

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 330th
MEETING**

*Friday, 9 October 1953,
at 3.15 p.m.*

New York

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet obtained a full measure of self-government: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (<i>continued</i>)	89

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet obtained a full measure of self-government: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories) (A/2428, A/C.4/L.272, A/C.4/L.273, A/C.4/L.274, A/C.4/L.275, A/C.4/L.276, A/C.4/L.277) (*continued*)

[Item 33]*

1. Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that before the introduction of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.274) to the list of factors proposed in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Factors (Non-Self-Governing Territories), (A/2428), his delegation had intended to support the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272) since it was in favour of that list of factors as a guide and had felt that further discussion of it in the Committee was unnecessary. He had hoped that the Brazilian draft resolution would be widely supported and help to narrow the gap between the administering and the non-administering Powers. At the previous meeting he had voted against the Guatemalan representative's proposal that the amendments (A/C.4/L.274) to the list of factors should be considered before the Brazilian draft resolution and the amendments thereto. Subsequently, however, since he was not opposed to the substance of the amendments to the list of factors, he had voted in favour of them though he did not feel very satisfied with the result in view of the very small majority by which most of them had been adopted.

2. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) said that the procedure followed by the Committee at the previous meeting had led to the adoption of certain decisions, as a result of which his delegation had had to reconsider its attitude to its draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272). That draft resolution had been based on the conviction that there were certain basic principles of international responsibility that the General Assembly should adopt and certain basic responsibilities of the Administering Members. He had hoped that it would prove acceptable to a large majority of the Committee. Its

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

central provision was the adoption of the list of factors proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee, though the possibility of subsequent revision by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had been left open in paragraph 8. The list proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee was the outcome of nearly three years' work, and his delegation had advocated its adoption in the belief that it would further international collaboration to promote the objectives of Chapter X of the Charter. He deeply regretted the decisions taken by the Committee at the previous meeting. His delegation had considered withdrawing its draft since paragraph 2 was irreconcilable with those decisions, but in order not to complicate the Committee's work it had in the end decided to maintain it, including paragraph 2. He urged the Committee to adopt that paragraph as it stood, in which case the decisions at the previous meeting would be annulled.

3. He wished to place the motive for his delegation's action on record and to make it clear that his delegation retained full liberty to support any compromise that might be suggested in the General Assembly.

4. Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America) said that her delegation appreciated the effort of the delegation of Brazil. Although her delegation was not entirely satisfied with the Brazilian draft resolution it would, in a spirit of conciliation, vote for eleven of the twelve paragraphs as they stood. If operative paragraph 3 was modified the United States delegation could also support it and vote for the draft resolution as a whole. She hoped that other delegations would vote in the same spirit.

5. The General Assembly had already performed a useful service in clarifying the complex and variable factors which indicated the achievement of a full measure of self-government. Although her delegation could not accept the principle implied in paragraph 3 of the Brazilian draft, its position on that matter was not a negative one. Under Article 10 of the Charter the Assembly was competent to discuss and attempt to define the expressions "Non-Self-Governing Territories" and "territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government"; it was entitled to recommend to the Administering Members in general the consideration of any definition it adopted or even to express its opinion in general terms on the principles which had guided or might guide such Members in deciding on which territories to transmit information. Moreover, her delegation had no objection to discussion by the Assembly of the information transmitted by the Administering Members in explanation of their decision to cease reporting on territories which had become self-governing. However, the United States Constitution gave the United States Congress the sovereign and exclusive power to decide upon changes in the constitutional status of United States territories. Only the United States could decide when one of its territories had attained self-government within the

terms of Article 73 of the Charter. She had therefore been startled to find that some delegations were supporting recommendations which would have no legally binding effect on the United States Congress and would be misunderstood by the people of the United States. As a practical matter such recommendations would be generally meaningless and, to the extent that they had any meaning, harmful. She appealed to the delegations concerned not to try to force such proposals through the Committee.

