



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter on Puerto Rico: report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	251

**Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).**

**Cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter on Puerto Rico: report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2465, A/C.4/L.300, A/C.4/L.301, A/C.4/L.302) (*continued*)**

[Item 34 (b)]\*

1. Mr. GUTIERREZ GUTIERREZ (Costa Rica) said that his country was profoundly interested in the economic and political development of Puerto Rico, as of all other Latin-American countries. It was regrettable that the debate had given rise to a difference among the countries of the Latin-American group which was symptomatic of a deep cleavage among them. On the one hand, there were feelings of sympathy for a sister republic; on the other, the reactions provoked by that country's special relationship with the United States, the biggest market for Latin-American products.
2. The fact must be recognized that total separation from the United States would be disastrous for Puerto Rico. Despite its recent rapid economic development, its economic position was still far from strong. Commonwealth status was therefore the best solution in all the circumstances. In every step that had been taken the fundamental right of self-determination had been observed. True, the instruments modifying Puerto Rico's status had been submitted to the United States Congress, but they had been in the form of a compact freely entered into by both parties.
3. The people of Puerto Rico were satisfied that they had attained full self-government; if at any time in the future they wished to change their status, they would be able to do so. They had been subjected to no economic pressure of any kind. After quoting various authorities in support of his contention that Puerto Rico was a sovereign State, he said his delegation considered that, inasmuch as the Government of Puerto Rico had jurisdiction in the economic, social and educational fields, it would be impossible for the United States to continue to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter.
4. To suggest that the United States might regret the step it had taken and revoke Puerto Rico's status was unworthy in view of the United States Government's faithful fulfilment of its international obligations.

\* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

By establishing a new relationship by means of a compact, the United States and Puerto Rico had set an admirable example and made a valuable contribution to the cause of anti-colonialism.

5. For the reasons adduced he had joined with the other six delegations in sponsoring the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.300. Puerto Rico had eliminated the last traces of colonialism in its relations with the United States, and it was for the Fourth Committee to put the seal on its achievement by recognizing its self-governing status.

6. Mr. CAMPOS CATELIN (Argentina) said that Argentina had followed the political development of Puerto Rico with interest. After becoming a dependent territory of the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War, it had, after fifty years of non-voluntary association with the Union, been given the opportunity by the administering Power to choose between solutions ranging from absolute independence to its incorporation as a state of the Union. The majority of the Puerto Rican electorate had opted for the intermediary formula under which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had emerged. The Argentine delegation was gratified by the political progress of the Puerto Rican people and respected its determination and the very special political status which ensured its future independence. However, it had serious doubts whether, given its present constitutional organization, the Puerto Rican people could achieve full self-government for, in the final analysis, sovereignty was indivisible and if a country did not enjoy full autonomy in its internal and foreign affairs, it did not actually enjoy genuine self-government. The Argentine delegation felt that the United Nations General Assembly could not repudiate its jurisdiction respecting Puerto Rico so long as that people had not been vested with all the attributes of sovereignty. To attain that end, political freedom should go hand in hand with economic freedom and the ideal of social justice towards which all systems of government should strive should be realized.

7. The Argentine delegation would judge the draft resolution and the amendments in the light of the foregoing considerations.

8. Mr. TOV (Israel) said that the question under discussion was one of extreme importance to a whole people and to the future of a new State. The difference of opinion in the Committee was due largely to the impatience of some delegations to see Puerto Rico enjoy complete independence at once, while others realized that the fundamental factor must be the will that had been freely expressed on several occasions by the Puerto Rican people themselves.

9. Having visited Puerto Rico three times in the past eight years, he was able to appreciate the great progress made, a fact which nearly all speakers had emphasized. On his last visit a few months previously, he had been vividly impressed by the spirit of unity and the will of the people to work and to progress.

