

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records


 Tuesday, 5 November 1957,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 35:	
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):	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information	
General debate and consideration of draft resolutions (continued)	221

Chairman: Mr. Thanat KHOMAN (Thailand).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Božović (Yugoslavia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 35

- 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/3601 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/3602, A/3603, A/3604, A/3605, A/3606/Rev.1, A/3607, A/3608, A/3609, A/3647 and Corr.1, A/C.4/360) (continued)
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/357/Rev.1, A/C.4/359 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.504/Rev.2)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.504/REV.2) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the amendment submitted by the representative of the Dominican Republic (A/C.4/L.505) to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.4/L.504/Rev.2) had been withdrawn at the previous meeting.
2. Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) proposed, as an amendment (A/C.4/L.506) to the draft resolution, the addition of the following operative paragraph:
"3. Decides that three of the six members of the Committee shall be elected from among those Member States which have responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government."
3. That amendment would not threaten the purposes of the draft resolution since it left the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 intact; on the other hand, it would give the Administering Members every safeguard that the report which the proposed committee was to present to the General Assembly would be impartial. His delegation was submitting the amendment in the hope that the seventeen-Power draft resolution would obtain a majority vote that would lend it the necessary moral support when it was considered by the General Assembly.

4. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that his delegation was grateful to the representative of Belgium for his statement at the 685th meeting furnishing information and figures which had rectified a number of omissions in the documentation.

5. While appreciating the positive elements supplied by the representative of Belgium, however, he could not but regret certain irrelevant references to conditions in another Member State. He also wished to reply to a criticism directed to the delegation of Iran. The Belgian representative had said that the Iranian delegation had been wrong in stating that the administering Powers had been entrusted with responsibilities with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, those Powers having been recognized as sovereign long before the United Nations Charter had been signed. His delegation had never questioned the sovereignty of Belgium or of any other administering Powers over the Territories under their administration; that sovereignty, however, made no difference to the fact that, under Article 73 of the Charter, those Powers had accepted as a "sacred trust" an obligation which entailed certain responsibilities.

6. With regard to the economic data furnished, he had not intended to ignore the figure of private investment in industry but in the light of the information available he had had no choice but to note the absence of any public investment in industry. It was reassuring to see, however, from the data now provided, that the rate of investment in the Belgian Congo was five times higher than the average investment rate in the other under-developed countries; he hoped that positive information would be complemented by further statistics and analyses concerning, for example, the sector of the population which benefited most from it, the average salary of workers and of farmers, the standard of living and the distribution of the national income.

7. So long as no precise figures and information were available it would be impossible to dispel so-called prejudices. For example, the Committee would be in a better position to appreciate the efforts made by Belgium and other Administering Members if the summaries of information transmitted to the Secretary-General included the following data: in the field of agriculture, more precise information concerning the distribution of land, the relations between various agricultural groups and categories, the amount of land ceded to foreign and metropolitan monopolies, the relations between tribal chiefs and the main farming population, the existence of compulsory labour and its social implications; in the field of industry and commerce, data concerning public and private investment and investment rates, the profits of major private companies and the margin left for the indigenous population, explanation of any imbalance between purchase prices and export prices; in the fields of education and public health, elements that would give a true and

objective picture. Such information would be not only useful but necessary in appraising the situation and it would be the best guarantee against misconceptions that might arise concerning the Administering Members.

8. In conclusion, he stressed that his suggestions had been prompted by the necessity of establishing mutual confidence in the Committee in order that friendly and impartial criticism might not be attributed to bad faith. His remarks should not be interpreted as reflecting on the experience and capabilities of the Administering Members, whose efforts he well appreciated. He only sought to throw some light on the difficulties confronting them, in order that the Committee might better assist them in their task.

9. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) congratulated the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution on the objective, moderate and constructive text they had submitted. He would support the revised text of the draft resolution, with the drafting amendment submitted by the representative of the Dominican Republic at the 691st meeting. With regard to the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of Venezuela, he would like to hear the views of the Administering Members before coming to any decision.