6. In the hope that her appeal would be effective, she wished to propose a change in paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution. She therefore requested the Chairman to take a separate vote on the words "by the Administering Members and by the General Assembly" in paragraph 3 of the Brazilian draft resolution and on the last part of that paragraph beginning with the words "in order that . . .".

7. Her delegation was prepared to support several of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273) to the Brazilian draft resolution but it would vote against amendments 2 and 3, because it supported the list of factors in the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report. If those amendments were rejected, the Committee would have an opportunity—by voting for the present text of the paragraphs of the Brazilian draft to which they referred—to remedy the hasty and unfortunate action it had taken at the previous meeting and to approve the list of factors proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee (A/2428). In order to meet the wishes of the eleven sponsors of the amendments to the list of factors the Committee might consider the possibility of referring the summary records of its debates on the question of factors to the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories with instructions to consider the suggestions of members of the Assembly when and if that Committee decided to consider further revisions in the list of factors.¹

8. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) welcomed the United States amendment as a very reasonable solution to the difficulty. He hoped that the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.4/L.274 would be prepared to vote in favour of it and, consequently, of paragraph 2 of the Brazilian draft resolution. His delegation would be glad of an opportunity to consider the amendments to the list of factors in the Committee of Information and might well be able to support many of them. At the previous meeting, however, those amendments had been adopted without proper consideration.

9. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala), supported by Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) and Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico), argued that to vote on paragraph 2 of the Brazilian draft resolution would be tantamount to reversing the Committee's decisions at the previous meeting. Under rule 122 of the rules of procedure such a step could be taken only if the Committee so decided by a two-thirds majority.

10. Mr. AROAZ (Bolivia) pointed out that whether the Committee approved paragraph 2 of the Brazilian draft or paragraph 3 of the amendments (A/C.4/L.273) the net result would be the same. The Committee had before it only one list of factors, namely, the amended list, since by the very act of amendment the original list of factors proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Com-

mittee had ceased to exist. If the Committee wished to reconsider its decision to amend the list of factors the rules of procedure governing such cases must be strictly applied.

11. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) and Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) could not agree that the list proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee no longer existed. In any case, the Committee had not considered any part of the Brazilian draft resolution or the amendments thereto at the previous meeting. It had voted only on the amendments to the list of factors. It must now proceed to vote on the draft resolution and amendments.

12. The CHAIRMAN ruled that the voting on the Brazilian draft resolution and amendments would not constitute reconsideration of the Committee's previous decisions and, consequently, that rule 122 did not apply.

13. No amendments had been submitted to the first two paragraphs of the preamble of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272) and, unless there were any objections, he would consider them adopted.

It was so decided.

14. The CHAIRMAN announced that amendment 1 of document A/C.4/L.273, proposing the insertion of a new third paragraph in the preamble, had been accepted by the Brazilian representative.

15. Mr. PIGNON (France) requested that the paragraph should nevertheless be put to the vote.

16. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France.

Abstaining: Norway, Sweden.

The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 11, with 2 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN announced that no amendments had been submitted to the original third—now fourth—paragraph of the preamble to the Brazilian draft resolution and that, unless there were any objections, he would consider it adopted.

It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the fate of the original fourth paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution and, consequently, of amendment 2 of the document A/C.4/L.273 would automatically be decided by the vote on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

19. No amendments had been submitted to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution and, unless there were any objections, he would consider it adopted.

It was so decided.

¹ An amendment to that effect was submitted by the United States delegation later in the meeting and was circulated as document A/C.4/L.276.

20. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) pointed out that the additional paragraph proposed by the United States might well affect the way in which a number of delegations voted on paragraph 2 of the Brazilian draft resolution and the amendment thereto. He therefore proposed that the meeting should be suspended pending circulation of the United States amendment.

21. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for suspension to the vote.

The motion was rejected by 17 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.

22. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) requested a separate vote on the first part of amendment 3 of document A/C.4/L.273, down to the words "is attached".

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of amendment 3.

The first part of amendment 3 was rejected by 24 votes to 20, with 3 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN observed that the second part of the paragraph would be meaningless by itself so that no vote could be taken on it.