10. Reviewing the progress in self-government made since the appointment of Mr. Muñoz Marín as Governor in 1946, he said there could be no doubt that the people of Puerto Rico had been fully aware of the significance of the new status on which they had decided. Mr. Muñoz Marín had made it plain to them that he would not have advocated the status of a Commonwealth freely associated with the United States if he had not had full confidence in the desire of the United States to end the colonial system in Puerto Rico. Before the referendum on the compact between the two countries had been taken, the Puerto Rican voters had understood that Puerto Rico would enjoy full self-government in internal matters, and that the relations between Puerto Rico and the United States could be amended only by mutual consent. They had made their choice accordingly. In the referendum on the three alternatives—*independence, statehood within the Union, and Commonwealth status*—they had voted three to one in favour of the latter. The new Constitution, which had been approved by four-fifths of the votes cast in the popular referendum, was the result of much careful study and would bear comparison with the most enlightened and progressive in the world.

11. In its new status, Puerto Rico formed a happy link between the United States and Latin America—politically it was linked to the United States and culturally to Latin America. Under the Point Four programme it was also making a great contribution to international improvement and to the aims of the United Nations in general.

12. The Israel delegation had thus no hesitation in supporting the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.300) acknowledging the changed status of Puerto Rico. The age of separatism was over: the leaders of Puerto Rico felt that their country would prosper better in free association with the United States than it could in isolation. Puerto Ricans favouring immediate independence had been shown to be in a minority. The way was still open for independence as the crowning point of Puerto Rican advancement. He was sure that the present arrangement would serve to encourage still greater achievements in all fields of activity.

13. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) wished to make it clear, as one of the sponsors of the joint amendments in document A/C.4/L.302, that his attitude was inspired by the greatest respect and admiration for the people of Puerto Rico. The country was eminently worthy of a full measure of self-government, and it was that point which had been the crux of his speech (349th meeting) in the general debate on the cessation of the transmission of information on Puerto Rico.

14. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) agreed with most of what had been said in the Committee regarding the admirable progress of Puerto Rico in the development of free institutions and self-government. His only disagreement was with the conclusion that those advances removed Puerto Rico from the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. The fact that the present status of Puerto Rico was the wish of the Puerto Rican people was not in dispute, but that status was still limited and it did not constitute that full measure of self-government which was recognized to be the ultimate aim of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Guatemalan delegation had therefore joined in proposing the amendments contained in document A/C.4/L.302. He wished to state his conviction that the transmission of information on conditions in a territory was in no

way detrimental to that territory's prestige, but constituted a valuable link between it and the United Nations. The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories had nothing to fear and much to hope from the United Nations.

15. Mrs. MENON (India) said that the point at issue was not whether Puerto Rico had progressed, which it certainly had under the United States, but whether it had achieved a full measure of self-government, and whether in negotiating the compact governing their relations, the United States and Puerto Rico had been on an equal footing. The mere existence of a compact could not be regarded as proof that Puerto Rico enjoyed a full measure of self-government. It was because the Indian delegation considered that the question deserved more detailed study than the Fourth Committee had been able to give it that it had put forward the amendments in document A/C.4/L.301, proposing the establishment of a special six-member committee to examine the question more closely.

16. With reference to the Peruvian representative's statement at the previous meeting, she noted that despite the high ideals certain delegations advocated, they were not always consistent in the position they adopted towards the question of a full measure of self-government. In the voting at the 330th meeting on the draft resolution to which the amended list of factors was attached, four of the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution, including the delegation of Peru, had voted in favour of a paragraph to the effect that the manner in which Non-Self-Governing Territories could become fully self-governing was primarily through the attainment of independence.

17. Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America) said that the expressions of satisfaction at the progress made in Puerto Rico were not only gratifying to the United States delegation but would encourage the people of Puerto Rico, who were justly proud to have a constitution and government of their own choosing.

