

HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 21 November 1949, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. LACHS (Poland).

Meetings of the Sixth Committee

1. Mr. PETREN (Sweden) suggested that the Committee, in order to speed up its proceedings, should hold longer meetings twice a day rather than meet three times a day, as had been arranged.
2. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) and Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) seconded that suggestion.
3. The CHAIRMAN, after consultation with the Secretariat, announced that, instead of the evening meeting scheduled for that day, an afternoon meeting lasting until 8 p.m. would be held.

Consideration by the General Assembly of items completed by the Sixth Committee

4. The CHAIRMAN said, in reply to a question by the United Kingdom representative, that the consideration by the General Assembly of items completed by the Sixth Committee had been deferred for only a brief period and might take place by the end of the week. The members of the Committee would then, it was hoped, be free to attend the plenary meetings, after having finished with the item 62, referred to them by the Third Committee, concerning the draft convention for the suppression of the traffic in persons and of the exploitation of the prostitution of others.

Draft rules for the calling of international conferences: report of the Secretary-General (A/943) (*continued*)

NEW RULE 4 (*concluded*)

5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of the new rule proposed by Australia (A/C.6/L.69)¹ as a new rule 4 to be inserted in the draft rules (A/943), and the Cuban amendment, which called for modifying the Australian text to read as follows (A/C.6/L.90/Rev.2) :

"The Council may decide to invite to a conference of States a territory which is concerned with the fields covered by the conference, although it is not responsible for the conduct of its foreign affairs. The Council shall decide the extent of the participation in the conference of any territory invited under such conditions."

6. Mr. CHAUDHURI (India) fully agreed with the spirit of the Australian proposal. He wished to point out, however, that the term "territory", as used in that text, was not clearly defined, and might therefore be held to apply to such territorial units as the Indian States, many of which possessed

¹ See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 73.

a large measure of self-government. He consequently moved that the words "as described in Article 73 of the Charter" should be inserted after the word "territory". Unless that change were accepted, he would be obliged to oppose the Australian proposal.

7. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) said that, while he approved of the motives behind the Australian proposal and the Cuban amendment, both because there were precedents for the proposal and because an international conference would benefit from the participation of territories directly interested in the subject-matter discussed, yet the actual wording of the two texts was open to juridical as well as to practical objections.

8. The juridical objection was that both texts spoke of invitations extended to territories which, not being responsible for the conduct of their foreign relations, were represented in international life by sovereign States which were in charge of those relations. Such territories, whether they were former protectorates, States belonging to a federation, Trust Territories or non-self-governing territories, did not possess international personality. Since the Committee had decided that the rules for the calling of international conferences by the Economic and Social Council under Article 62, paragraph 4, of the Charter were to be confined to conferences of States, the calling of such conferences was an international activity in which only entities possessing international personality could participate. The Council could therefore not issue an invitation to any territory directly. The State responsible for that territory's foreign relations, and consequently for its participation in international life, would have to decide whether or not, and to what extent, such a territory should take part in any international conference.

9. The practical objection was that conferences should be attended only by representatives of territories which possessed a sufficient degree of technical competence and autonomy in the matters discussed, if their participation was to be useful.

10. Examining in the light of those remarks, the two texts proposed the French representative noted that, while the Australian proposal explicitly stated that the invitation to any territory to attend an international conference should be approved by the responsible State, and the Cuban amendment did not so state, there was little to choose between them inasmuch as their effect would be the same. A resolution of the General Assembly could not change positive international law on that point, which was that such approval was essential.

11. The Australian description of the territories to be invited was preferable to the Cuban. Any territory might be presumed to be "concerned with the fields covered by the conference" if the responsible State was; but the real criterion in issuing an invitation was whether the territory was self-governing in that particular field and could therefore make a useful contribution to the work of the conference.

12. The second sentence of both texts was entirely unacceptable to the French delegation, which from the first had taken the position that the Economic and Social Council should not be given discretionary powers to determine the extent of participation in a conference. Where a territory was concerned, that extent should be determined

by the responsible State which represented that territory in international life. The Council could not arrogate to itself the powers of such sovereign States.