25. Mrs. MENON (India) proposed that in paragraph 2 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution the words "contained in that report" should be deleted and replaced by "as adopted by the Fourth Committee".

26. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) supported that proposal, both for reasons of substance and for reasons of procedure. Since the Committee had already approved the amended list of factors, there was no point in voting on a paragraph which approved the *Ad Hoc* Committee's list.

27. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) maintained that despite the vote taken at the previous meeting there were still two lists of factors: that proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee and that approved by the Fourth Committee. There was no reason why the Committee should not vote on a draft resolution approving the former if the Brazilian delegation so wished.

28. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, did not consider it proper that a new amendment should be submitted when the Committee had already begun voting on the eleven-Power amendments.

29. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) did not think the Indian amendment could be put to the vote since it would in effect reintroduce the amendment the Committee had just rejected.

30. Mr. PIGNON (France) said the Indian amendment was one of substance and the voting on the eleven-Power amendments could not be interrupted to take a vote on it.

31. Mrs. MENON (India) insisted that by rejecting amendment 3 of the eleven-Power amendments the Committee had in effect rejected the amended list of factors which it had adopted at the previous meeting. On the other hand, by adopting the amended list of factors it had automatically rejected the original list. In fact, therefore, no list remained on which it could vote.

32. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) urged that the Committee should vote on the Brazilian draft resolution.

33. The CHAIRMAN proposed to put the Indian amendment to the vote.

34. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) emphasized that the Indian amendment was out of

order under rule 127 of the rules of procedure. Furthermore, the amendment reopened a subject on which the Committee had already come to a decision.

35. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide whether it wished to vote on the Indian amendment.

The Committee decided by 25 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions, to vote on the Indian amendment.

36. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that under rule 119 of the rules of procedure the Indian amendment should be circulated in writing and the Committee should be given time to study it.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the meeting would be suspended for fifteen minutes to allow the Indian amendment to be circulated in writing.

The meeting was suspended at 5.15 p.m. and was resumed at 5.45 p.m.

38. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that although rule 119 of the rules of procedure allowed the Chairman to permit the discussion of amendments which had not been circulated, it did not allow him to put such amendments to the vote before circulation. Moreover, rule 127 said that voting could not be interrupted except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. The Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.277) was not a point of order and it had been submitted in the course of the voting.

39. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) agreed that the Indian amendment was not purely formal, but insisted that even if it were, the fact that it had been introduced during the voting meant that to receive it would create a very serious precedent. In view of the grave implications he felt that the Committee should have time to study the Indian amendment. He therefore suggested that the meeting should be adjourned.

The proposal was not adopted, 19 votes being cast in favour and 19 against, with 11 abstentions.

40. Mrs. MENON (India) said that the amendment proposed by her delegation was not substantive but merely a consequential change in view of the fact that the Committee had adopted an amended list of factors at its previous meeting.

41. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) noted for the purposes of the summary record and the report that at the proposal of the Chairman the Committee had voted on and rejected the first part of amendment 3 of the joint amendments (A/C.4/L.273), and was to vote on the Indian amendment after the rejection of the joint amendment.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.277) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution submitted by Brazil (A/C.4/L.272).

43. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

*The vote was taken by roll-call.
Sweden, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Against: Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru.

Abstaining: Thailand, China, Greece, Philippines.

The amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 18, with 4 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272), as amended, noting that the amendment implied the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

45. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Syria, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan.

Against: Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru.

Abstaining: Philippines, Thailand, China, Greece.

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to 23, with 4 abstentions.

46. Mrs. BOLTON (United States) withdrew her proposal for a separate vote on paragraph 3 of the Brazilian draft resolution.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would regard the first part of paragraph 3 of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272) as far as the word "as a guide", as adopted.

It was so decided.

48. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) said that if a vote had been taken, his delegation would have voted against the first part of paragraph 3.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point (a) of the Philippine amendment (A/C.4/L.275), to the effect that the words "in appropriate consultations" should be inserted after the words "as a guide" in paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 26 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of amendment 4 of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273), to the effect that the clause "and applied in the light of all relevant circumstances pertinent to each particular situation . . ." should be deleted from paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution.

