

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 270th

MEETING

Tuesday, 11 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2219 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.221, A/C.4/L.224, A/C.4/L.227, A/C.4/L.228, A/C.4/L.230/Rev.1) (<i>continued</i>)	143
---	-----

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2219 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.221, A/C.4/L.224, A/C.4/L.227, A/C.4/L.228, A/C.4/L.230/Rev.1) (*continued*)

[Item 35]*

1. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that it was with growing weariness and discouragement that the Belgian delegation had followed the work of the Fourth Committee each year. In continuing to adopt resolutions imposing obligations on only a few of its members, the Committee seemed to have lost all sense of proportion and responsibility. It was now considering taking upon itself the right to question the methods of sovereign States in choosing their delegations to the United Nations. Such an attempt would be unthinkable in any Committee save the Fourth. In the other Main Committees there was one law for all Member States, but the majority in the Fourth Committee looked upon the law as applying only to the administering Powers. However, when all States which had within their territories peoples not yet administering themselves—including some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.221—recognized that under the terms of Article 73 e of the Charter they too were required to supply information, the atmosphere in the Fourth Committee might improve and a new sense of responsibility be born. The majority would perhaps realize that they too would have to comply with the resolutions adopted, and would not take far-reaching decisions as lightly as hitherto.

2. In subscribing to Chapter XI of the Charter, Belgium had undertaken to submit statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which it was responsible. When it had been proposed at San Francisco that the administering Powers should supply reports rather than information, and to the

General Assembly rather than to the Secretary-General, the administering Powers had refused to do so and the idea had been abandoned. When it had been suggested that the administering Powers should supply political information, they had again refused, and that idea too had been abandoned. It was now proposed that they should be invited to report on the reactions of legislative bodies in the Non-Self-Governing Territories to such resolutions as the one on the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information. In the eyes of the Belgian delegation, such reports would constitute political information, which Belgium had not undertaken to supply, and despite any General Assembly decision to that effect, it would not transmit such information. Belgium would support all resolutions which were in conformity with the obligations it had assumed in signing the Charter; likewise, it would reject any which were not in conformity with those obligations unless they applied to all States that administered Native populations. Despite the slanderous accusations of the USSR, it was the intention of Belgium to continue to fulfil its obligations under the Charter. Participation in the work of the Committee on Information was not such an obligation and although Belgian representatives had so far participated, Belgium had never undertaken to continue to do so in any and all circumstances.

3. Mr. McINNIS (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation was concerned over the implications of the draft resolution under discussion (A/C.4/L.221). It had voted for the continuation of the Committee on Information, despite the somewhat undesirable form of the draft resolution finally adopted at the 267th meeting, on the grounds that, properly used, the Committee could contribute to the achievement of the objectives of Chapter XI of the Charter. It had appreciated the doubts and reservations of the administering Powers but had felt, nevertheless, that in the present world circumstances a continuing attempt at co-operation within such a framework should be made. If the situation which had obtained when the Canadian delegation supported the draft resolution on the continuation

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

of the Committee on Information remained the same, it would support that resolution in the General Assembly. However, if new factors were introduced, it would have to reconsider its course of action.

4. The phrase "on the same basis", in the draft resolution on the continuation of the Committee on Information, was most important. It naturally excluded any formal change in the Committee's terms of reference. However, if any practical change were to be introduced by a subsequent resolution, altering the nature of the Committee's work, the Canadian delegation would have to reconsider its earlier stand. In its views, draft resolution A/C.4/L.221 tended to bring about such an alteration. On first seeing the resolution, it had been struck by the phrase which had also drawn the attention of the United States delegation and the amendments suggested by the United States (A/C.4/L.228) corresponded almost exactly to the views of the Canadian delegation. If the Committee on Information was to work effectively, it must constitute a basis for co-operation, and difficult demands must not be made nor elements of dissension introduced. The last phrase in the operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, and possibly operative paragraph 3 also, might have such a tendency. The doubts of the Canadian delegation would be largely resolved by the acceptance of the United States amendments. If those amendments were adopted, the Canadian delegation would recognize that the draft resolution was prompted by a desire for co-operation, and would accept a verbal clarification of the remainder of the original motion.

