

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 769th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 22 October 1958,  
at 3.10 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 39:   |      |
| Question of South West Africa (continued):                    |      |
| (a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa |      |
| Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .          | 119  |

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

**AGENDA ITEM 39**

**Question of South West Africa (continued):**

**(a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa (A/3900, A/C.4/L.531, A/C.4/L.532)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.531, A/C.4/L.532) (continued)**

1. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had misgivings concerning the possible implications of the text of the Chilean amendments (A/C.4/L.536) to the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) in the light of statements made during the general debate. The word "difficulties" in the first amendment (A/C.4/L.536, para. 1), for example, might be interpreted either as referring to the well-known difficulties created by the South African Government or as an attempt indirectly to justify the mistake which many members of the Fourth Committee felt that the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa had made in allowing itself to be drawn into consideration of the partition proposal. The second amendment (A/C.4/L.536, paras. 2 and 3) might be interpreted as meaning that if conditions in the Territory were to change the General Assembly might be willing to accept partition as a solution. The Committee had been given an indication of how those conditions might change in the statement made at the 745th meeting by the South African Minister of External Affairs, who had said that the investigation by his Government of the practicability of partition would cover the possibility of moving four of five reserves to the northern part of the Territory. The removal of those reserves would leave the white population in a majority in the South, in which case the Union Government might feel it could argue that annexation would be in accordance with the wishes of the people.

2. Mr. COHEN (Chile) said that as he was fundamentally in agreement with the majority of the Committee he had tried, in a spirit of conciliation, to make it clear that he would be willing to accept any amendments of form which did not alter the substance of his text. As most of the speakers had praised the manner in which the Good Offices Committee had carried out its task he saw no reason why that praise should not be expressed in the resolution. In deference to the wishes of the majority, however, he had been willing to omit an expression of praise and substitute

for it a phrase simply recognizing the difficulties with which the Committee had been confronted. His reason for insisting on that amendment was simple: to give any indication that the Good Offices Committee did not enjoy the confidence of the Fourth Committee would be to weaken its position *vis-à-vis* the Union Government.

3. With regard to his second amendment, he had stressed at the 766th meeting that as a matter of principle the United Nations did not have the right to pre-judge a possible future solution of the problem, whether legal or political. In its discussions the Committee had referred constantly to the United Nations and the Union Government as the two major factors in the solution of the problem while seeming to forget the third and in his view the most important element, namely, the population of the Territory, particularly the indigenous inhabitants. The United Nations could not adopt a resolution which might stand in the way of their eventually seeking whatever means they preferred of putting an end to their present situation. As he had not been able to persuade the five Powers to include a statement to that effect in the operative part of their draft resolution, he had suggested including in the preamble a phrase which would show that the General Assembly was not compromising the freedom of the inhabitants to seek whatever solution they might choose in the future. His second amendment was to be considered solely in that light.

4. In that connexion he recalled that other representatives had doubted the ability of the indigenous inhabitants to express their wishes in a consultation held under the auspices of the United Nations. Yet the experience of Togoland under French administration, in which the results of the election conducted recently under United Nations auspices had been directly contrary to those of the previous election, showed what a difference the presence of the United Nations could make in such circumstances.

5. He had no objection to paragraph 1 of the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) because it was simply a statement of fact. If the second of the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535, para. 2) were approved, that would convey substantially the same thing that he had had in mind in drawing up the fifth paragraph of the preamble of his own draft resolution (A/C.4/L.531) and thus would reflect the attitude of principle which he had maintained throughout.

6. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) did not think the Chilean representative's first amendment (A/C.4/L.536, para. 1) could be interpreted as a tribute to the Good Offices Committee for the manner in which it had done its work. As the difficulties to which the amendment referred had not been created by either the Good Offices Committee or the United Nations, the amendment seemed to be an implied criticism of the Union Government's attitude. In that case, he could not sup-

port it, as he did not think the resolution extending the life of the Good Offices Committee should condemn any of the parties. There was no need to mention the word "difficulties" because the very fact that the United Nations was seeking a solution implied that the difficulties existed. The proposed amendment would therefore only confuse the issue. If the amendment were approved, it would be important to determine just what it was that the Committee would be expressing its appreciation of. From the statements made by the Chairman of the Good Offices Committee it could be seen that the results of its work were two proposals which were contrary to the principles of the United Nations and that in presenting them the Good Offices Committee had exceeded its terms of reference. As the Fourth Committee had almost unanimously expressed its opposition to those proposals, to express appreciation of the Committee's work now would be tantamount to putting the seal of approval on something which had already been rejected. The most that his delegation would be willing to agree to would be to add a few words praising the Committee for the time and effort it had devoted to the search for a solution but in that case it would be necessary, in order to maintain a proper perspective, to express regret that the Good Offices Committee had been unable to present any proposal which did not exceed its terms of reference.

7. The second Chilean amendment (A/C.4/L.536, paras. 2 and 3) was irrelevant inasmuch as conditions in the Territory were the subject of a report by another committee and delegations should formulate their views on them in separate resolutions rather than merely mention them in passing in the text of the resolution on the report of the Good Offices Committee. There was nothing in either General Assembly resolution 1143 (XII) originally setting up the Good Offices Committee or the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) to justify mentioning conditions in the Territory, for both those texts were concerned with the problem of persuading the Union Government to recognize the legitimate international status of the Territory in accordance with the terms of the Mandate and to make that status effective. He wondered whether the amendment was meant to impress upon either the Fourth Committee, the Union Government or the Good Offices Committee that the continued existence of the latter was closely related to conditions obtaining in the Territory, in other words, that the decision to renew the Good Offices Committee arose from an attitude of despair at those conditions. If so, that was not in accordance with the position of his delegation, which felt that the resolution should be based rather on a spirit of conciliation and a willingness to take a new approach in seeking a solution.

8. He reserved his delegation's position with regard to the five-Power draft resolution itself.

9. Mr. VAWUMIA (Ghana) said that the fact that the General Assembly wanted the Good Offices Committee to continue its negotiations was an indication of its confidence in the members of that body. If the Fourth Committee were to express appreciation of the work of the Good Offices Committee, it would also have to include an expression of dissatisfaction with the results; and his delegation would prefer that the Committee should not be put in such a position.

10. The second Chilean amendment might be inter-

preted as implying that the General Assembly was rejecting partition because of present conditions in the Territory, which might in turn create the impression that it would be prepared to accept partition if conditions changed.

11. The Chilean amendments as a whole failed to take into account the fact that in paragraph 52, subparagraph 7, of its report (A/3900) the Good Offices Committee had exceeded its terms of reference. His delegation was entirely in agreement that the inhabitants of the Territory must eventually be consulted with regard to their future but that could not be done until the Union Government had recognized the principle of adult suffrage for all the inhabitants of the Territory.

12. The five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) and the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535) taken together reflected to a large extent the opinions expressed in the general debate. His delegation had refrained from insisting on a more comprehensive resolution as that might reduce the chances of a unanimous vote in the Committee.

13. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that his delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the eight-Power amendments because they improved the five-Power draft resolution by giving it greater clarity and precision.

14. He understood the Belgian representative to have said at the previous meeting that he objected to the second of the eight-Power amendments because it appeared to give the Good Offices Committee authority to interpret the purposes and principles of the Charter. If that argument were accepted, it would be only logical to object to operative paragraph 3 of the five-Power draft resolution, for the lengthy and involved discussions to which it referred were certainly more difficult to interpret than were the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. He therefore hoped that the Belgian representative would withdraw that objection.

15. Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan) proposed that, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure, the list of speakers should be closed.

The proposal was adopted by 26 votes to 1, with 41 abstentions.

16. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) opposed the first Chilean amendment (A/C.4/L.536, para. 1) to the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532), for reasons both on form and substance. The French text was not well drafted; moreover, from the point of view of substance, he did not understand what was intended by the word "conscience", which might be taken in several ways. Although that was certainly not the intention of the sponsor, it might imply criticism of those members of the Committee who had criticized the Good Offices Committee and its report. He would suggest that the words "which had been faced with a difficult task" would better express the sponsor's intentions and would meet the objections of representatives who held that the original expression conveyed criticism of the Union Government, or of the Good Offices Committee, or of the Fourth Committee.

17. His main objection, however, was to the second Chilean amendment (A/C.4/L.536, paras. 2 and 3). He did not think that the proposed additional preambular

paragraph would necessarily be interpreted as meaning that the prevailing conditions should be taken into consideration.

18. The representative of Chile appeared to have misinterpreted a statement the speaker had made at the 767th meeting. On that occasion, he had said that his delegation was opposed in existing circumstances to consultation of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa, as the time was not yet ripe for it. The Chilean representative's observations hardly gave due recognition to the efforts made by the French and United Kingdom Governments in the zones of Togoland which they had administered to educate the indigenous inhabitants politically. As a result it had proved possible to hold elections such as the one that had taken place recently in Togoland under French administration. That was not the case in South West Africa.

19. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he found the first Chilean amendment far from clear. If it implied sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of the Good Offices Committee's task rather than praise for its work, the amendment seemed superfluous. In the course of the debate, the Committee had taken cognizance of the difficulties of the Good Offices Committee. If on the other hand the intention of the Chilean amendment was that there should be an expression of appreciation for the work of the Good Offices Committee, the wording should be changed. The Fourth Committee was in fact expressing its confidence in the Good Offices Committee by keeping it in being. It was unfortunate that an amendment intended purely as an expression of courtesy had raised questions of principle on which many representatives were unable to compromise.

20. The second Chilean amendment was also not clear. If its purpose was to leave the door open for the inhabitants to express their opinions, that was adequately provided for in the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535), and his delegation would vote in favour of those amendments. It was important that the status of South West Africa as a Mandated Territory should be stressed and that a reference to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter should be included in the resolution in order to ensure that the Good Offices Committee would not deviate from them.

21. His delegation was willing to abide by the opinion of the majority of the members of the Committee and to give the Good Offices Committee an opportunity to negotiate with clearer terms of reference which would unmistakably express the views of the General Assembly. He was glad that the idea for partition had been rejected and hoped that it would not be brought up again.

22. If the eight-Power amendments were adopted, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. If they were not adopted, or if the Chilean amendments were adopted, it would be obliged to abstain.

23. U ON SEIN (Burma) recalled that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 1143 (XII) setting up the Good Offices Committee, not because it objected to negotiations but because it was convinced that the Territory should be placed under trusteeship. He felt doubtful whether further efforts should be made by the Good Offices Committee. That attitude should not be interpreted as a lack of respect

for the members of that Committee; it was one forced upon him by the intransigence of the Union Government.

24. His delegation would vote for operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) and accepted the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535) as they reflected the general opinion in the Committee. It would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole and could not support either the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.4/L.531) or the Chilean amendments (A/C.4/L.536).

25. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the discussion which had just taken place was precisely what her delegation had hoped to avoid. She greatly respected the members of the Good Offices Committee and regretted that an amendment expressing appreciation of their work had been introduced since it was bound to arouse controversy. Operative paragraph 2 of the five-Power draft resolution left the matter open, since it did not expressly refer to appreciation of the work of the Good Offices Committee.

26. Her delegation would oppose any amendment except those proposed in document A/C.4/L.535.

27. Mr. WOLF (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1143 (XII) on the understanding that such an approach would be favourably received by the Union Government. That optimism had seemed justified, since the Union Government had agreed to take part in the activities of the United Nations and to negotiate with the Good Offices Committee. He had therefore been very disappointed at the withdrawal of the South African delegation. The main concern of members of the Committee was the inhabitants of the Territory, and the common goal was that the Territory should be placed under trusteeship.

