



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Mahmoud Azmi.....	165
Programme of work.....	165
Agenda item 31:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories trans- mitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on In- formation from Non-Self-Governing Territories ( <i>con-        tinued</i> ):	165
(a) Information on economic conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) Transmission of information;	
(d) Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories	

**Chairman: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).**

***Tribute to the memory of Mr. Mahmoud Azmi***

1. The CHAIRMAN said he was sure that the Committee would wish to discharge a sad duty before taking up the business of the day. As the members had heard, Mr. Azmi had collapsed at the 684th meeting of the Security Council, on 3 November 1954, and had died shortly afterwards. It would be for the General Assembly and its President to pay a tribute to that loyal citizen of Egypt, that good man who had died while discharging his duties to his country and to the United Nations. The Committee wished, however, to pay its respects to Mr. Azmi, who at the present session had been Egypt's Permanent Representative to the United Nations and Chairman of the Egyptian delegation. The Committee would undoubtedly wish to convey its deepest sympathy and its sincere condolences to the Egyptian delegation. He proposed that the Committee should observe a minute's silence.

*The Committee observed a minute's silence in memory of Mr. Mahmoud Azmi.*

2. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) said that Mr. Azmi's sudden death, which had occurred at the moment when he was admirably defending the interests of Egypt and the Arab world, was a cruel blow to all his colleagues and friends. Mr. Azmi had been a great patriot, a distinguished man of letters and a skilful diplomat. He had concerned himself up to the last moment with international security, peace, prosperity and co-operation. Mr. Itani recalled the enthusiasm with which Mr. Azmi had fought for the ideal of the United Nations in the Commission on Human Rights. Together with all the Arab delegations, Mr. Itani joined with the Egyptian Government in mourning its loss and extended to it his heartfelt condolences.

3. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Latin-American delegations, Mr. TRIANTA-PHYLLAKOS (Greece), Mr. SINGH (India), speaking on behalf of the Indian and Indonesian delegations, Miss BROOKS (Liberia), Mr. Fida Muhammad KHAN (Pakistan), Mr. S. S. LIU (China), Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America), Mr. HARARI (Israel), Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. PIGNON (France), Mr. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia), Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom), Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Burmese and Brazilian delegations, Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the New Zealand and Netherlands delegations, and Mr. LYNKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) joined in the tribute paid to the memory of Mr. Azmi and extended their condolences to the Egyptian Government.

4. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) thanked the members of the Committee for the sympathy they had shown in the cruel bereavement which his country had just suffered.

***Programme of work***

5. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that when agenda item 32 (a), relating to Greenland, was discussed, two of that Territory's representatives in the Danish Parliament would be included among the members of the Danish delegation.

6. Turning to the question of requests for hearings, he recalled that the Committee had granted fourteen hearings—eight concerning Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration and six concerning the Cameroons under French administration. The petitioners had already been informed of the Committee's decision concerning them. It would, however, be desirable to notify them in good time of the date on which the hearings would be granted so that they could make arrangements to proceed to New York. He proposed that the hearings concerning the Cameroons under French administration (A/C.4/262, A/C.4/264, A/C.4/267) should be granted during the week from 15 to 19 November and those concerning Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration (A/C.4/262, A/C.4/266, A/C.4/268 to 273) during the week from 22 to 26 November.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 31**

**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/2651, A/2652, A/**

**2653, A/2654 and Add.1 to 3, A/2655, A/2657 and Add.1 to 4, A/2658, A/2729) (continued):**

- (a) Information on economic conditions;**
- (b) Information on other conditions;**
- (c) Transmission of information;**
- (d) Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories**

7. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation had not taken part in the general discussion of the item under consideration simply because it had not wished to prolong the debate excessively. His country was not, however, indifferent to the fate of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He would like to make a few general remarks, which he would confine to the area south of the Sahara, whose difficulties he was better able to appreciate. He recalled in that connexion that he personally represented his country in an African regional commission one of whose principal aims was to assist in the technical development of the territories under its jurisdiction.