10. The terms of the draft resolution were sufficiently clear and he did not share the apprehensions voiced in the Committee that it represented a move against one particular country. He recalled the discussions at the previous session^{1/} when it had been objected, in connexion with a similar draft resolution, that the general application of Chapter XI had not been fully discussed. He felt that that objection had been fully met in the text under consideration. It was clearly important to provide for a thorough study in order to avoid criticisms on the grounds of superficiality.

11. The tendency to avoid discussion in the Committee had become increasingly apparent of late. Objections were raised to the establishment of a committee, to enlisting the services of the Secretary-General and to any discussion of the information transmitted by Administering Members. It was time matters were discussed openly in the Committee, for no Member with a clear conscience would stand to lose by it.

12. He could not but be surprised at the negative statements that had been made with regard to the General Assembly's action in the matter of factors indicative of the attainment of a full measure of self-government. In his view resolution 742 (VIII) was one of the most laudable resolutions the Assembly had ever adopted. It had, moreover, been frequently quoted by Administering Members in support of their position.

13. His delegation had been disappointed to hear the statement of the Under-Secretary at the 691st meeting concerning the position in which the Committee's debate had placed the Secretary-General. The expedient of inducing the representatives of the Secretary-General to adopt a negative position in the course of a debate was frequently employed to undermine measures proposed by non-administering delegations. That practice was damaging to the relations between the United Nations and its highest administrative officer.

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Fourth Committee, 615th to 623rd meetings; and Plenary Meetings, 656th and 657th meetings.

Since some Members considered it a legitimate expedient and would apparently continue to use it, the Committee would have no choice but to invoke its rights under Article 98 of the Charter in order to ensure that the requisite services were provided.

14. Mr. GUASTONE BELCREDI (Italy) said that he had listened attentively to the arguments submitted by the sponsors of the draft resolution but was not convinced of the usefulness either of the Secretariat's undertaking the proposed study or of the establishment of the proposed committee. To summarize all the opinions expressed by members would alone entail considerable work for the Secretariat, but to make a study of all the treatises on the interpretation of the Charter would be an enormous task involving considerable expense. Apart from those considerations, the work entailed would be quite useless, since it would not contribute substantially to the information already available; moreover, the establishment of a committee to study the results of the work would further envenom the atmosphere of the United Nations.

15. His delegation felt, therefore, that the draft resolution was not only superfluous but represented a potential danger. It would accordingly vote against it.

16. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan) said that at the previous session his delegation had voted against a similar proposal to set up a committee to examine the replies of new Members on the subject of the transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories. His delegation's position remained unchanged; it would continue to judge the soundness of any such proposal according to the universal nature of its application. Its only interest was to avoid the establishment of a precedent whereby a certain country or group of countries was singled out for criticism or scrutiny.

17. His delegation regretted that, as at the previous session, the debate had assumed a political character. Some delegations had referred directly to the country which was the object of that attack. His delegation, however, had tried to maintain a balanced perspective and it considered the issue before the Committee a relatively simple one. It was the Committee's duty to ensure that the incidence of obligations did not fall unequally on Member States which, under the Charter, had the same obligations to assume and discharge.

18. In its anxiety to make sure that the measures proposed in the draft resolution would not be discriminatory, his delegation had carefully followed the debate. The clarifications offered by the sponsors to some of the questions put to them had not dispelled all the doubts it entertained about the wisdom of the proposals. The representative of Guatemala had stated clearly that the summary to be prepared by the Secretary-General would include only the opinions furnished in the replies of Member States. If that implied that only the relatively few countries which had replied to the Secretary-General's communication would be subjected to examination by the proposed committee, while others which had not replied would be excluded from the study, that would certainly amount to discrimination.

19. The representative of Belgium had asked about the application of the Indian definition of "non-self-governing people", as given in document A/AC.17/W.10, to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands: that raised the pertinent

question whether some of the sponsors of the draft resolution were willing to let the General Assembly decide whether the "constitutional considerations" mentioned in Article 73 e might or might not constitute a limitation on the transmission of information so far as their own overseas territories were concerned. He would like to ask the Indian representative whether his delegation would be prepared to allow the General Assembly or one of its Committees to consider whether, the Indian Constitution notwithstanding, those islands might or might not fall within the purview of Chapter XI. It was common knowledge that they were as much an integral part of India as the overseas territories of Portugal were part of Portugal.