5. At the 393rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the leader of the Indian delegation had spoken on the colonial question, saying that she hoped that the transition to ultimate freedom would be smooth and swift. The Canadian delegation and Government had consistently supported that view and was reluctant to sacrifice one aspect of that transition to the other. It felt that the original draft resolution would not accelerate that transition but would diminish its smoothness. It hoped, therefore, that the Committee would support the United States amendment.

6. Mr. MIKAOUÏ (Lebanon) said that his delegation continued to regard the USSR amendment (A/C.4/L.224) as an improvement on the original draft resolution. However, it preferred the amendment proposed by Argentina, Bolivia, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and Syria, a revised text of which had now been submitted (A/C.4/L.230/Rev.1), on the grounds that it was more acceptable to a number of other delegations, and was therefore more likely to guarantee to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories effective association with the Committee on Information. If it was put to the vote first, the Lebanese delegation would vote in favour of it. However, if the USSR amendment was put to the vote first, the Lebanese delegation would be obliged to abstain. It would vote for the Brazilian amendments (A/C.4/L.227) and for the joint draft resolution with those amendments.

7. U THANT (Burma), speaking as one of the co-sponsors of the original draft resolution, said that it was in complete accordance with General Assembly resolution 566 (VI), which had considered that the direct association of the Non-Self-Governing Territo-

ries in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies was an effective means of promoting the progress of the peoples of those territories. Burma, which had struggled for its independence for several decades, could well understand the desire of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories for closer association with international bodies. The adoption of the draft resolution would be a boon to those peoples who were yearning for closer contact with United Nations activities. He did not believe that it had the implications feared by the administering Powers; in a sense, it was merely an expression of the hope that the administering Powers would extend the practice of associating suitably qualified persons from their territories in the work of the Committee and an invitation to them to send representatives of their dependent peoples to international conferences.

8. The Burmese delegation appreciated the sentiments of the USSR delegation on behalf of the dependent peoples, but could not accept its amendment; it sought to dictate a specific course of action to the administering Powers and was not in conformity with the spirit of the Charter. Paragraph 1 of the United States amendment was acceptable, as it would not materially affect the aims of the draft resolution; however, paragraph 2, which would defeat the whole purpose of the draft resolution, was not acceptable. There was no objection to the Brazilian amendment which did not alter or modify the original purpose of the draft resolution. The revised version of the nine-Power amendment was a shade milder than the first, which had been an improvement on the original draft resolution in clarity and force, but since it did not differ materially, it also was acceptable to the Burmese delegation.

9. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) said that when it had co-sponsored the joint draft resolution, the Indonesian delegation had not realized that the administering Powers would oppose it so strongly. He felt that such terms as "a constitutional monstrosity", which had been used by the Australian delegation, and "usurpation of powers of the administering Powers by the General Assembly", which had been used by certain Administering Members, were exaggerated and out of place. The resolution was in fact a moderate proposal offered in a spirit of conciliation. In reply to the Australian representative's question whether the Indonesian Government would agree to have Borneo represented in its delegation to the United Nations, he pointed out that he himself came from Borneo. He agreed that every Member State was entitled to determine the composition of its delegation to international conferences, but felt that operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution did not in any way impair that principle.

10. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution had met with strong objection from the administering Powers. However, General Assembly resolutions and Committee reports were not secret documents and should in fact be accessible to all. The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were entitled to know what was being done for them at the international level and to comment on any such action. Some Non-Self-Governing Territories had legislatures of their own which were in a position to express their opinions through elected representatives. That was why para-

graph 2 referred to "such territories as [had] legislatures". It did not go beyond the constitutional limits, because it did not create a direct relationship. It was the administering Powers which were invited to send the documents and they were invited to include the views of the legislatures in the information annually furnished to the Secretary-General.

11. Operative paragraph 3 introduced no new element. Since the Committee on Information had only studied the question of the participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in its work at one session, further study would be both useful and necessary.

