



CONTENTS

Agenda item 36:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):	
(a) Information on social conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General;	
(e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community;	
(f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .	473
General debate and consideration of draft resolutions	476

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 36

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3806, A/3807, A/3808, A/3809/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/3810, A/3811 and Add.1, A/3812 and Add.1, A/3813 and Add.1, A/3814, A/3815 and Add.1, A/3816, A/3837) (continued):

- (a) Information on social conditions (A/C.4/L.565);
- (b) Information on other conditions;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/374, A/C.4/375, A/C.4/385/Rev.1, A/C.4/390, A/C.4/L.569);
- (d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/3903);
- (e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/3916/Rev.1);
- (f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General (A/3917/Rev.1 and Add.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.565) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, the debate having been closed, the Committee should proceed to vote on the ten-Power draft resolution concerning racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/

C.4/L.565). He pointed out that the five Powers which had submitted amendments in document A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1 had accepted the Iranian amendments (A/C.4/L.567). In addition to the five-Power amendments as thus amended, he would put to the vote the amendments submitted by Bulgaria (A/C.4/L.568).

2. He drew attention to the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution and the authors of the five-Power amendments had agreed that the second paragraph of the preamble should be redrafted to read: "Noting the need for providing more adequate information on human rights". The sponsors had also accepted the third of the five-Power amendments, with the result that the fourth paragraph of the preamble would now read: "Having regard to the fundamental importance of race relations, particularly under modern conditions, for the attainment of the objectives of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations".

3. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that in view of some remarks that had been made earlier his delegation wished to make some changes in the amendments it had proposed (A/C.4/L.568). In its first amendment the word "urgent" should be replaced by "immediate", so that the phrase to be added to operative paragraph 2 would read "and take immediate practical measures for". With respect to the second amendment, in view of the objections that had been raised to the words "a special section" in the proposed new operative paragraph 3, they should be replaced by the word "information", so that the paragraph would read: "Invites the Administering Members to include in the annual reports submitted under Article 73 e of the Charter information on the measures taken by them for the implementation of the present resolution".

4. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second of the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) incorporating the first of the Iranian amendments (A/C.4/L.567), which concerned the third preambular paragraph of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565).

At the request of the Czechoslovak representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

Against: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Libya, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic,

Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, Panama, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Burma.

Present and not voting: Belgium.

The amendment was adopted by 39 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.

5. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first of the Bulgarian amendments (A/C.4/L.568), as revised orally (see para. 3 above).

At the request of the Bulgarian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Hungary, Indonesia, Libya, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Greece.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland.

Abstaining: India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Argentina, Burma, Ceylon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Federation of Malaya, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti.

Present and not voting: Belgium.

The amendment was rejected by 24 votes to 21, with 24 abstentions.

6. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourth of the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.566/Rev.1) incorporating the second of the Iranian amendments (A/C.4/L.567), which concerned operative paragraph 2 of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565).

At the request of the Indian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Haiti, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark.

Against: Hungary, Liberia, Libya, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Philip-

pines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon.

Present and not voting: Belgium.

The amendment was adopted by 38 votes to 11, with 20 abstentions.

7. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second of the Bulgarian amendments (A/C.4/L.568), as revised orally (see para. 3 above).

At the request of the Czechoslovak representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France.

Abstaining: India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Federation of Malaya.

Present and not voting: Belgium.

The paragraph was adopted by 31 votes to 21, with 17 abstentions.

8. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) suggested that the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) as a whole, as amended, should be adopted without a vote.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.565) as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

9. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) explained that his delegation had not participated in the voting on either the draft resolution concerning international collaboration in respect of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in Africa (A/C.4/L.563/Rev.2) or on the draft resolution concerning racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/L.565) because the General Assembly was not competent to take decisions concerning the subject-matter of those texts.

10. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation had been in favour of the ten-Power draft resolution as a whole because its purpose was a worthy one. There were no discriminatory laws or practices in France or in the Territories under its administration. He was particularly glad that the resolution had been approved even by those delegations which had not voted in favour of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; if the provisions of that instrument were applied in all countries there would be no need for such a resolution as the one that the Committee had just approved. He hoped that the attack on racial

discrimination called for in the resolution would be accompanied by an equally vigorous attack on discrimination in all other forms.

11. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that, although his delegation had been able to accept the resolution as a whole, had there been a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph he would have abstained from voting on the words "particularly under modern conditions". While he was in sympathy with the spirit of the resolution, however, he was not convinced that that spirit was finding expression in all the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

12. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her Government not only felt strongly that discrimination in any form was a barrier to the attainment of the objectives of the Charter but regarded it as a deadly disease which undermined the structure of any social order. It had therefore recently enacted a law making racial discrimination a criminal offence.