20. Lastly, he would like the sponsors of the draft resolution to reply to two questions: first, whether they were prepared to amend the wording of the draft resolution so that it could apply equally to all Member States, whether or not they had replied to the Secretary-General's communication; and secondly whether those sponsors who had raised doubts about the constitution of a certain new Member State were willing to subject their own constitutions to examination by the United Nations. The attitude of his delegation would largely depend on the answer to those questions.

21. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the reply of the Indian Government would be subjected to the same examination as those of other Governments.

22. Mrs. SHELTON (Cuba) said that her delegation feared that the study called for in the draft resolution would be too complex to be feasible and would be unlikely to produce any practical result, for which reasons she would vote against it. Her delegation was not yet in a position to take a stand on the Venezuelan amendment.

23. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that his delegation challenged the observations made at the preceding meeting to the effect that the draft resolution was misleading and would serve no useful purpose, because those remarks implied that the sponsors must have had ulterior motives in submitting it. The list of sponsors, which included countries from many parts of the world, some of which were members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Baghdad Pact or the Organization of American States, was in itself an indication that the submission of the draft resolution had been inspired not by political but by moral considerations.

24. It was unfortunate that after more than ten years there should still be so much argument about the interpretation of certain Articles of the Charter, for if the Member States were to be able to fulfil their obligations under the Charter they must have a clear understanding of what those obligations were. The sponsors of the draft resolution had no intention of singling out a new Member State but simply wished to reach an understanding which would be of general application where the transmission of information under Article 73 e was concerned. Apart from its practical usefulness, moreover, the draft resolution would serve a high moral purpose since by making it easier for the United Nations to fulfil its obligations towards the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories it would contribute to the strengthening of the concept of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

25. Mr. WHITE (Canada) said that his delegation

appreciated the efforts the sponsors of the draft resolution had made to meet criticisms that had been made at the previous session of the similar draft resolution. The present draft resolution was certainly more moderate in language and more conciliatory in its approach. The changes which had been made, however, did not meet the basic objections the Canadian delegation had had in the past to resolutions of that character. It could not, therefore, support the draft resolution.

26. The negative vote of his delegation did not mean that the Canadian Government did not attach the greatest importance to Chapter XI of the Charter and to the work of the Fourth Committee. It considered it of great importance that the General Assembly should receive the fullest possible information under the terms of Article 73 e and it would be glad if all the Powers which were responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories would exercise their responsibilities under Chapter XI liberally and in the best interests of the inhabitants of those Territories, as indeed the United Kingdom and other Administering Members were doing. Co-operation on the part of the Administering Members should, however, be voluntary; attempts to change voluntary co-operation to veiled compulsion were unlikely to attain the desired ends.

27. The Canadian delegation joined the representative of Sweden and others in associating itself with the statement made by the representative of the United States at the 674th meeting.

28. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) expressed his delegation's gratitude to the representatives who had commended the rectitude and clarity of the Spanish position in the matter of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

29. The draft resolution before the Committee simply reiterated matters that the Committee had examined at the eleventh session, when the General Assembly had taken a clear and categorical decision on the problem (657th plenary meeting). Many delegations considered that the draft resolution was directed against one particular Member of the United Nations—Portugal. The Spanish delegation would be only too pleased if the sponsors could demonstrate that that was not the case. Portugal was in fact being attacked because it had declared that, in accordance with its Constitution, it did not exercise control over any Non-Self-Governing Territories and was consequently not subject to the provisions of Article 73 of the Charter. Under the Portuguese Constitution there were no first- or second-class Portuguese citizens; all were citizens with equal rights and duties. The Portuguese had maintained their unity across continents and oceans, without discrimination of any sort. It was with that structure, and no other, that Portugal had been admitted to the United Nations. It could not now be asked to change its constitutional law.