8. His country was not unaware of the fact that its progress was linked to that of the rest of Africa. It also realized the magnitude of the task to be accomplished. The primary need was to develop productive capacity, and that implied the furnishing of capital and the training of key personnel. It was also necessary to control disease, conserve and improve the soil, modernize agricultural methods, improve the quality of livestock, improve nutrition and provide adequate housing, especially in the areas that were undergoing industrialization. A marginal economy must be modernized and the people provided with the schools that would enable them to raise their living standards. That was why the Union of South Africa was endeavouring to encourage the technical development of the African territories in every possible way, and its efforts in that direction had led it to take a keen interest in the debates of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

9. He recalled that in the opinion of his delegation the Committee on Information was in some respects a means of bringing political pressure to bear on the Administering Members, but he realized that it had enabled non-administering Members to gain a better insight into the complexity of the problems in the Territories. That Committee's most recent report (A/2729) was the best published so far, because it gave considerably more space to expert opinions and tended to exclude political considerations. He hoped that the Committee on Information would continue along the same lines, and suggested to that end that the representatives appointed to that Committee by the administering and non-administering Powers should be experts rather than administrators or diplomats. That would give added value to the report of the Committee on Information and would thus enable the Fourth Committee to concentrate on the fundamental problems of the Territories, which, it should be repeated, were not political.

10. In view of the conclusions of the report of the Committee on Information, he would be pleased to support draft resolution B (A/2729, part one, annex II), it being understood that there was no change in the Union of South Africa's position with regard to the constitutionality of that body.

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO (A/2729, PART ONE, ANNEX II, A/C.4/L.343, A/C.4/L.344, A/C.4/L.345)**

11. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) recalled that he had already informed the Committee on Information that the procedure laid down in draft resolution A in the report (A/2729, part one, annex II) would not fit into the normal services of the Technical Assistance Administration. He reaffirmed that it was undesirable for the resolution to refer to the Technical Assistance Administration. TAA fellowships and scholarships were awarded at the request of the country concerned and fitted into an over-all programme. The Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration felt that, under those conditions, his department could not implement the plan laid down in draft resolution A with the staff and resources at its disposal. Mr. Hoo added, however, that with the amendments in documents A/C.4/L.343 and A/C.4/L.344 the difficulties of draft resolution A would be avoided.

12. He explained that if paragraph 3 of either document A/C.4/L.343 or document A/C.4/L.344 were adopted, the Secretariat would interpret it as involving no additional publication but the inclusion of the necessary details in existing publications.

13. U HLA AUNG (Burma) said that the purpose of the amendments proposed in document A/C.4/L.343 was to restore the text originally introduced in the Committee on Information by India and Burma (A/2729, part one, para. 33) and to take account of the amendments suggested in that Committee by Guatemala (A/AC.35/L.180). Most States admitted the need to accelerate the pace of education in the Territories. That was why it was proposed in the draft, that measures should be taken to that end. Moreover, by adopting procedures which would enable assistance in the field of educational advancement to be increased, it might be possible to lessen the criticisms directed at the Administering Members and thereby to fulfil more effectively the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter.

14. He recalled the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 557 (VI), 743 (VIII) and 753 (VIII) concerning the award of scholarships and fellowships. At the last session of the Committee on Information, the Indian and Burmese delegations had considered that the time had come to provide, in the most simple form possible, for offers of scholarships to the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. While there had been no substantial opposition to that course, various amendments to the draft had been introduced and had been included in draft resolution A.

15. The reason why the nine Powers were proposing an amendment to paragraph 3 was that it was administratively inappropriate to by-pass the Secretary-General and to attempt to deal directly with the Technical Assistance Administration, which was under his instructions. There was some similarity in that respect between the nine-Power amendments and those of the United Kingdom (A/C.4/L.344). The United Kingdom amendments, however, would have the effect of reducing the part to be taken by the Secretary-General to that of reporting in a minor way on events already covered in the reports to the Committee on Information. In particular, the outright deletion of paragraph 5, as pro-

posed by the United Kingdom, seemed to deprive the resolution of any effective purpose.

16. He was convinced that if the United Kingdom delegation would consider those questions more closely, it might perhaps be willing to support the joint amendments.

17. His delegation was pleased to be able to accept the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.345) and thought that the other sponsors of the joint amendments would also be able to support it after the United States representative had clarified certain points in connexion with it.

18. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom) pointed out that the preamble of draft resolution A submitted by the Committee on Information mentioned the inadequacies in the people's education and in educational facilities in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. While his delegation did not ask for the deletion of those expressions, it thought that they savoured of the abstract and "ideal" criticism to which he had previously referred (411th meeting). With regard to the Territories administered by the United Kingdom, education was certainly inadequate in the sense that much still remained to be done, but it was not so if the expression was intended to mean that the Governments of the United Kingdom Territories, and the United Kingdom Government itself, were not continuously making energetic efforts to improve the situation. He cited the progress made in the Territories administered by his country, especially in the field of higher education. The capital assistance granted or pledged by the United Kingdom for that purpose amounted to about £10 million.

19. He had cited those facts because he was convinced that all the members of the Committee felt, as he did, that the Non-Self-Governing Territories should look to their own institutions for the fulfilment of their hopes and ambitions in the matter of education.

20. His country did not on that account appreciate less highly the generosity of the Member States which offered scholarships and fellowships to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It had always welcomed that generosity and would continue to do so. He nevertheless felt that their educational purpose could be achieved only if they were co-ordinated with the speedy development of educational facilities within the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That consideration brought up the question of the offers of and applications for educational facilities. The amendments proposed by his delegation (A/C.4/L.344) were intended to retain the essential purpose expressed in the draft resolution originally submitted to the Committee on Information by India and Burma, and at the same time to avoid any complications of a practical nature. His country had for many years been conducting scholarship programmes in direct consultation with other Governments in the interests of the peoples of certain Non-Self-Governing Territories, and that system worked with a minimum of complications. His delegation had no objection to the Secretary-General's being informed about that co-operation in detail, and thought that the Secretary-General would have no difficulty in assuming the duties which would be assigned to him under the United Kingdom amendments. His delegation thought it inappropriate, however, that the Secretary-General should himself become a transmitting agent duplicating the direct channels

which already existed and which could doubtless be extended.

21. There was nothing at present to show that the system set up for the granting of scholarships in the Trust Territories was a precedent worth following. His country had cause to regret the complications resulting from the multiplicity of channels of transmission used in giving effect to the scheme, for, in addition to the purely administrative difficulties, there was a danger that the educational objectives might be thwarted through a lack of proper co-ordination.

22. He hoped that the members of the Committee would accept the explanations he had just given and would vote for the draft resolution in the light of the United Kingdom amendments. If those amendments were adopted, his delegation would be happy to vote for the draft resolution as a whole. If, however, the Committee adopted the amendments proposed in document A/C.4/L.343, his delegation would be unable to vote for the draft resolution as a whole as thus amended.

23. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that his delegation was submitting the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.345, because the United States would like to be consulted on the procedure contemplated in the draft resolution. His Government had long been interested in exchanges of educational facilities and, as an Administering Member, felt that it could make a more constructive contribution if its amendment were adopted.

24. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation, in sponsoring the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.343, had wished to join with the other sponsors of that draft in persuading the Committee to return to the spirit of the proposal originally submitted by India and Burma to the Committee on Information. Those two delegations had wished to extend the benefit of scholarships to a particular class of young persons living in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

25. He would regret it very much if the French representative maintained his position on the draft resolution, and in that connexion he wished to correct an error in a statement regarding him made by Mr. Pignon at the Committee's 415th meeting. Contrary to what Mr. Pignon seemed to have understood, the present speaker had said at the 410th meeting that the original draft resolution had invited Member States to extend generously offers of scholarships to students in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, not only for study of university standard but, in the first place, for study at the post-primary level, etc. He had not, therefore, said that the scholarships in question were intended for post-primary and vocational education "rather than university studies". He had furthermore said at the 410th meeting that, in his opinion and under the terms of the draft resolution, the scholarships would relate to all aspects of post-primary and higher education and to all scientific and cultural fields.