18. She had however been surprised that many speakers had made up their minds before the Committee began its discussion of the Puerto Rican case and did not seem to have grasped the facts presented by the United States, in particular the actions begun in 1948 and completed in July 1952. They had apparently based their attitudes on obsolete documents, random discussion and the views expressed by Puerto Rican minority parties and dissidents daily rejected by a large majority of the voters rather than on the final acts of legitimate authorities. Such an attitude was tragic evidence of ignorance of the basic meaning of democratic methods as understood by the United States. It was unfortunate that so much time had been used to discuss the matter of "independence" in spite of the fact that that word did not appear in Chapter XI of the Charter. The United States contention was that independence and self-government were two entirely different matters, and that only self-government was the legitimate concern of the Fourth Committee when it was discussing matters under Chapter XI. It was sobering to realize that some members were willing to equate those two terms, particularly when it could be seen from the past as well as the present that a people could have independence without having self-government or knowing what it meant.

19. In the doctrinaire approach of some representatives it was clear that there existed but one door from

which a dependent territory could emerge, namely, independence. She wondered whether the conclusion to be drawn from the debate was that the United Nations was unwilling to accept new formulae and new methods better adapted to the relationships of the modern world.

20. Some delegations had commented on the fact that the article on human rights as originally drafted in the Puerto Rican Constitution had been amended. The United States Congress had been of the opinion that to incorporate in the Puerto Rican Constitution the objectives and aspirations contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could be interpreted to mean that legal obligations had been created on the part of the Puerto Rican Government beyond its power to fulfil within a republican structure of government. The Constitutional Convention had agreed to the deletion of section 20 of Article II from the Constitution on the understanding that that in no way implied a denial to the people of Puerto Rico of the human rights specified therein. The deletion did not curtail the power of the Puerto Rican legislature with respect to those objectives, any more than the absence of similar provisions in state constitutions had prevented state legislatures from taking action in those fields. The objectives set forth in section 20 were vigorously pursued in Puerto Rico by positive programmes for the promotion of better housing, job opportunities, education, health and other conditions necessary for ensuring to the people an adequate standard of living. It was perhaps natural that the people of the United States should feel that the people of Puerto Rico should have freedom to add their own form of their own bill of rights to their own Constitution after complete jurisdiction in the matter had been established for Puerto Rico.

21. The views expressed by the representative of Indonesia (352nd meeting) were particularly interesting because of the method used in reaching them. Although the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (A/2428) stated that no list of factors could serve as more than a guide in determining whether any particular territory had obtained a full measure of self-government, the representative of Indonesia had applied that list quite rigidly. In the case of Puerto Rico it was only reasonable to expect that the factor of legislative representation would not be rigidly applied. Had the people of Puerto Rico chosen integration into the Federal Union as a state, then obviously equality of legislative representation in the United States Congress would have been pertinent. However, the people of Puerto Rico, in choosing the commonwealth relationship, had deliberately laid aside equality of legislative representation in the United States Congress in favour of substantial fiscal advantages which they would not have had had Puerto Rico been a state of the Union. Clearly that was an instance where the freely expressed will of the people should be the controlling factor.

22. She had been at a loss to understand the point of view of the representative of India. It was well known that one of India's principal aims was the eradication of colonialism. It was difficult to see, however, how that aim was being furthered by the representative of India. In the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories that representative had voted in favour of a resolution relating to Puerto Rico (A/2465, part one, para. 67) on the understanding that the Committee should not prejudge the matter, since the General Assembly had not yet given its opinion on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on

Factors, but should refer the question to the Assembly. Now that the matter was before the General Assembly, however, she was proposing that a small committee should be established to study it. It would perhaps be less difficult to understand the attitude of the Indian delegation towards the Puerto Rican case if one knew why the Indian delegation regarded the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as less of a self-governing area than the territories listed in part D of the Constitution of India, such as the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

23. The Committee should ponder where its proceedings were leading and their grave implications for the United Nations. If the Committee could not vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution, that would mean that no territory could be considered as having achieved a full measure of self-government unless it could also claim independence. Self-government as envisaged in Chapter XI would be ruled out by an illegal rewriting of the Chapter by the Fourth Committee. Such an eventuality could only cause the Administering Members to weigh carefully the value of United Nations activity in the field of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

24. The United States delegation had assumed that the matter of Puerto Rico would be considered on its merits, and it hoped that a large number of delegations had been able to do that. It therefore urged the Committee to reject the Indian amendments and also the joint amendments contained in document A/C.4/L.302, and to adopt the seven-Power draft resolution as it stood.