30. The transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories had been introduced as a means of constituting a common fund of experience that would be useful for the administration of peoples which were not yet ready for self-government, but never as an instrument of interference in the internal administration of Member States. There must be no violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. In matters of sovereignty Member States should not be demanding where their own was concerned and heedless about that of others.

31. For all the above reasons his delegation would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution.

32. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's views on the meaning of Article 73 e and the proper procedure under that Article were too well known for it to be necessary for him to repeat them. The United Kingdom Government had played a leading part in the drafting of Chapter XI and had made as large a contribution as any in implementing the provisions of that Chapter.

33. His delegation disagreed with much that had been said during the debate; above all it could not accept the view that those who sought to stretch the interpretation of Chapter XI beyond what was intended by the Charter were the only "liberals" in the Committee. His Government considered that its interpretation of Chapter XI was best designed to promote the progress of the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and it had a record that was second to none in helping those peoples forward to self-government or independence.

34. The debate was in substance merely a repetition of the discussion of the previous session on the subject of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter. The main provision of the draft resolution was to set in motion a study to be carried out by a specially constituted committee. That committee would be asked to study, among other matters, what were described in the draft resolution—not quite accurately—as the opinions furnished in the replies of Member States to the communications of the Secretary-General regarding the transmission of information. A similar study had been proposed in the draft resolution rejected by the General Assembly at the 657th plenary meeting, held during its eleventh session (A/3531 and Add.1 para.63, draft resolution VI). The United Kingdom delegation considered that the replies of Member States on the subject could not properly be the object of study and that the formal statements of Members of the United Nations should be accepted by the General Assembly, and not called into question by it.

35. He would not go further into the substance of the matter, since everything had already been said not only at the current session but at the eleventh session and many times before that.

36. It had been argued that the draft resolution before the Committee differed substantially in one respect from that of the previous year, in that it did not relate only to the newly admitted Members of the United Nations, and therefore could not be described as discriminatory. As far as its wording went, that was undoubtedly true, but at the same time his delegation had no doubt that the origin of the draft resolution derived from the particular reply of one Member State. That being so, he wondered whether the resolution would be really non-discriminatory in its effect. The whole history of the issue supported the view that it would not. It was admittedly couched in more moderate language than the previous year's draft resolution but it was aimed at precisely the same target. None of the speeches made in support of the draft resolution had convinced him that it contained anything new or had shown any reason for changing the decision made by the General Assembly at the previous session. His delegation could not see that any useful purpose would be served by the proposed study, which appeared to be designed merely to elicit once more opinions, state-

ments and attitudes which were well known to every member of the Committee. It was essential for the United Nations to avoid unnecessary expense and work and he saw no reason for continuing to go over the same ground again and again.

37. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution and hoped that it would be rejected by the Committee.

38. Mr. CARREÑO MALLARINO (Colombia) observed that the obligation to transmit information in accordance with Article 73 e of the Charter did not authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. The principle of non-intervention was fundamental in American law and his delegation did not wish to see it compromised or limited in respect to a matter such as information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

39. His delegation considered that the scope of Article 73 was limited by "constitutional considerations" of the States Members of the United Nations. For a Member State to be obliged to submit information on a territory it was necessary that that territory should be internationally recognized as a Non-Self-Governing Territory or a colony. The geographical situation of a territory or the fact that it was physically joined to the metropolitan country was not an adequate basis for deciding whether it was non-self-governing. Similarly, to define a Non-Self-Governing Territory as one that did not possess a Government of its own would be a questionable criterion, which if carried to its logical conclusion would lead to the annihilation of States.

40. If some States considered that certain territories were colonies and others thought that they were not, the problem resolved itself into a political rather than a legal one, except in the case of territories which had been internationally recognized as colonies.

41. For those reasons and others that had been adduced, the Colombian delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

42. Mr. NARITA (Japan) said that as opinions differed among Members of the United Nations regarding the application of the provisions of Chapter XI to Non-Self-Governing Territories, it was proper that the General Assembly should endeavour to clarify the problem and to lay down some guiding principles.