12. The Indonesian delegation was willing to accept the Brazilian amendments to the draft resolution. With regard to the United States amendments, it was unable to accept paragraph 1 (a), on the grounds that it unduly limited the scope of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, although it regarded the addition proposed in paragraph 1 (b) as acceptable. It would oppose paragraph 2, which would delete the most important part of the draft resolution. The USSR amendment was substantially the same as the draft resolution, but for psychological reasons the Indonesian delegation preferred its own wording, and it would therefore oppose the USSR amendment. If the amendment suggested by the Danish delegation at the 269th meeting would facilitate the adoption of the draft resolution, the Indonesian delegation was willing to accept it. It would gladly vote in favour also of the nine-Power amendment. However, he did not agree with the Iraqi representative that the acceptance of the nine-Power amendment would mean that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should be dropped. He did not regard the amendments to paragraph 1 and paragraph 3 of the original draft resolution as mutually exclusive, but rather as complementary.

13. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that in discussing the question of the participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information, the Fourth Committee should be guided solely by the principles of Chapter XI of the Charter and in particular by Article 73, which stressed the need for recognition of the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount. If those interests could best be served by allowing representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to attend the Committee on Information, provision should be made for them to do so.

14. The report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2219 and Corr.1) pointed out in paragraph 15 and 16 of part two, in connexion with general social problems and policies in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, that the widest possible collaboration of the peoples, both in the planning and in the execution of programmes of social advancement, was not only desirable for reasons of social policy but also an economic necessity. The report also noted that no social or economic policy could be successful without the prior consent of the inhabitants, and the most democratic and efficient way of obtaining that consent was to seek the collaboration of the people in the formulation of policy as well as in its execution. Those remarks by the Committee on Information were very pertinent to the discussion,

particularly if it was recalled that the information supplied by the administering Powers was in many cases incomplete and unobjective. The participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would help to overcome some of the difficulties experienced by the Committee because of the inadequate and inaccurate information it received.

15. The Byelorussian delegation would therefore support the joint draft resolution as providing a fairly satisfactory answer to the problem. It would also support the USSR amendment on the grounds that it improved the draft resolution by making it more specific.

16. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that whereas the meaning of paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution had been quite clear, the same could not be said of the nine-Power amendment. He would like to know how its authors envisaged its practical implementation. For example, would the Committee on Information select the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories or would the administering Powers do so, and would such representatives participate in the Committee's work as members of the delegations of the administering Powers or in some other capacity? He wondered whether there was any significance in the change from the active to the passive mood in the revised version of the nine-Power amendment. Did the phrase "invites the Administering Members to make such participation possible" imply that their role would be confined to making it physically possible for representatives of the indigenous peoples to attend meetings of the Committee, i.e., by issuing passports and visas? He was not quite clear what the Iraqi representative had meant by saying that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution could be deleted if the nine-Power amendment were adopted.

17. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) felt that the draft resolution was constructive and, with certain amendments, worthy of approval. It was essential to ensure greater co-operation between the administering and non-administering members of the Committee on Information. The United States amendment and the nine-Power amendment, of which he was a co-sponsor, represented a compromise between the various trends evident in the Fourth Committee. He was prepared to support paragraph 1 of the United States amendment, but could support paragraph 2 only if the nine-Power amendment to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution were adopted; in that case, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would cease to have any *raison d'être*.

18. It would be for the administering Powers rather than the Committee on Information to select the representatives from the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Their participation in the Committee's work might be ensured by their integration in the delegations of the administering Powers, or the Committee as a whole might agree to allow certain representatives of institutions or groups to participate as such. It would not be advisable to attempt to specify the exact procedure in the draft resolution. In any event, the co-operation and goodwill of the administering Powers was essential; that was the idea expressed in the words "and invites the Administering Members to make such participation possible".

19. The first part of the nine-Power amendment had been reworded in the passive mood in order to overcome the doubts previously expressed by the French representative; in the revised text the initiative was left to the administering Powers rather than to the Committee on Information.

20. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) had no doubt of the great benefits which might be derived from the direct participation of the non-self-governing peoples in the work of the Committee on Information. Such participation would help to prepare them for the responsibilities which they would have to assume in, as he hoped, the near future. The Fourth Committee must determine the best way in which that participation could be ensured. The joint draft resolution represented a step in the right direction. Operative paragraph 1, however, could be interpreted in a number of ways and the purpose of the nine-Power amendment was to eliminate that ambiguity.

21. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) explained that he had not asked the Indonesian representative whether his delegation had seen fit to include a representative from Borneo, but whether he would be prepared to accept the right of the United Nations to direct his Government to include such a representative in its delegation. The Indonesian representative had not answered that question. The question was one of principle, applying to Borneo as much as to Papua, and the Australian position was consistent: Australia conceded Indonesia's right to select the members of its delegation and asked Indonesia to allow it the same right.

22. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said that his Government might be ready, in appropriate cases, to let Denmark be represented in the Fourth Committee and the Committee on Information by a compatriot from Greenland, designated upon recommendation of the National Council of Greenland. Such a representative, however, would attend meetings as a regular member of the Danish delegation, with equal rights of speaking and voting. Any other procedure would be inadequate and unacceptable.

23. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) agreed with the French and Indonesian representatives that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and the nine-Power amendment were not mutually exclusive. He had accepted the United States proposal to delete paragraph 3 in the hope of conciliation; since several members of the Committee were obviously against that deletion, he would not press for it.

24. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) recalled that his delegation had been one of the sponsors of resolution 566 (VI). He was glad to note the conciliatory spirit prevailing in the Fourth Committee and believed that the resolution finally adopted would please the majority of the Committee. His delegation would support the United States amendment.

25. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) has listened with interest to the lucid and able arguments of the Australian representative and was in general agreement with his stand both on principles and on voting on the joint draft resolution and the amendments to it.

26. His delegation was in favour of the Danish proposal to replace the word "discussion" in the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution by the word "work". It hoped that the other sponsors of the joint draft resolution would follow the example of Indonesia and Burma and agree to it.

27. It had been alleged that the administering Powers had not been willing to make concessions to meet the majority point of view. That that was not really the case was proved by the following examples: first, New Zealand had voluntarily submitted political information not required under the Charter with regard to its Non-Self-Governing Territories; secondly, his Government had been prepared to acquiesce in the re-establishment of the Committee on Information as proposed in the joint United States-Venezuelan amendment (A/C.4/L.223/Rev.1) and had reluctantly voted against the final draft resolution because that amendment had not been accepted in its entirety; thirdly, his Government was prepared to accept the General Assembly's opinion on the composition of the New Zealand delegation to the Committee on Information, though that represented a certain limitation of sovereignty, a limitation which would not affect the Committee as a whole, but only the eight administering Powers.

28. It had further been alleged that the argument advanced by the administering Powers against the constitutionality and value of the Committee were flimsy. Those arguments had not been seriously examined; the non-administering Powers had merely reiterated in very general terms that the participation of the indigenous inhabitants would be useful and valuable. The strong language used by certain administering Powers, while perhaps regrettable, might be due to the fact that they felt that such language was the only way to ensure that their legal arguments would be considered. He took strong exception to the USSR representative's contention that the administering Powers had threatened not to carry out its obligations and he did not believe that any administering Power had threatened not to do so.

29. The joint draft resolution had been described as a concession to the point of view of the administering Powers. He agreed with the Indian representative that there was some similarity between the preamble and paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution, on the one hand, and the text submitted by the United States delegation in the Committee on Information (A/2219 and Corr.1, part one, para. 97), on the other. There the similarity ended: paragraphs 2 and 3 of the joint draft resolution introduced entirely new elements.

30. Much had been said about the welfare of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Certain representatives seemed to be more concerned with speaking ill of the administering Powers than with promoting that welfare. He urged the members of the Fourth Committee to be realistic and to face the fact that without the co-operation of the administering and non-administering Powers there was no possibility of furthering the welfare of the indigenous populations or of promoting the orderly advancement towards self-government which they all desired. The United States amendment represented the best possible compromise, and he urged the Committee to support it.

31. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) pointed out that the joint draft resolution appeared to be the logical result of General Assembly resolution 566 (VI) and, as such, entirely acceptable. It merely asked for an extension by the administering Powers of the practice of associating suitably qualified persons from their Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information and invited that Committee to continue the study requested by the General Assembly.