13. With respect to the Indian amendment, he remarked that the Council would call international conferences presumably with a view to achieving the purposes of Article 55 b, of the Charter, the terms of which were broad enough to apply to territories other than non-self-governing territories within the meaning of Article 73. He deplored the tendency to regard colonial Powers as scapegoats to be blamed for every shortcoming in the territories under their administration and to overlook the imperfections in the administration of sovereign States. Only those who opened their own doors wide to international co-operation and to examination of the economic and social conditions within their territories were, in his view, justified in criticizing others.

14. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) observed that his delegation agreed in principle with both the Australian proposal and the Cuban amendment to it. The United Nations should certainly make it possible for the territories concerned with fields covered by inter-State conferences to attend them.

15. In reply to the French representative, he said that it was most important to determine precisely which territories the Economic and Social Council could invite to conferences. As the Indian amendment would make that point clear, he supported it, on the understanding that other territories might still be invited, if necessary, and that wide participation might thus be ensured.

16. He could not agree with the French representative that the responsible States should determine the extent of participation in a conference of the territories under their administration. Clearly, those territories would not have the same rights as sovereign States, and would certainly not have the right to vote. Under those conditions, and since inviting those territories would be in the nature of an experiment, it was the Economic and Social Council, proceeding cautiously, which should designate the territories and limit the extent of their participation.

17. If the Indian amendment were adopted, he suggested that the last sentence of the Australian proposal might state that the Council would, in the invitation, indicate the extent of participation in the conference of any such territories.

18. Mr. MAÚRTUA (Peru) said that, as he had indicated at the 197th meeting¹, the problem before the Committee was directly related to the powers of an international conference. In the view of his delegation, the form and extent of participation in the conference should be prescribed not by the Economic and Social Council but by the conference itself in rules laid down for that purpose and dealing with the right to speak, to make proposals and amendments, to vote, and similar matters. Those rules should, as in the past, be based on the principle of the equality of sovereign States at international conferences. The granting of such rights to dependent territories would confer upon them international personality, which was an attribute of sovereign States; therefore, that could

¹ See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 85.

not be allowed. Moreover, representatives of States might be influenced by speeches made by representatives of territories and cast their votes accordingly. Besides, there was the question of who would instruct the representatives of territories; for instructions also constituted an expression of sovereignty. If instructions were given by the Governments of responsible States, such States would have double representation at the conference.

19. Furthermore, if territories concerned with the subject of the conference were to be invited, that might include territories of States not recognized by the United Nations and consequently raise the problem of recognition. Finally, since it had been decided that States not invited to the conference could only send observers, it would be contrary to the general interest to give territories a higher status by permitting them to address the conference.

20. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representatives of Cuba, India and Argentina might help the Committee by combining their amendments to the Australian proposal in a joint text.

21. Mr. DUYNSTEE (Netherlands) failed to understand the purport of the Cuban amendment in calling for the deletion of the words "With the approval of the responsible Member", with which the Australian proposal began. The Cuban representative must be fully aware that such approval was required under existing international law and in the practice of the United Nations. Thus, in its resolution 69 (V), laying down the terms of reference for the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic and Social Council had stated that any territory which was not a member or an associate member of the Commission might be invited by the latter to participate in a consultative capacity "with the concurrence of the Member responsible for its international relations". In international law, the approval of the responsible State was always required. As the Greek representative had pointed out¹ the General Assembly could not alter positive international law by adopting a resolution; and surely the Cuban representative did not intend that the Assembly should authorize the Economic and Social Council to do anything incompatible with international law.

22. Mr. Duynstee therefore preferred the terms of the Australian proposal, which was clearly in conformity with existing law and practice.

23. There were also practical reasons for accepting that proposal. The invitation issued by the Council to a territory, as envisaged in draft rule 8, could be addressed only to the State responsible for its foreign relations. Any other procedure would have no result save that of embittering international relations and hampering international co-operation. Therefore, he urged the Committee to adopt the Australian proposal.

24. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) agreed with the French representative's remarks concerning the Indian proposal. He had noted that there was alarm and despondency whenever the possibility arose that a clause such as that under discussion might apply to a territory which was part of a union or a federation. India, comprising

many territories which under the former régime had been Indian States under the protection of the British Crown and now were autonomous except in their foreign relations for which India had become responsible, was a case in point.

25. Mr. Fitzmaurice could not accept the Indian proposal because he saw no reason why the clause should be applied to Malta and Rhodesia, and not to Hyderabad or Mysore.

26. As regards the formula proposed by the Argentine representative, he thought that reference to Article 73 of the Charter would give rise to great difficulty and ambiguities. There was a great divergency of opinion on what constituted a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of that Article. No generally accepted interpretation existed. His own Government had, rightly or wrongly, not furnished information on many territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations it was responsible because it did not consider them non-self-governing territories within the meaning of Article 73. Consequently, if a reference to Article 73 was to be included in the Australian proposal, it would, ironically enough, rule out the participation of a number of territories which, being entirely self-governing internally, would be most eligible to participate.

27. He was therefore opposed to the formula proposed by the Argentine representative.

28. He agreed with the Peruvian representative's remarks on the question of the authority to determine the extent of participation of territories invited. The French representative's view would have been acceptable if there had been any question of those territories participating on an equal footing with States, but that, as the Chairman had previously explained, was not the case: the draft rules applied to conferences of sovereign States only. If it were within the power of a State responsible for the foreign relations of a territory to determine the extent of the latter's participation, theoretically, that State might decide to give the territory voting rights. Thus, the United Kingdom might be accompanied at the conference by representatives of twenty territories all voting as it did. Surely, that was not what the Sixth Committee or the conference would desire. Moreover, the extent of participation should be uniform for all territories. Consequently, since it had been decided that territories would not participate with the same rights as States, the extent of their participation should be decided by a central organ, namely the Council.

29. While supporting the Netherlands representative's views he could not, for the reasons stated, share his apprehensions regarding the Cuban amendment. The invitation to a territory to attend a conference would be transmitted to it through the State responsible for the conduct of its foreign relations, and could only be accepted through that State. Consequently, unless the State responsible gave its approval, the territory in question could not participate in a conference. The Cuban amendment would therefore have exactly the same effect as the Australian proposal, except that under the latter the consent of the State responsible would be required at an earlier stage.

30. In view of those considerations, and despite the fact that he preferred the Australian text, which was clearer and which provided for consul-

¹ See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 115.

tation of States responsible at an earlier stage, Mr. Fitzmaurice saw no real objection to the Cuban amendment.

31. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) wished to thank the representatives who had supported his proposal.

32. His amendment (A/C.6/L.90/Rev.2), under which the Council would have the power to invite territories concerned to an international conference without having to ask the prior approval of the States responsible for the conduct of the foreign relations of those territories, was based on new legal principles which some representatives refused to accept. Nevertheless, the Cuban delegation had merely recognized a legitimate right set forth in the Charter and in other international instruments. The representative of Greece, who had considered that amendment incompatible with the generally applied principles of international law, seemed to have confused its central idea — which was that no approval by the State responsible for the conduct of a territory's foreign relations should be required — with the traditional method of transmitting such an invitation through the responsible State. It was a matter of complete indifference to the Cuban representative how such an invitation was transmitted, whether directly through the Secretary-General of the United Nations or through the responsible State. The representatives of France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom had considered that the deletion of the approval clause would not matter since international law in any case required the approval of the responsible State. The principles to which they had referred, and which he did not wish to discuss, were old and had been superseded by new ones. Thus, the Bogotá Conference of American States, in adopting resolution XXXIII¹, had decided to centralize information on dependent territories on the American continent, and to ask such territories, without approval by the States responsible for the conduct of their foreign relations, to submit the information. The data thus received had been considered at the Havana Conference.

33. Furthermore, the General Assembly, at the second part of its first session, had adopted resolution 67 (I) on regional conferences of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories; that resolution recommended "all Members having or assuming responsibilities for the administration of non-self-governing territories to convene conferences of representatives of non-self-governing peoples chosen or preferably elected in such a way that the representation of the people will be ensured to the extent that the particular conditions of the territory concerned permit, in order that effect may be given to the letter and spirit of Chapter XI of the Charter and that the wishes and aspirations of the Non-Self-Governing Peoples may be expressed". The resolution had not considered that the approval of the responsible State was needed to permit a non-self-governing territory to attend such a conference.