43. At the eleventh session of the General Assembly the Committee had considered a draft resolution proposing the setting up of a committee to study the application of the provisions of Chapter XI to new Members of the United Nations. One of the reasons why the Japanese delegation had not supported it was that it had proposed to deal with only the new Members of the United Nations. The draft resolution at present before the Committee tried to approach the problem more objectively, was more constructive in that it was trying to find some principles, and did not limit its study to new Members only.

44. The Japanese delegation could not, however, accept the first part of the paragraph 2, because it did not give any directions about the composition of the committee and there was nothing to ensure that a committee of a political nature would not emerge.

45. The Japanese delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

46. Mr. LUCOCK (Australia) said that there had been a tendency in the Fourth Committee to disregard those provisions of the Charter which laid down the areas of discussion open to them, with the result that the Committee had at times become involved in debate on matters which were more properly the province of the Economic and Social Council, the Sixth Committee or the International Court of Justice. The resulting confusion had been aggravated by the present draft resolution, which, in the view of his delegation, trenched upon inalienable rights of all Member States. The draft resolution aimed at eliciting from the proposed committee a report which would endorse the claim of a number of countries to determine, in contradiction to Article 2, paragraph 7, and Article 73, subparagraph e of the Charter, what territories forming part of the metropolitan areas of Member States, as defined in their constitutions, were to be characterized as Non-Self-Governing Territories. In accordance with that theory the constitutions of all Member States could be called into question and the social and political conditions in their domain examined.

47. His delegation considered that to accept the draft resolution would be to do violence to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. In that sense the draft resolution was aimed not against any State in particular but against the rights, interests and constitutions of all Member States. It was not surprising that so many representatives, whether speaking in favour of the draft resolution or against it, had described it as one of the most important in the history of the United Nations. Indeed, its importance was such that the decision taken on it by the General Assembly would in effect constitute a decision on an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. In short, the draft resolution went far beyond the competence of either the Fourth Committee or the General Assembly and in considering it the Committee was embarking on a course which could bring discredit on the United Nations. Furthermore, his delegation attached the greatest importance to the considerations of economy and expenditure advanced by the Swedish and Italian representatives.

48. For all those reasons his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

49. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) stated that as the primary purpose of the committee proposed in the draft resolution would be to study the application of Article 73 e, that committee would be in a position to determine whether certain Members had an obligation to transmit information or whether they had failed to fulfil any of their obligations towards Non-Self-Governing Territories. In so doing it would have to deal with the constitutions of some Member States; that would be a violation of such provisions of the Charter as Article 2, paragraph 7, and Article 73 e. His delegation could not therefore support the establishment of such a committee, or indeed, any proposal that was likely to infringe the domestic jurisdiction of any Member State.

50. Moreover, his delegation understood from the Under-Secretary's statement at the 691st meeting that the Secretary-General had some apprehensions about the task entrusted to him in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. It appreciated those apprehensions, for it could foresee the criticism to which the Secretariat would inevitably be subjected.

51. His delegation considered the Venezuelan amendment to the draft resolution to be a valuable contribution and in accord with the principle of justice but it would be obliged to abstain from voting for that amendment because it intended to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

52. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) wished to explain his delegation's approach to the vital question on which the Committee was called upon to vote.

53. When at the previous session the Fourth Committee and, later, the General Assembly had been engaged in a discussion of a similar question, the delegation of Ireland had felt in duty bound to oppose the draft resolution then under consideration, chiefly because it seemed to have a discriminatory impact on the new Members of the United Nations. The present draft resolution did not refer to the new Members, or indeed to any country or group of countries, and was accordingly more worthy of consideration and support.

54. If his delegation considered that the draft resolution would contribute to a solution of the problem, it would be glad to support it. It had, however, fundamental reservations on the subject. The United States representative had said at the previous meeting that the draft resolution might lead not to constructive results but even to further embitterment. Moreover, the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the Philippine representative (690th meeting) and embodied in the present revised text now before the Committee appeared to have broadened considerably the task of the proposed committee, so that the report to the General Assembly might contain much material in addition to the Secretary-General's study. The representatives of the Dominican Republic and Sweden had also expressed apprehension concerning the kind of study which might emerge and its possible results.