13. With regard to the first Iranian amendment her delegation recognized that efforts had been made in some Territories to eliminate racial discrimination; Hawaii, in fact, was in a category by itself in that connexion. Hence she wished to make it clear that in voting against that amendment she had had in mind Territories other than Hawaii.

14. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), replying to the argument the Indian representative had advanced (829th meeting, para. 35) in connexion with the Yugoslav delegation's comments on the phrase "particularly under modern conditions," said that his purpose had been simply to emphasize that there were two opposing views in the Committee on race relations: one was the view frequently put forward by the United Kingdom delegation to the effect that in the Non-Self-Governing Territories there should be complete equality of racial communities without regard to the numerical strength of each; the other was that race relations in Non-Self-Governing Territories should be based on respect for the individual rights of the inhabitants, which would mean that the right of political representation would be determined on the basis of the number of persons represented. His delegation had felt that the resolution could be interpreted as favouring the parity system, which in its view would not further the attainment of the objectives of the Charter. It therefore thought that the fourth preambular paragraph should have read, "Having regard to the necessity of establishing race relations based on respect for the individual rights of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories".

15. He had voted against the first Iranian amendment because it had involved a substantive change. He would have been able to vote in favour of the second Iranian amendment if the first Bulgarian amendment had not been rejected.

16. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia) said that he had voted against the first Iranian amendment because it entirely altered the sense of the third preambular paragraph. The intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been to emphasize that the progress made was very limited, whereas the amendment would have emphasized something quite different. He had voted in favour of the first Bulgarian amendment because it would not have altered the basic purpose of the resolution. He had abstained from voting on the second Iranian amendment rather than voting against it because although the addi-

tion of the words "in the future" lessened the emphasis on the matter of urgency, to which his delegation attached the greatest importance, it did not change the basic meaning of operative paragraph 2. He had voted in favour of the second Bulgarian amendment because if provided for measures to implement the resolution. Although he would have preferred the original text he had accepted the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, because his delegation considered that the problem of race relations deserved the urgent attention of the Fourth Committee.

17. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that although in his view the first Iranian amendment entailed a shift in emphasis, he did not think that it changed the character of the resolution and he therefore had no objection to its inclusion.

18. Similarly, he felt that the second Iranian amendment made little or no difference to the character of the resolution, and while he had abstained in the vote his delegation did not regret its having been adopted and in fact had no strong views on the subject.

19. At the previous meeting, he had explained his delegation's views with regard to the amendments proposed by the delegation of Bulgaria though the amendments had been somewhat altered since then. His delegation had abstained in the vote on both amendments. He could not see that the additional paragraph would make any difference to the character of the resolution, since the Administering Members were already bound by the Standard Form and by Chapter XI of the Charter and thus were under an obligation to submit information on the subject referred to in the resolution.

20. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the unanimous approval of the draft resolution. His delegation's attitude in the matter had been decided by the vote on the second Bulgarian amendment adding a new operative paragraph. That was perhaps the key paragraph of the draft resolution. His delegation looked forward with interest to the report of the Administering Members on the implementation of the resolution.

21. He had abstained in the vote on the first Iranian amendment because he had been in some doubt about its meaning. He had abstained in the vote on the first Bulgarian amendment because he had felt it was unnecessary to add the words "and take immediate practical measures for", especially in the light of the additional operative paragraph 3 proposed by the Bulgarian delegation. With regard to the second Iranian amendment, though he would have preferred the word "urgent" to be maintained his delegation felt that the wording that had been adopted implied urgency and he had therefore been able to abstain in the vote on that amendment.

22. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) expressed satisfaction that the delegations present, including the administering Powers, had been able to reconcile their differences. He hoped that the resolution would encourage the administering Powers to take all possible steps to eliminate racial discrimination in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

23. As there seemed to be some confusion regarding the implications of his first amendment, he would like to explain that its purpose had been to note that in cer-

tain Territories the progress attained had been limited. He had had no objection in principle to the Bulgarian amendments but had abstained from voting on them for fear that their adoption might upset the delicate balance which, thanks to the conciliatory spirit of the administering Powers, had been achieved. Like all compromises, the resolution as a whole had certain shortcomings but they were outweighed by its positive aspects.

24. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that amendments which weakened the original text of the draft resolution had been adopted while an amendment which would have emphasized the need for taking immediate practical measures to implement it had been rejected. Nevertheless, he had not objected to the approval of the resolution as a whole, because even in that form it called upon the administering Powers to implement General Assembly resolution 644 (VII) providing for the elimination of discriminatory practices which were still widespread in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and because the second Bulgarian amendment, which had been adopted, invited the administering Powers to submit information annually on the measures taken to give effect to the present resolution.

25. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) explained that although his delegation had in principle favoured the first Bulgarian amendment he had abstained from voting on it because the sponsors of the draft resolution had felt that they should vote together.

26. Mr. CORDERO MICHEL (Dominican Republic) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it reflected his Government's policy with regard to racial discrimination. In the Dominican Republic everyone enjoyed full political and social equality regardless of race.

27. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that no delegation was happier than his own that the goodwill and spirit of co-operation shown by the delegations concerned had made it possible to approve the draft resolution without a dissentient vote. He thought that his own country could claim to have done as much as any other to eliminate racial discrimination. The resolution would serve to encourage it in its further efforts in that direction, particularly in view of the form in which operative paragraph 2 had been approved. The wording adopted for the third preambular paragraph avoided any implications with regard to Territories to which it did not refer; the original wording had implied that no progress had been made in the majority of Territories, which was not in accordance with the facts.

28. He did not understand what the Yugoslav representative had meant by his remarks about United Kingdom policy and would therefore enter a reservation in that regard.

29. He had voted against the second Bulgarian amendment because it was quite unnecessary; the transmission of the information referred to therein was already provided for. The administering Powers did not submit "annual reports" but transmitted "information"; as he did not understand the term "annual reports" as meaning anything other than the information already transmitted, he had not felt that the adoption of the amendment constituted an obstacle to acceptance of the draft resolution as a whole.

30. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) expressed satisfaction that the Committee, by unanimously approving the draft resolution, had demonstrated that all its members wanted to go on record as being opposed to racial discrimination. He hoped that the approval of the resolution would help to encourage a new spirit which would facilitate the practical application of its provisions.

31. Mr. Irving SALOMON (United States of America) was glad that the principle embodied in the resolution had been reaffirmed, for his Government was unalterably opposed to discrimination of any kind. He had voted against the Bulgarian amendments because they were unnecessary and because the first one implied unwarranted and unnecessary criticism of all the administering Powers.

32. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he would like to point out for the record that no vote had been taken on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, that at least one representative had indicated that he was not participating in the voting, and that, no vote having been taken on the draft resolution as a whole, the Australian delegation was to be considered as not having participated.

33. The second Bulgarian amendment was quite inconsistent with the provisions of Article 73 e of the Charter and to that extent constituted a nullity. That Article imposed no obligation whatsoever on the Powers administering Non-Self-Governing Territories to transmit annual reports to the United Nations.

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.569)

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to begin discussion of sub-item (c) on general questions relating to the transmission and examination of information.

35. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), introducing the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.569) on behalf of the sponsors, said that the first and second paragraphs of the preamble were self-explanatory, while the third was rendered necessary by the considerable differences of opinion which had existed in the past on the matter referred to. The time had come for the General Assembly to reach a decision on it.

36. He would emphasize that the reference in operative paragraph 1 to replies of Members to the communications of the Secretary-General regarding the transmission of information and to the relevant deliberations of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly or of the Committees concerned was to all replies and all relevant deliberations since 1946. With regard to the reference to the relevant legal treatises on the interpretation of the Charter, the Secretary-General was left free to choose whatever legal works he considered most useful. That again, therefore, was not a controversial matter. The small Committee proposed in operative paragraph 2 would be useful, because the volume of information received from the Secretary-General would undoubtedly be considerable and would therefore be best referred to a small group, which would carry out the preliminary work. The sponsors of the draft resolution were agreed that the composition of that committee of six should be in accordance with previous practice: it should comprise three representatives of Member States which transmitted information and three representatives of Member States which did not. Objectivity would thus be ensured.

The sponsors were in fact proposing that machinery should be provided to assist the United Nations to solve a problem which had been under discussion since its earliest days. He felt that the proposal should arouse little objection.

37. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that in its communication of 14 April 1958 to the Secretary-General (see A/C.4/375), the Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations had informed him that the Spanish reply to the Secretary-General's letter concerning the application of Chapter XI of the Charter to Territories under Spanish administration would be in keeping with the spirit of the Charter. That reply, reproduced in document A/C.4/385/Rev.1, was now before the Committee and its third paragraph stated that the Territories subject to Spanish sovereignty in Africa were, in accordance with the legislation now in force, considered to be and classified as provinces of Spain and that consequently there were, legally speaking, no Non-Self-Governing Territories within the Spanish administrative system.