28. In the opinion of his delegation, the five-Power draft resolution constituted the best approach and it would accordingly vote for that draft resolution as a whole; it would also vote in favour of the eight-Power amendments and in favour of the first Chilean amendment; there should be some expression of appreciation for the Good Offices Committee, which could hardly be expected to carry on its work in the absence of any comment on what it had done. His delegation would abstain from voting on the second Chilean amendment, since the wording did not seem to be entirely relevant.

29. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) regretted that the explanation given by the Chilean representative had failed to convince him. He could agree with that representative when he said he wished to leave open the possibility for the inhabitants to be consulted as to their wishes; but that was an inalienable right of the indigenous population. Through their representatives, those inhabitants had expressed their opposition to any suggestion of partition or annexation. The desires of the people of South West Africa had been clearly expressed; if anything had been forgotten, it was a reference to those desires.

30. What was most important to his delegation was to know whether the representatives of those countries to which the members of the Good Offices Committee belonged would vote in favour of the five-Power draft resolution in part or as a whole. That was of capital importance if negotiations were to be continued, for the Good Offices Committee must implement the opin-

ion of the General Assembly. If those representatives abstained from voting on paragraphs 1 and 2 but voted for the draft resolution as a whole, the question would arise whether there was any point in having the Good Offices Committee. His delegation reserved the right to base its vote on the way in which those representatives voted. If they abstained, his delegation could not vote for the draft resolution.

31. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia) wished to make his delegation's position clear, since the Chilean representative was maintaining his amendments.

32. In his delegation's view the insertion of the first Chilean amendment would lead to a serious inconsistency. If that amendment were read in conjunction with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the five-Power draft resolution it would appear that the General Assembly was rejecting the idea of partition and annexation on the one hand while on the other hand inviting the Good Offices Committee to renew discussions with the Union Government merely because the General Assembly appreciated the difficulties of its task. It could hardly be hoped that the Good Offices Committee would encounter no further difficulties in its future negotiations with the Union Government. What was more important, however, was the implication that the United Nations had been responsible for creating difficulties. The insertion of the proposed amendment might give the dangerous impression that the Good Offices Committee could ignore the fact that the General Assembly had rejected the idea of partition and annexation and evade the difficulties that would inevitably be encountered in negotiating with the Union Government. The danger was even greater in view of the reservations expressed by several delegations which intended to abstain in the vote on paragraph 1 of the five-Power draft resolution because in their view, since the idea of partition and annexation had not emanated from the members of the Good Offices Committee, the General Assembly should not pass judgement on the results of their work. That might be interpreted as a justification of the Good Offices Committee's attitude if at some future time it were to propose partition as the only solution of the problem. The General Assembly must make it clear that as far as the United Nations was concerned there could be only one solution: the Territory was a Mandated Territory and its international status should be in conformity with the Principles and Purposes of the Charter. To state that plainly would facilitate the task of the Good Offices Committee rather than make it more difficult, as some delegations appeared to think.

33. With regard to the second Chilean amendment, he was not clear whether it meant that the Good Offices Committee should negotiate with a view to placing the Territory under the International Trusteeship System or whether it implied that a suggestion for something less than the status of a Mandated Territory might be acceptable. Moreover, the amendment appeared to be totally out of context since the Committee was not dealing for the time being with conditions in the Territory but restating the United Nations position with regard to the Territory's international status.

34. For those reasons he would be obliged to vote against the Chilean amendments and he associated his delegation with those which urged the Chilean representative to withdraw them.

35. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) wished to clarify the position of his delegation with regard to the second of the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535, para. 2) in view of the statements made at the present meeting by the representative of Venezuela and at the previous meeting by the representative of Ceylon. His delegation considered, as he had explained at the previous meeting, that the amendment was out of place: it recalled principles which were acknowledged but to which it was pointless to refer in that context. In the opinion of his delegation, the purpose of the Good Offices Committee was to make diplomatic contacts, not decisions. Its members were well-qualified to know the conditions necessary to ensure respect for justice and the other obligations deriving from international treaties. The amendment could lead only to useless controversy on the results of their mission.

36. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) explained that, in the amendment to which the representative of Belgium had referred, the sponsors had invoked the principles and purposes of the United Nations simply because those principles and purposes existed for general guidance. It was not suggested that the members of the Good Offices Committee were unaware of them; but there was no harm in reasserting them. The work of the Good Offices Committee should be carried on in the context of those principles, and it was inconceivable that there should be any objection to them. He could not understand therefore on what grounds objection was raised to the amendment.

37. Mr. COHEN (Chile), replying to the various comments that had been made on his delegation's first amendment (A/C.4/L.536, para. 1), said that in speaking of the difficulties of the task of the Good Offices Committee he had intended to refer to the difficulties inherent in that task, i.e., the difficulty of reaching agreement in such a complex and delicate matter. To include some recognition of the difficulties faced by the Good Offices Committee in no way implied a judgement of that Committee's report.

38. He would be prepared to withdraw his second amendment (A/C.4/L.536, paras. 2 and 3) provided that the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535) were adopted.

39. In reply to the representative of Haiti, he emphasized that he did not underestimate the achievements of the United Kingdom and French Administrations in the two Territories of Togoland. He was well aware of the magnitude of those achievements and he also recognized that if the people of South West Africa were given the same help and encouragement as had been given to the people of the two Togolands they also would be capable of deciding on their own future.

40. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that before voting on the renewal of the Good Offices Committee the financial implications must be considered. In the absence of a programme of work for the Good Offices Committee it was impossible to give a detailed estimate for the time being. Assuming, however, that its programme of work would be comparable to that for 1958, the estimated expenditure would be approximately \$26,000.

41. He proposed, with the consent of the representative of Chile, that the Committee should vote first on the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) and

the various amendments thereto, beginning with the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535).

It was so decided.

The first eight-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.535, para. 1) was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Ceylon a vote on the second eight-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.535, para. 2) 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: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey.

Abstaining: Belgium, Japan.

That amendment was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to vote on the Chilean amendments (A/C.4/L.536) to the five-Power draft resolution.

At the request of the representative of Brazil a vote on the first amendment (A/C.4/L.536, para. 1) was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil.

Against: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina.

That amendment was adopted by 28 votes to 21 with 24 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, the eight-Power

amendments having been adopted, the representative of Chile had withdrawn his second amendment (A/C.4/L.536 paras. 2 and 3).

44. He invited the Committee to vote on the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532), as amended.

The preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 44 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Yugoslavia, a vote on operative paragraph 1 was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Abstaining: Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that at the request of the representative of Australia he would put operative paragraph 2 to the vote in two parts: first from the beginning of the paragraph up to and including the word "agreement": secondly, the remainder of the paragraph beginning with the words "which would continue" and including the amendments that had been adopted.

The first part of paragraph 2 was adopted by 60 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

At the request of the representative of Ceylon, a vote on the second part of paragraph 2, as amended, 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, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Against: Hungary.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Italy, New



Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada.

The second part of paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, a vote on paragraph 2 as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands.

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

Abstaining: Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Italy, New Zealand.

Paragraph 2 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 52 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

46. Mr. PHUONG MARGAIN (Cambodia) pointed out that the second part of paragraph 2 could not stand alone. He therefore did not consider it should have been voted on separately.

47. Mr. SZALL (Hungary) said that he had cast his vote against the second part of paragraph 2 in the belief that the vote was being taken on the paragraph as a whole. Had he realized that the vote was on the second part of the paragraph he would have voted in favour instead of against it.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 63 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 64 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

In the absence of any objection, paragraph 5 was adopted.

The five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.532) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 55 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.

48. Mr. COHEN (Chile) said that in view of the fact that the draft resolution that had been adopted included the eight-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.535) he would withdraw his delegation's draft resolution (A/C.4/L.531).

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.