55. For all those reasons his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

56. He hoped that with the passage of time the need to engage annually in so painful a discussion would no longer arise and that the issues involved would be solved in a realistic manner and in a spirit of compromise. He pledged his delegation's full support for any positive and effective efforts to attain that end.

57. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not had an opportunity to discuss the suggestion made by the Chinese representative at the previous meeting that paragraph 2, calling for the establishment of a committee to study the Secretary-General's summary, should be deleted. He wished to point out, however, on behalf of his own delegation, that under the terms of the draft resolution, which in his view was purely procedural in character, the purpose of that committee would be to screen material which would otherwise be too extensive for so large a body as the Fourth Committee to consider. For that reason his delegation could not accept the Chinese representatives suggestion.

58. Some delegations claimed to discover concealed motives in the draft resolution. That opinion was based on pure conjecture, for the sponsors had had no purpose other than what was expressly set forth in the text. His own delegation saw in the course which the debate was taking, however, an attempt, hidden behind the pretext of procedural considerations to

build up an attack on a competence which the General Assembly had little by little established for itself in the question at issue. Throughout the controversy, which had likewise arisen at earlier sessions, his delegation had simply tried to assist in establishing the correct procedure for obtaining co-operation between the General Assembly and the Administering Members in matters concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The General Assembly, to its credit, had always exercised restraint in making use of its powers in that connexion.

59. With regard to the Under-Secretary's statement that the draft resolution would impose a heavy burden on the Secretariat, he recalled that there had been instances in the past when the Secretariat had been able to carry out such a task. The records of the United Nations included various summaries of opinions regarding the interpretation of certain Articles of the Charter. After the adoption of the General Assembly resolution 334 (IV), for example, the Secretariat had prepared for the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter a document setting forth extensive background material relating to the matter which had been under discussion (A/AC.35/L.8 and Corr.1); a subsequent document (A/AC.35/L.30 and Add.1) had incorporated that material with commentaries made by various experts on the interpretation of the Charter. His delegation was therefore confident that the Secretariat would be able to carry out the task that would be entrusted to it.

60. He would not try to refute all the objections which had been raised, for they had been put forward whenever certain delegations had submitted draft resolutions directly or indirectly reaffirming the General Assembly's competence with regard to the interpretation and application of Chapter XI of the Charter. Those oft-repeated objections and the replies to them would constitute a part of the summary to be prepared by the Secretariat.

61. The sponsors of the draft resolution had not had an opportunity to exchange views with regard to the amendment proposed by Venezuela. His own delegation, however, would suggest that the Venezuelan amendment might be altered to read:

"3. Decided that three of the six members of the Committee shall be elected from among those Member States which have the responsibility for transmitting information under Article 73 e of the Charter, if they do not decline to serve on it."

62. With the introduction of that proviso the committee could still be formed even if the Administering Members refused to serve on it. If the Venezuelan representative accepted that suggestion, he would vote in favour of the amendment.

63. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) moved the closure of the debate.

64. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) suggested that the debate should not be closed until the Venezuelan representative had replied to his suggestion.

65. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the Venezuelan representative could reply to the Guatemalan suggestion when the draft resolution was put to the vote.

66. Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) objected to that suggestion, because it would prevent other delegations

from expressing their opinions with regard to the Venezuelan amendment.

67. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) said that he too would oppose closure of the debate on the ground that the merits of the Venezuelan amendment had not been discussed.

68. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Dominican representative's motion for closure.

The Dominican motion was rejected by 44 votes to 21, with 8 abstentions.

69. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that, since the purpose of the draft resolution was to determine whether the Members which had not transmitted information under Article 73 e should be considered Members administering Non-Self-Governing Territories, the implication was that the identity of all such Powers had not yet been established. Hence it was to be asked how three members of the proposed committee could be appointed from among those Powers.

70. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories), replying to comments on his statement at the 691st meeting, pointed out that under Article 98 of the Charter the Secretary-General should perform such functions as were entrusted to him by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. The fact that he might sometimes feel it necessary to mention difficulties to which some of those tasks might give rise did not mean that he was attempting to influence the decision of the body concerned. He must, however, draw attention to the possible difficulties of the proposed task in case later he were to be criticized for the manner in which he had carried out his functions. The Secretary-General had on various occasions made studies similar to those now proposed and had always done his best to show complete impartiality in conformity with his position as head of an international organization.