38. Such a reply raised the question whether, in fact, it was in keeping with the statement made by the Permanent Mission of Spain in its previous communication, but before coming to a definite opinion he would wish to be certain of what it meant: parts of it suggested that there was some possibility of reaching an understanding. By a decree of 21 August 1956, the Spanish Government had changed the name of the Directorate General of Morocco and the Colonies to "Directorate General of the 'Plazas' and African Provinces". The reason for the omission of Morocco was of course clear, but no explanation was given for replacing the word "colonies" by "provinces" and he would be glad to learn what alteration in the status of the Territories concerned had made such a change necessary. Again, a decree of 10 January 1958 had declared the Territories of Spanish West Africa to be composed of the provinces of Ifni and Spanish Sahara. In that case also it would be useful to know what changes in political status and what degree of advancement of the inhabitants justified the Spanish Government's attitude towards its responsibilities under the Charter.

39. He noted with interest the statement in the same communication that, in accordance with its desire to act in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations, the Permanent Mission of Spain was placing official and other documents at the disposal of the Secretary-General. The Spanish Government undoubtedly realized that such documents, in accordance with normal procedure, would be placed before the General Assembly or its appropriate Committees for examination.

40. He awaited clarification of those points and would meanwhile turn to the question of the obligations assumed by the Portuguese Government under Chapter XI of the Charter, a question which had already been discussed at great length at past sessions. In his opinion, the position of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under Portuguese administration, and in particular that of the inhabitants of Mozambique, Angola, and Portuguese Guinea, did not warrant the conclusion that their economic, social and educational advancement was proceeding in accordance with the principles of Chapter XI of the Charter.

41. During the eleventh session of the General Assembly, the representative of Portugal had stated in

the Fourth Committee (620th meeting, para. 5) that in five of the eight provinces of his country the population enjoyed all the attributes of citizenship. The representative of Portugal had therefore recognized the existence of inequality of treatment where the inhabitants of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea were concerned. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation that was an implicit admission that those Territories were indeed non-self-governing. International interest in their fate was consequently well justified and could best be expressed by the application to them of the relevant provisions of the Charter.

42. There was nevertheless a possibility of reaching an acceptable solution. His delegation would support any efforts in that sense.

43. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that he would reply fully at the appropriate moment in the debate but he would say at once that there had been no General Assembly decision that entitled the Yugoslav representative or any other representative to describe the overseas Territories of Portugal as Non-Self-Governing Territories. What the Yugoslav representative had described as inequality of treatment arose from the fact that some of the inhabitants had not yet attained full citizenship. Nationality was a separate matter from citizenship and the distinction did not imply inequality of treatment.

44. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, since no General Assembly decision on terminology existed, the representative of Portugal might also accept the argument that representatives were free to designate those Territories as Non-Self-Governing Territories if they so desired.

45. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that, while it was apparently true that there was no decision, it was not the practice of the General Assembly to make a reply to the communications received but merely to take note of them. What was not specifically allowed by General Assembly practice was forbidden.

46. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that, in the case of other replies, there was nothing in dispute, whereas the Portuguese reply had been contested for two years.

47. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) felt that he should point out to the Yugoslav representative that many replies from Member States had in fact been challenged.

48. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the limited time left to the Committee, the Committee might wish to place some limit on the length of speeches. He would suggest fifteen minutes.

49. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the joint draft resolution seemed to assail the sovereign rights of all States and it was unthinkable that any limitation should be imposed on speeches in that connexion.

50. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) felt that such a time limit would discriminate against those representatives who wished to explain the situation in their countries; that might well take longer. The idea was unacceptable to him.

51. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Miss BROOKS (Liberia) and Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) supported the Chairman's suggestion.

52. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that, while some limitation was no doubt wise, he supported the observations of the representative of Spain.

53. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that, while some time limit was undoubtedly necessary, he felt that it would be wrong to place limitations on representatives who felt that the course of debate touched on questions of importance to their Governments. He would suggest a fifteen-minute limit, with certain representatives being allowed to speak for longer if absolutely necessary.

54. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that representatives should limit the length of their speeches as much as possible. The representatives of Spain and Portugal should, however, be free to answer at length.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that speeches could be limited to fifteen minutes, but exceptions could be made in the case of representatives who thought that the interests of their countries were especially affected by the course of the debate.

56. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) disagreed. All representatives had the same interest in the matter and there should be no preferential treatment.

57. Mr. EL HAMID (United Arab Republic) noted that in his report on offers of study and training facilities (A/3917/Rev.1 and Add.1) the Secretary-General had included a reference to scholarships other than those deriving from General Assembly resolution 845 (IX). That was a useful step which he hoped would be followed in the future. He would be glad if the Secretariat could inform him whether future reports could include information on special intern programmes: whether some indigenous inhabitants from the Non-Self-Governing Territories benefited from those programmes and whether they had been granted fairly good chances under those programmes in the past.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would consider the matter.

59. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) proposed the adjournment of the meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.