32. The various amendments, however, completely changed the picture. The fact that the Committee had discussed the question of participation at considerable length without being able to reach agreement did not mean that the matter should not be studied further; on the contrary, it was highly advisable that the discussion should be continued. Paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution was extremely important, therefore, and should be retained. If the nine-Power amendment were adopted, paragraph 3 would logically become unnecessary, for the question would have been decided once and for all and no further study would be required. He recalled the French proverb "*Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien*"; in his opinion the Committee would be over-hasty if it were to adopt any amendment which implied that there was no need for further study. That was particularly true in view of the fact that the next item on the Fourth Committee's agenda was the question of "factors", which opened up vast possibilities. He would therefore vote in favour of paragraphs 1 and 3 of the joint draft resolution rather than the nine-Power amendment. He had no objection to the United States amendment to paragraph 2, which did not modify the purpose of the draft resolution.

33. Certain representatives had stressed that, by its decision at its 267th meeting, the Fourth Committee had renewed the Committee on Information "on the same basis" as before. Although that was true, it should be remembered that the Committee had already been given the task of studying the question of participation. There was nothing in the joint draft resolution, therefore, to surprise the administering Powers, who must consider it in the light of General Assembly resolution 566 (VI). He urged the Committee to vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood. It marked a constructive line of evolution which should be continued; it expressed the Fourth Committee's real purpose and was more conducive to co-operation than any of the amendments.

34. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) drew the United States representative's attention to the fact that in the majority of Non-Self-Governing Territories it was constitutionally impossible for communications to be transmitted from the metropolitan government to the local legislative branch. Unless special legislation were enacted, such communications could be transmitted only to the local executive branch.

35. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) replied that his delegation had always contemplated that the administering Power would transmit the communications in question through whatever channels were appropriate in each constitutional system.

36. He had been somewhat confused by the series of explanations on the numerous amendments submitted. The revised version of the nine-Power amendment had at first seemed preferable to the original text. After

the explanations that had been given, however, he was not so sure. Whereas paragraph 1 of the draft resolution logically followed on from the last paragraph of the preamble, that was not true of the nine-Power amendment, which, besides, was not in accord with the general approach outlined by the Indian representative.

37. His delegation had proposed the deletion of paragraph 3 because it felt that the question of participation had already been adequately studied. It would, as a matter of principle, have to vote against the Brazilian amendment and the nine-Power amendment; should they be rejected, however, and paragraph 1 adopted as it stood, in order to meet the wishes expressed by other delegations, his delegation would not press for the deletion of paragraph 3. It maintained its amendments to paragraph 2.

38. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) was not sure of the exact implications of the revised nine-Power amendment. He felt that it might be conceived as going far beyond what had originally been proposed in the joint draft resolution, since it might even permit direct association not only of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories as such but of groups in those territories, as had been proposed by the USSR in the Committee on Information (A/2219 and Corr.1, part one, para. 96).

39. His delegation had always been in favour of giving the Non-Self-Governing Territories a voice in the Committee on Information, but it recognized that such participation could be achieved only with the co-operation of the administering Powers. It could not agree to any territory being associated in the work of the United Nations without the approval of the authority internationally responsible for that territory under the Charter and international law. Adoption of the nine-Power amendment could give rise to a number of difficulties.

40. The phrase "qualified indigenous representatives" was not clear. It might refer to qualified indigenous persons who would participate in the Committee's work as members of the delegations of the administering Powers, or to representatives of the governments in the Non-Self-Governing Territories appointed with the consent and on the initiative of the administering Powers. If either of those interpretations was correct, it was acceptable. But it might open the door to all and sundry who claimed to represent the indigenous peoples, a step to which the administering Powers could justifiably object. Unless some explanation was forthcoming, he would have to abstain from voting on the nine-Power amendment and would vote in favour of the original paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution. He deeply regretted the uncompromising and unjust attitude of the administering Powers, but he emphasized that the Committee should be careful not to justify their assertion that its actions constituted an infringement of their rights.

41. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) was surprised at the Brazilian representative's interpretation of the nine-Power amendment. He thought he had made it clear that that was not its implication.

42. Mr. VILLAMIL (Honduras) was in favour of the joint draft resolution with paragraph 1 of the

Brazilian amendment and the nine-Power amendment. He was not in favour of paragraph 2 of the Brazilian amendment.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Burma, India, Indonesia and Pakistan (A/C.4/L.221) would be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to the Brazilian amendment to the third paragraph of the preamble, to the effect that the words "the closer association" should be replaced by "direct participation" (A/C.4/L.227, para. 1); and to a verbal proposal made at the 269th meeting by the Danish representative to the effect that the word "discussions" should be replaced by the word "work".

The third paragraph of the preamble, as amended, was adopted by 40 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part proposed by the delegation of the USSR (A/C.4/L.224) was rejected by 23 votes to 7, with 22 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the nine-Power amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part (A/C.4/L.230/Rev.1).

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

In favour: Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

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

Abstaining: Philippines, Thailand, Brazil, Canada, China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, India.

The amendment was adopted by 31 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions.

The first United States amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part (A/C.4/L.228, para 1 (a)) was adopted by 32 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

The second United States amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part (A/C.4/L.228, para 1 (b)) was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the operative part, as amended, was adopted by 44 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the United States amendment concerning paragraph 3 of the operative part (A/C.4/L.228, para. 2).

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

In favour: Haiti, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Guatemala.

Against: Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt.

Abstaining: Iran, Liberia, Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece.

The amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 17, with 15 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 3 of the operative part (A/C.4/L.227, para. 2), whereby the words "to study the further question of the direct association" would be replaced by "further to study the question of direct participation".

Paragraph 3 of the operative part, as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to 12, with 1 abstention.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.221) as a whole, as amended.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Greece, Israel, Norway.

The draft resolution was adopted by 40 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

46. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) explained that he had voted for the United States amendment to the effect that paragraph 3 of the operative part should be deleted, in a spirit of conciliation; but since that amendment had been rejected, he had voted in favour of retaining the paragraph.

47. Mr. PONCE YEPEZ (Ecuador) considered that the preamble of the draft resolution was of some value. He had been obliged to vote against the USSR amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part because he felt it was an attempt to impose a binding obligation on the administering Powers.

48. He had voted for the United States amendments to paragraph 2, as they eliminated certain points which might have constituted interference in the administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

49. He had supported paragraph 3 as amended by Brazil because he considered that the procedure suggested would be appropriate and effective.

50. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) emphasized that his vote on the joint draft resolution and the amendments thereto had been consistent with his attitude as expressed in the general debate, and was inspired by the wish to find immediately the best possible means of securing the participation of representatives of the indigenous peoples in the work of the Committee on Information.

51. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) had voted against the nine-Power proposal because he would have preferred to retain the original text of the joint draft resolution, of which he had clearly expressed his support.

52. He had voted against paragraph 2 of the United States amendment and in favour of retaining paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution in support of his view that the study called for by General Assembly resolution 566 (VI) should be continued in order to encourage constructive co-operation between the administering Powers and the non-administering Powers.

53. He had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole after the adoption of the nine-Power amendment in order to mark his preference for the original idea embodied in the joint draft resolution.

54. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) had voted for the renewal of the Committee on Information because he felt it would be useful not only to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories but also to the administering Powers themselves. He had also been in favour of stating the principle that a closer association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Committee's work would be of great assistance in promoting the progress of those territories towards the goals set forth in Chapter XI of the Charter.

55. He had been unable to support the proposal that the functions of the Committee on Information should be enlarged to include consideration of the views of the legislatures of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, as that might entail constitutional difficulties.

56. He considered paragraph 3 of the operative part to be unnecessary. After the adoption of the United States amendments to paragraph 2 of the operative part, however, he had been glad to be able to support the draft resolution as a whole.

57. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested that much of the Committee's time might be saved if a member of the Secretariat were to be appointed as a "language officer" with whom members of the Committee could get in touch on matters of translation.

58. Mr. BENSON (Secretariat) said that that was being done.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.