34. The introductory paragraph and sub-paragraph b of Article 73 were even clearer in that regard. They enunciated the basic new principles which had taken the place of the colonial concept

that the Administering Power had absolute control over a dependent territory.

35. Consequently, the Council, in inviting a territory concerned to an international conference, would not need the approval of the State responsible for the foreign relations of that territory. The interests concerned were those of the territory and not of the State; therefore, the Council should decide whether or not such territory should be invited.

36. The extent of participation of territories would be determined by the Council, which surely would not give territories the same rights it gave to States. Consequently, the apprehensions of the Belgian representative were not warranted.

37. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) considered that the difference of substance between the Australian proposal and the Cuban amendment was slight and could be easily reconciled.

38. First, the Australian proposal (A/C.6/L.69) referred to a territory which was self-governing in the fields covered by the terms of reference of the conference, whereas the Cuban amendment (A/C.6/L.90/Rev.2) spoke of territories concerned with the fields covered by the conference.

39. The second difference between the two texts — a point on which divergent views had been expressed in the Committee — was whether or not the responsible State's consent was a prerequisite to an invitation to a non-self-governing territory. The Australian proposal called for the approval of the responsible State; the Cuban amendment implied, although it did not explicitly state, that no such approval was necessary. Those representatives who maintained that invitation of a non-self-governing territory required, under existing international law, the approval of the responsible State, in no way wished to exclude non-self-governing territories from participating in conferences; on the contrary, those representatives wished that the views of the territories should be heard, and merely stressed the fact that the traditional procedure of international law should be followed. The French representative's argument that the conferences in question were conferences of sovereign States only — and not conferences of experts or organizations for which special rules of procedure might later be drawn up — could apply in the present case: the conferences contemplated would be composed of sovereign States, and not of States and non-self-governing territories. Consequently, direct invitations should be issued to sovereign States only, and non-self-governing territories should be invited through the States responsible for the conduct of their foreign relations.

40. The Cuban representative's reference to the Bogotá Conference was not relevant to the point at issue. That Conference of American States had adopted a resolution appointing a committee to study information submitted by various organs and institutions in non-self-governing territories on the American Continent, with a view to determining how the independence of those territories might be achieved. Never to his knowledge, however, had an inter-American conference been attended by a non-self-governing territory.

41. Consequently, the representative of Ecuador felt that there was essentially little difference between the two texts, and that the Committee

¹ See Final Act of the Ninth International Conference of American States, page 48.

should vote on either one, or on a joint text if the representatives of Cuba and Australia agreed to present one. The Committee might also consider a text which he had worked out with the Argentine representative, under which the Council could, with the knowledge of the State concerned, invite a non-self-governing territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter to a conference provided that the extent of the participation of such a territory was determined in the invitation.

42. Mr. Trujillo thought that such a text might reconcile the two extreme points of view.

43. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) said that he would accept the first part of the Cuban amendment (A/C.6/L.90/Rev.2) proposing the deletion of the phrase "With the approval of the responsible Member" provided that the Committee's report to the General Assembly made it clear that an invitation to a non-self-governing territory should be conveyed through the responsible State.

44. The second part of the Cuban amendment, to replace the words "which is self-governing in the fields" by "which is concerned with the fields", was unacceptable to the Australian delegation because the wording was so general that it would enable any territory to be invited to a conference, irrespective of the questions to be discussed. That might lead to the impossible situation where the conference would be attended by more non-self-governing territories than sovereign States. He agreed with the French representative's views on that point; only territories particularly concerned in the field should be invited.

45. In conclusion, the representative of Australia asked the Cuban representative whether it would be the Council, the responsible State or the territory concerned which, under the Cuban amendment, would determine if a territory was concerned with the questions to be discussed at the conference.

46. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) replied that he did not think that the second phrase referred to by the Australian representative affected the substance of the matter. It was implicit in the Cuban amendment that the Economic and Social Council, not the territory or the State responsible for its foreign relations, should determine whether or not a territory was to be invited to a conference.

47. With regard to the deletion of the first phrase of the amendment, his delegation appreciated the conciliatory spirit of the Australian delegation and was quite agreeable to the suggestion that the report should state that an invitation to a conference should be transmitted to a non-self-governing territory through the Member responsible for the conduct of the territory's foreign relations. It was of no consequence, in his opinion, whether the invitation was sent by the Secretary-General directly to the territory or through the responsible State.

48. Mr. MAKROS (United States of America) referring to the statement of the Cuban representative in which he had agreed that the Committee's report should mention that an invitation to a non-self-governing territory to attend a conference should be transmitted through the State

responsible for the foreign relations of that territory, said that the role of the parent Government would be reduced thereby to that of a messenger. What was important was the consent of the parent Government, and not the formal act of transmitting the invitation. He agreed with the view of the Australian representative on that point.¹ In reply to the Cuban representative, he wished to state, with respect to the application of international law to the case under consideration, that whatever the Committee might decide to say in the rules for the calling of international conferences or in its report would not change international law. With reference to the decision of the Bogotá Conference, he wished to observe that the agreements made there were binding only on the States which became parties thereto. It was a regional conference which could not change international law. Moreover, the decision had been in the form of a resolution, not of a convention.

49. General Assembly resolution 67 (I), recommending States to call conferences of representatives of non-self-governing peoples, left liberty of action to the responsible Governments. A General Assembly resolution could not change international law either. He recalled that it had been stated, in connexion with the draft declaration on rights and duties of States, that to be legally binding such an instrument must be either a convention or confine itself to already existing rules of international law. Otherwise, such a document was purely declaratory, like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The latter was not legally binding and, therefore, a covenant was also necessary.

50. Article 73 of the Charter did not purport to change international law in respect of relations between parent Governments and territories. The only juridical person in international law was the parent State.

51. Mr. MAKROS agreed with the Australian representative that the term "concerned with" in the Cuban amendment was so broad as to be all-inclusive; it would permit all territories to be invited to conferences.

52. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) remarked that, in view of the Cuban representative's interpretation of his compromise offer to state only in the report that invitations should be sent to non-self-governing territories through the States responsible for their foreign relations, he would withdraw that offer and insist upon the original wording of his delegation's proposal (A/C.6/L.69).

53. He added that if that proposal were put to the vote, his delegation would accept the Norwegian amendment² to replace the word "Member" by the word "State".

54. The CHAIRMAN expressed regret that it had not been possible to merge the Australian and Cuban texts. He announced that the representatives of Cuba, Argentina and India had agreed to incorporate their amendments in a common text, which read:

"The Council may invite non-self-governing territories referred to in Article 73 of the Charter and concerned with the fields covered by the conference. The Council shall state in the invitation

¹ See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 76.

² See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 77.

the extent of the participation in the conference of such territories."

55. He added that the Committee was accordingly dealing only with that joint amendment and the Australian proposal.

56. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) requested that the Committee should vote first on the deletion of the first phrase of his delegation's proposal and then on the joint amendment.

57. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) and the CHAIRMAN explained that the original Cuban amendment (A/C.6/L.90/Rev.2) had ceased to exist when the Cuban representative had agreed to merge his text with the amendments of Argentina and India; therefore the only amendment to be considered was the joint amendment.

58. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) pointed out that strong objections had been raised by various members to the reference to Article 73 of the Charter and to the words "concerned with" included in the joint amendment. He therefore suggested that the amendment should be divided into two parts and that each part should be voted on separately. The first part would comprise the text up to and including the words "Article 73 of the Charter"; and the second part would comprise the remainder of the amendment.

59. Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) requested that the text of the joint amendment should be submitted to the Committee in writing, so that there would be no misunderstanding about what was being put to the vote.

60. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) seconded that suggestion.

61. Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) suggested that the Committee would save time by having the text of the joint amendment read again rather than waiting for a written text to be distributed.