The amendment was adopted by 26 votes to 18, with 6 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point (b) of the Philippine amendment (A/C.4/L.275), to the effect that the words "a decision may be taken", in

paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution, should be replaced by the words "agreement may be reached".

The amendment was rejected by 19 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third part of amendment 4 of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273), to the effect that the words "by the General Assembly" should be inserted between the words "may be taken" and the words "on the continuation", in paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution.

The amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the whole of paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.272), as amended.

Paragraph 3, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to 23, with 3 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote amendment 5 of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273), proposing a new text for paragraph 4 of the Brazilian draft resolution.

Amendment 5 was adopted by 35 votes to 11, with 4 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new operative paragraph 5 proposed in amendment 6 of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273).

The new paragraph 5 was adopted by 29 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the new operative paragraph 6 proposed in amendment 6 of the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273), as far as the words "the attainment of independence", as requested by the representative of Poland.

57. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico.

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

Abstaining: Pakistan, Thailand, China, Ethiopia.

That part of the new paragraph 6 was adopted by 35 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the remainder of the new paragraph 6.

The remainder of the new paragraph 6 was adopted by 28 votes to 7 with 15 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new paragraph 6 as a whole.

Paragraph 6, as a whole, was adopted by 28 votes to 18, with 3 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection to amendments 7 and 8 of the eleven-

Power amendments (A/C.4/L.273), which had been accepted by Brazil, the original paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Brazilian draft resolution, as amended, which would now become paragraphs 7 and 8, would be regarded as adopted.

It was so decided.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of amendment 9 of the eleven-Power amendments, to the effect that the word "further" should be deleted from the first line of paragraph 7 of the operative part of the Brazilian draft resolution, which had become paragraph 9.

The amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of amendment 9 of the eleven-Power amendments, to the effect that the part of paragraph 9 of the Brazilian draft resolution following the words "of cessation of information" should be deleted.

The amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 9 of the Brazilian draft resolution, as amended.

Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted by 28 votes to 21, with 2 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote amendment 10 of the eleven-Power amendments, which proposed a new text for the last paragraph, formerly paragraph 8, of the Brazilian draft resolution.

The amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.

65. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) noted that he had voted against the amendment, but not because he did not think that the list was capable of improvement.

66. The CHAIRMAN stated that the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.276) had been withdrawn.

67. He put to the vote the whole of the Brazilian draft resolution, as amended, with the list of factors, as amended.

68. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union

of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Sweden.

Abstaining: China, Thailand.

The Brazilian draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 27 votes to 23, with 2 abstentions.

69. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) said that the position of the Polish delegation on the list of factors had been motivated by its support for the principle of self-determination of peoples. Thus, although it had been able to accept and vote for the first part of the list, it had found the second and third parts unacceptable because they did not provide for the accession of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to the status of sovereign States. The second and third parts could thus be open to an interpretation serving the perpetuation of colonial rule under another form, instead of serving the aim of ultimate independence for dependent peoples.

70. The Polish delegation had been obliged to vote against the Brazilian draft resolution, even as amended, because its essential part consisted of an approval of the unsatisfactory list of factors. Neither the amendments suggested to the list of factors nor the amendments to the draft resolution had improved the original text and thus disposed of the Polish delegation's serious doubts.

71. He wished to re-emphasize another fundamental consideration already expressed by the Polish delegation during the previous discussion of the same topic by the Fourth Committee. The obligation to transmit information undertaken by the colonial Powers was a binding agreement, and the international responsibility assumed by those Powers could be disposed of only by international decision of the General Assembly. Before any Administering Member could be released from its duty to submit information under Article 73 e of the Charter, the General Assembly must consider all the data relating to the changes in the status of the territory and take the final decision, having regard to all the relevant circumstances of the case. Those considerations would guide the Polish delegation in the future, whenever the General Assembly was called upon to decide whether a territory was or was not a territory whose people had not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.