25. She drew attention to the reasons advanced by the Peruvian representative at the 354th meeting to show why it would be impossible for the United States to resume reporting on Puerto Rico under Article 73 e of the Charter, and read an extract from a resolution adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on 29 October 1953, stating that the further sending of reports on Puerto Rico would be a denial of its true political status, and approving the United States decision to discontinue sending reports on Puerto Rico to the United Nations.

26. Mrs. MENON (India) explained, in connexion with the United States representative's reference to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, that those territories had a representative in the Indian Federal Parliament with the right to speak and to vote on issues which concerned them, a right which the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington did not have.

27. In reply to a question from Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America), Mrs. MENON (India) said that the representative was appointed by the Government of India.

28. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) felt that the experience of those countries which had advanced in a single leap from non-self-governing status to complete independence with full international personality led them naturally enough to regard that as the only way in which a territory could achieve self-government. It had not been in any critical spirit that he had pointed out that that criterion was somewhat subjective.

29. In answer to the reference made by the Indian representative to the voting on the draft resolution on factors (A/C.4/L.279) he pointed out that the paragraph in question had included the word "primarily". Had it used the word "solely", the Peruvian delegation would have voted differently. Moreover, the paragraph went on to say that it was recognized

that self-government could also be achieved by association with another State or group of States, if that were done freely and on the basis of absolute equality. Equality in that connexion could mean only legal equality, wherein both parties shared in the decision. If, therefore, association was chosen by the freely expressed will of a people enjoying legal equality with the other party to the association, that undoubtedly constituted a full measure of self-government. There was thus no inconsistency in the Peruvian position.

30. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia), replying to the United States representative, said that it was certainly her delegation's contention that the list of factors should be used as a guide and should be taken into consideration in each case. She had weighed the importance of each factor as it applied to the case of Puerto Rico.

31. With reference to the Peruvian representative's remarks on subjective interpretations, she pointed out that her country's idealism and subjectivity had been the motive power behind its attainment of independence.

32. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation had always maintained that the determining factor should be the freely expressed will of the people concerned. No one had denied that between 1948 and 1952 the Puerto Rican people had had several opportunities of freely expressing their will. The political sovereignty of Puerto Rico was admittedly limited in some ways and neither Puerto Rico nor the United States had tried to conceal that fact. While it was true that the Puerto Rican people would have had full representation in the United States Congress had Puerto Rico become a state of the Union, that status would have constituted a form of assimilation which the majority of the Puerto Rican people, who wished to retain their individuality, had rejected.

33. The adoption of the seven-Power draft resolution would not set a dangerous precedent in the matter of applying the list of factors, since the paramount consideration underlying that draft resolution was the fact that a people who were already politically mature and had reached what could be considered a high level of education had been able freely and democratically to express their will. Furthermore, the draft resolution made it clear that the Puerto Rican people had the right to change the terms of its association with the United States by mutual agreement should it subsequently want complete independence. For the time being both parties had considered that independence would be premature. In that connexion he reminded the Committee that at the 321st meeting, during the discussion of the request for an oral hearing by the Puerto Rican Independence Party, he had assured the Puerto Rican people of his best wishes in its advance towards complete independence.

34. He would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution, but against the Indian amendments, which were in complete opposition to his delegation's views. With regard to the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.302), amendment 1 expressed a principle with which his delegation was in full agreement. He would vote in favour of the paragraph proposed; but, as a matter of principle, he would be unable to support amendments 2 and 3.

35. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that had the United States decided in 1946 not to transmit information on Hawaii and Puerto Rico, no one would

have raised any objection. At that time, however, the United States had decided that Article 73 e of the Charter applied to Puerto Rico. Its decision would have been different had Puerto Rico had its present constitutional status. His delegation believed that the General Assembly could only note the decision of the United States Government to cease transmitting information on Puerto Rico. It would have been able to vote in favour of operative paragraph 7 of the seven-Power draft resolution had that paragraph referred to the "decision" of the United States Government rather than its "opinion". As the paragraph stood, however, he would abstain from voting on it.