71. It would be recalled that during the previous session of the General Assembly he had stated to the Committee (579th meeting) that the Secretary-General's numerous and important tasks might preclude him from taking the action that had been proposed in connexion with the problem of South West Africa. The adoption at the present session (709th plenary meeting) of resolution 1143 (XII) setting up a Good Offices Committee on South West Africa was an admission that the procedure proposed at the previous session had been impracticable.

72. He thanked those delegations which had expressed satisfaction with the manner in which the Secretariat carried out its work. If the Committee so decided the Secretary-General would prepare a summary in accordance with the terms of the draft resolution in the most impartial and thorough manner. All he had wished to do at the 691st meeting was to point out the complexities with which the Secretary-General and his staff might be faced in making such a summary.

73. Mr. WONGSANITH (Cambodia) associated his delegation with the remarks of the Mexican representative.

74. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the Venezuelan amendment if it were put to the vote separately.

75. It would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution, since it regarded the proposed action as the only way of freeing the Non-Self-Governing Territories from colonialism.

76. Mr. GOMESDE OLIVEIRA (Brazil) referred to his country's close and long-standing ties with Portugal. Portugal had given her overseas territories the status of provinces and had enabled the peoples of those territories to enjoy the culture it had brought into their lives.

77. His delegation regarded the draft resolution as a moderate text and recognized the sponsors' constructive intentions. It did not, however, agree with the proposed course of action since it considered that the experience of the General Assembly in the matter offered sufficient basis for the analysis of all the problems involved.

78. He was doubtful of the wisdom of inviting the Secretary-General to prepare the summary referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. At best it would be a duplication of effort since there was already a complete study of the subjects referred to in that paragraph in the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs.^{2/} The staff of the Division of Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories was already over-burdened with work in connexion with the preparation of the report on progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories to be submitted to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly and his delegation considered it inadvisable to ask the Secretariat to perform unnecessary additional work.

79. With regard to paragraph 2, his delegation saw no reason for the establishment of the proposed committee. The Fourth Committee was the right body to perform such a task. If the Fourth Committee was unable to study and interpret the provisions of the Charter regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories it was unlikely that any ad hoc committee would be better able to do so.

80. For those reasons he was unable to support the draft resolution.

81. Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) said that as there was so little support for his amendment he would withdraw it.

82. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) moved the adjournment of the meeting, in accordance with rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for adjournment was rejected by 43 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.

83. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 2.

84. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preamble and paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.504/Rev.2).

The preamble and paragraph 1 were adopted by 45 votes to 23, with 6 abstentions.

At the request of the Dominican representative a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 2.

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

In favour: Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador.

Against: Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

Abstaining: Ireland, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Ecuador.

The paragraph was adopted by 43 votes to 29, with 5 abstentions.

At the request of the Portuguese representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on the joint draft resolution as a whole.

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

In favour: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ireland, Japan, Malaya (Federation of), Venezuela.

The draft resolution was adopted by 42 votes to 27, with 8 abstentions.

85. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) recalled that during the debate his delegation had made it quite clear that it was opposed to the draft resolution, on various grounds. First, in accordance with the statements of the sponsors themselves, it represented the same spirit which certain delegations had displayed at the previous session of the General Assembly and which had led them to question the reply of the Portuguese Government to the Secretary-General's letter. Secondly, although it was carefully couched in vague terms, the real purpose of the draft resolution was to reopen a question on which the Assembly had taken a clear stand at the previous session. Thirdly, the draft resolution was a dangerous precedent and indicated a path which, if followed to the end, would upset the entire balance between international co-operation and nation-

^{2/} United Nations publication, Sales No.:1955.V.2.

al sovereignty and threaten the very life, authority and prestige of the United Nations.

86. For those reasons he reserved his Government's

position in respect of the draft resolution and any future developments to which it might give rise.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.