62. Mr. PÉREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) asked the representative of India to explain the reference to Article 73 contained in the joint amendment. He wished to know, in particular, if that reference excluded the possibility of inviting to conferences such territories as Malta and Southern Rhodesia.

63. Mr. CHAUDHURI (India) explained that his delegation had not wished to exclude any territories, but had wished to define what territories would be invited. He did not think that Mr. Fitzmaurice's reference to Mysore and Hyderabad was pertinent; the United Kingdom representative had referred to those territories as if they were still in the same position as when England was the State responsible for the conduct of their foreign relations. There was still some discussion as to whether or not Malta and Southern Rhodesia were self-governing. The Indian delegation also wished to prevent the invitation of great numbers of territories which were not interested in the matter dealt with in a conference.

64. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom), in reply to the representative of India, stated that the latter had not clarified the reference to Article 73, as the representative of Venezuela had requested. The point should be clarified before a vote was taken on the proposal.

65. He considered it inconsistent to say that certain Indian territories need not attend conferences because they had the Government of India to represent them internationally and to look after their interest. The same could be said of all other colonial territories. If that were the criterion which the Committee adopted, there would be no need for the draft rule under consideration or, if such a rule were accepted, it should apply to all territories internationally represented by the Government responsible for the conduct of their foreign relations, including such territories in India.

66. The representative of India had said that he did not wish to exclude any territories, but the rule would have that effect, if the reference to Article 73 were retained in it. Due to differences of interpretation of that Article, the United Kingdom had never transmitted information with regard to certain territories which it considered self-governing; if the reference to Article 73 were inserted in the rule, the Economic and Social Council would be prevented from inviting those territories to conferences. He assumed that the purpose of the Indian delegation in submitting its amendment was to exclude the possibility of having separate invitations extended to such territories as Mysore and Hyderabad; but that delegation should find some other method of doing so, because the wording of the joint amendment would also exclude some territories which everyone would wish to see invited to conferences. Reference to Article 73 would give rise to confusion. The meaning of the phrase referred to could not be clarified. For instance, the Fourth Committee had spent weeks trying to clarify it and had not been able to interpret it satisfactorily. Some other wording should therefore be used in the rule under discussion.

67. Mr. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation would vote against both the Australian proposal and the amendments. He recalled that the Committee had decided¹ to delete the second sentence of draft rule 8. His delegation would vote against any text reintroducing in a "surrogate" way the substance of that sentence.

68. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the joint amendment of Cuba, Argentina and India, including the text up to and including the words "Article 73 of the Charter".

The first part of the joint amendment was rejected by 20 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

69. In reply to a suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) said it was unnecessary for the Committee to vote on the last part of the joint amendment; since the basis of the amendment had been rejected, the remainder of the text had no meaning.

70. The CHAIRMAN stated that the only proposal remaining before the Committee for a new rule 4 was that of Australia (A/C.6/L.69).²

71. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) asked that the retention of the first phrase of the Australian proposal, "With the approval of the responsible State", should be voted on separately.

72. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first phrase of the Australian proposal.

The first phrase of the Australian proposal was approved by 18 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

¹ See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 71.

² See the summary record of the 197th meeting, paragraph 73, and also paragraph 53 above.

73. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Australian proposal as a whole, as amended, for the insertion of a new rule 4 in the draft rules. (A/943).

The proposal was adopted by 24 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions.

74. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting because it had wanted to ensure that all non-self-governing territories could be invited. He regretted that the phrase "with the approval of the responsible State" re-introduced the colonial clause which had caused so much difficulty for non-self-governing territories.

75. Mr. CHAUDHURI (India) explained that his delegation, although it agreed with the proposal in principle, had voted against it because the definition of the territories which could be invited was too vague.

76. Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal, on the understanding that it did not have any effect on the status of non-self-governing territories. With the elimination of reference to Article 73 of the Charter, the text of the rule would now refer to all territories which were autonomous, even constituent parts of federal States.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

¹ See the Summary Record of the 191st graphs 1 to 26.

² *Ibid.*, paragraphs 11 and 12.

³ *Ibid.*, paragraph 5.