36. He wished to make it quite clear that his delegation's attitude should not be interpreted as a lack of respect or sympathy for the Puerto Rican people. He congratulated them on their progress under United States administration and he was convinced that they had attained a full measure of self-government in domestic affairs. If the General Assembly had been competent to appraise the decision of the United States Government to cease transmitting information, his delegation would enthusiastically have supported the seven-Power draft resolution. The General Assembly, however, was not competent. His delegation would vote against all amendments to the seven-Power draft resolution.

37. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia), supported by Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) and Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil), argued that the amendments contained in documents A/C.4/L.301 and A/C.4/L.302 so changed the substance of the seven-Power draft resolution that they could not really be considered amendments, but were in fact new proposals.

38. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) could not agree with that contention.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the ruling that, under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, the amendments in documents A/C.4/L.301 and A/C.4/L.302 were amendments and not separate proposals.

*The ruling was upheld by 38 votes to 11, with 3 abstentions.*

40. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) and Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) explained that their affirmative votes should not be interpreted as a vote on the substance of the amendments. They had simply wished to endorse the Chairman's ruling.

41. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that his negative vote should not be considered as expressing his delegation's view on the substance of the amendments.

42. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) said that the seven-Power draft resolution simply restated the United States position in a new form. It was not acceptable to his delegation because it was in open contradiction with the true situation and with the spirit of the Charter. He would vote in favour of the Indian and five-Power amendments since they more nearly reflected the spirit of the Charter and his delegation's position.

43. He had been surprised to hear certain Latin-American representatives, whose national heroes had fought for complete independence from Spain, defend the United States position. He was convinced, moreover, that some of the facts stated by the representatives

of Peru and Ecuador would come as a surprise to the people of Puerto Rico.

44. His delegation was imbued with a deep sense of friendship and responsibility towards the Puerto Rican people and was convinced that by voting in the way he had just outlined it would be helping that people in their struggle for true independence and freedom from exploitation by United States monopolies.

45. He requested that the preamble to the seven-Power draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

46. Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America) said that she would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution. Nevertheless, if the paragraph proposed by the five Powers in amendment 1 (A/C.4/L.302) were adopted, she would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendments (A/C.4/L.301) to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.300).

*Amendment 1 was rejected by 31 votes to 21, with 6 abstentions.*

*Amendment 2 was rejected by 34 votes to 18, with 7 abstentions.*

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendments submitted jointly by Burma, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia and Mexico (A/C.4/L.302) to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.300).

*At the request of the representative of Australia, a vote was taken by roll call on amendment 1.*

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

*In favour:* Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

*Against:* Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France.

*Abstaining:* Iran, Nicaragua, Peru, Thailand, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic.

*Amendment 1 was adopted by 32 votes to 19, with 8 abstentions.*

*Amendment 2 was rejected by 31 votes to 15, with 13 abstentions.*

*Amendment 3 was rejected by 34 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.*

49. Mr. SUAREZ (Uruguay) requested that the operative part of the seven-Power draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama and Peru (A/C.4/L.300), paragraph by paragraph.

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 48 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.*

*The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 47 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.*

*The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 48 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

*The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 40 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.*

*The fifth paragraph of the preamble, as amended by the deletion of the word "additional", was adopted by 34 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 29 votes to 12, with 16 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 32 votes to 8, with 19 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 26 votes to 14, with 18 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 30 votes to 14, with 13 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 37 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Guatemala, a vote was taken by roll call on operative paragraph 8.*

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

*In favour:* Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba.

*Against:* Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

*Abstaining:* Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Lebanon, Liberia, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Canada.

*Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 24 votes to 17, with 17 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 31 votes to 8, with 19 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Nicaragua, a vote was taken by roll call on the whole of the draft resolution, as amended.*

*The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Uruguay, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey.

*Against:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Australia, Belgium, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa.

*Abstaining:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Denmark, Egypt, El

Salvador, France, Greece, Iceland, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria.

*The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to 18, with 19 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.