoint immediately an interministerial commission entrusted with the task of preparing as soon as possible the holding of a constitutional conference of Equatorial Guinea. The text of your letter has been circulated as a document of the Special Committee (A/AC.109/217). I should appreciate it if your Government would inform me as soon as practicable of the results of the Constitutional Conference.

"I should also welcome an indication from your Government as to the appropriate time for initiating the consultation envisaged in operative paragraph 9 of the resolution concerning the establishment of a United Nations presence in the Territory."

3. At its 508th meeting on 6 April 1967, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples decided, in the light of its programme of work for 1967, to request the Secretary-General to expedite the consultations envisaged in operative paragraph 9 of the above-mentioned resolution. By letter dated 11 April 1967, the Secretary-General informed the Permanent Representative of Spain that, having regard to this decision, he would appreciate receiving at an early date the information requested in his letter dated 19 January 1967.

4. By letter dated 18 April 1967, the Permanent Representative of Spain addressed the following reply to the Secretary-General's letter dated 19 January 1967:

"I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 19 January transmitting to me the text of General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI) relating to Equatorial Guinea.

"In 1963, as you are aware, the inhabitants of Equatorial Guinea approved by means of a referendum the autonomous régime now in force, which is part of the process leading to independence. In order to enable the United Nations to verify the political progress being made by the Territory, the Spanish Government extended an invitation last year to a visiting mission, which sought the views of various persons concerning the future of Equatorial Guinea but was unable, as can be seen from the text of resolution 2230 (XXI) itself, to make a comprehensive survey of opinion in the Territory. It should be noted, in this connexion, that on 24 August 1966, the Assembly of Equatorial Guinea expressed its disagreement with the interpretation given to the visit.

"Last December, on instructions from the Spanish Government, my delegation announced in the Fourth Committee that a Constitutional Conference was to be convened in which the various political sectors and groups of Equatorial Guinea would be represented. A specially appointed Interministerial Committee has already initiated talks with representatives of those sectors and groups.

"The Constitutional Conference, which will be held very shortly, as soon as the preparations are completed, will determine what the people wish, and it is in accordance with those wishes that the procedures and time-table for completing the process begun in 1963 will be established. It should be noted that the Spanish Government promised some time ago that if a majority of the inhabitants of Equatorial Guinea wished to alter their present status, Spain would be fully prepared to consult with the Guinean people concerning their future.

"The decisions adopted by the Constitutional Conference will be submitted to the people of Equatorial Guinea for approval on the basis of universal adult suffrage. The Spanish Government will keep the United Nations Secretariat informed of the proceedings and results of the Constitutional Conference."

5. In submitting this preliminary report, the Secretary-General wishes to state that he will report to and consult with the Special Committee as appropriate in the light of further developments pertaining to the implementation of operative paragraph 9 of the above-mentioned resolution.