26. Everyone knew that, for reasons which it was unnecessary to enumerate, priority should be given to fellowships when a programme of scholarships and fellowships abroad was being drafted. However, a fellowship, as its French name *bourse de perfectionnement* implied, presupposed that a student had been able in his home country to attend a school enabling him to acquire a basic training in the branch of study he had chosen. If there was no such school, or if the branch of study concerned was not taught in the country of origin,

there could be no question of a fellowship. It was certainly preferable by far that a student should have completed all his primary and secondary studies in his own country before proceeding abroad to continue his studies, but consideration had to be given to the particular circumstances of countries or Territories whose educational institutions could not accommodate all who wished and were able to receive a secondary education. The same remark applied to post-primary and post-secondary vocational education.

27. Recalling that the Committee on Information had observed in its 1953 report that in almost all the Territories the education provided did not yet satisfy the needs of the peoples either in quantity or in quality (A/2465, part two, para. 10), he felt that emphasis should be placed not so much on fixed conceptions concerning the part that scholarships and fellowships might play in training the élite of the indigenous inhabitants but rather on a practical solution of the problem pending the time when the Administering Members would be in a position to put adequate educational facilities for the indigenous peoples into operation at every level.

28. Turning to the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.4/L.344), he noted with pleasure that the United Kingdom delegation, recognizing the mistake made in the Committee on Information, proposed to eliminate the reference to the Technical Assistance Administration and restore the Secretary-General's authority and prerogatives. The United Kingdom delegation was thus recognizing that the Haitian delegation's criticisms had been well founded. The amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegation did not, however, fully satisfy the Haitian delegation for the reasons which the Burmese representative had just explained. Moreover, the United Kingdom delegation had formally stated that it did not accept the amendments in document A/C.4/L.343.

29. His delegation had no objection to the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.345) if the procedure to be established for the distribution of the fellowships and scholarships would thereby be facilitated. It would like, however, to hear the views on that point of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.4/L.343.

30. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that his country's position on the advantages which the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories might derive from progress in education had already been explained by him at the 415th meeting. He still thought that only fellowships could be of real help to the inhabitants of those Territories.

31. So far as the procedural and administrative aspects of the question were concerned, he felt obliged to say that the Assistant Secretary-General's statement had not convinced him at all. If it was necessary to make some change in the Technical Assistance Administration's present methods, that was a reform that should take very little time. If the Technical Assistance Administration needed to recruit even one additional official to deal with the allocation of half a dozen fellowships, it was in serious need of reform.

32. In reply to the Haitian representative, he said that he had accurately quoted the summary record in which the statement made by that representative at the 410th meeting was reported. He would shortly prove

that. He had fully understood the Haitian representative's generous attitude, but to his great regret he could not follow him at the practical level.

33. Mr. SINGH (India) was surprised at the United Kingdom representative's remark that the preamble to draft resolution A might give the impression that the Administering Members were not making the necessary efforts to ensure progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It had never occurred to the Burmese and Indian delegations that the draft might be so construed. On the contrary, his delegation had, in the Committee on Information, paid a sincere tribute to the efforts made by the Administering Members in that connexion.

34. If the United Kingdom delegation had made that observation earlier, the sponsors of the amendments would certainly have hastened to add a paragraph paying a tribute to the efforts being made by the Administering Members to ensure the advancement of the peoples in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. If some Administering Members felt that the preamble as it stood was open to the interpretation put on it by the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Singh would be grateful if they would say so frankly so that the sponsors of the amendments would do what was necessary to preclude such an interpretation.

35. He pointed out that the object of the draft resolution was not to send students from Non-Self-Governing Territories to learn languages and occupations which would be useless to them when they returned home. He wished in that connexion to draw the Committee's attention to the example set by Indonesia. The scholarships and fellowships offered by that country were not granted on the condition that the students went to study in Indonesia but they enabled young people from the Non-Self-Governing Territories to go to any country. Young students from Non-Self-Governing Territories would, moreover, profit more if they did not go to countries that were much more advanced than their own Territories because by not going there they would avoid having to accustom themselves to methods and equipment which they would not be able to use on their return home.

36. He supported the appeal made by the Haitian representative, for only through education would the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories be able to achieve economic, social and cultural advancement. He therefore requested all Member States to be generous enough to offer fellowships and scholarships which would enable young people from the Non-Self-Governing Territories to pursue their studies.

37. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he was in general agreement with the Indian representative on the third paragraph of the preamble. That paragraph should not be taken as a criticism of the Administering Members; it was a simple statement of fact, as the United Kingdom representative had himself admitted when he had said that much remained to be done in some Non-Self-Governing Territories.

38. The procedure suggested by the nine delegations in their joint amendments (A/C.4/L.343) was intended not to replace but to supplement the existing procedure so as to permit international co-operation in that field. Consequently, it would not, as the United Kingdom representative had feared, interfere with the

normal course of offers of and requests for educational facilities.

39. The Yugoslav delegation was able to accept the second part of the United Kingdom delegation's first amendment (A/C.4/L.344) to operative paragraph 3, as it was similar to what had been proposed by the nine Powers. With regard to the first part, the proposal that the words "for their information" should be added after the words "Administering Members and" did not seem to be compatible with the operative paragraph 5 proposed in the nine-Power amendments, which requested the Secretary-General to establish a procedure. The Yugoslav delegation would not, therefore, be able to vote for the United Kingdom proposal.

40. The United Kingdom went on to propose that paragraph 5 of the operative part of the draft resolution should be deleted, but the Yugoslav delegation would have difficulty in accepting that proposal, as it was diametrically opposed to the nine-Power suggestion.

41. If paragraph 7 as proposed by the United Kingdom was intended not to replace but to supplement paragraph 7 as proposed in the nine-Power amendments, the Yugoslav delegation was prepared to vote for it.

42. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) did not regard the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.345) as intrinsically bad. However, the Administering Members had quite different ideas on the economic, social and cultural development of indigenous peoples, and the various delegations should therefore consider the amendment carefully before voting upon it.

43. Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) observed that no delegation had directly opposed draft resolution A submitted by the Committee on Information in the general debate, but no delegation had been completely in favour of it. It might have been drafted too hastily, but he did not think it had deserved quite so much criticism so far as its substance was concerned.

44. Of the three sets of amendments, that proposed by the United States seemed to have met with no opposition. In the case of the two others, there did not seem to be a very great difference of opinion on paragraph 7. The only objection had come from the Burmese representative, who had said that paragraph 7 of the nine-Power proposal was not identical with the paragraph 7 proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

45. The Guatemalan delegation hoped that the nine Powers and the United Kingdom delegation could agree to accept each other's proposals. The Guatemalan delegation would like to be informed on that possibility before voting.

46. It would also like to ask the United Kingdom representative why he wanted to delete paragraph 5.

47. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation had suggested the deletion of paragraph 5 of the original text because it saw no need to increase the number of channels dealing with offers of and requests for scholarships. There seemed to be no good reason for bringing in the Secretary-General for that purpose.

48. Paragraph 7 as proposed by the United Kingdom was intended to replace paragraph 7 in the original text.

49. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation would have great difficulty in voting. It fully appreciated the administrative difficulties which were like-

ly to be raised by the draft resolution and which had called forth objections from the United Kingdom and France. It would therefore be prepared to vote for the joint amendments and for some parts of the United Kingdom and United States amendments. For example, a passage could be added to the paragraph 7 submitted by the nine Powers to provide that the Secretary-General would consult the Administering Members in order to issue details of offers of facilities. The Committee should not adopt the Guatemalan representative's suggestion to put together the paragraph 7 proposed by the nine Powers and the United Kingdom delegation's paragraph 7 as that would lead to redundancy and contradiction.

50. He wondered whether all sponsors of amendments could not try to reconcile their points of view.

51. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) stated that he was prepared to accept the United States amendment, which meant, he thought, that the Secretary-General would have to consult the Administering Members before establishing the procedure contemplated in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

52. He hoped that the United Kingdom representative would make it quite clear whether the new paragraph 7 proposed by the United Kingdom delegation was an addition to or a replacement of the original paragraph 7.

53. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) agreed with the French representative. The only offers of importance to the indigenous students were those which provided fellowships or in other words courses which were not available in their own Territories, for it was better for a student to receive his education in his own country if it provided the same facilities for study as another country. For example, it was much better for Congolese students to study agronomy in the agricultural schools of the Congo where they would be trained in methods suited to the climate and local conditions. Furthermore, if a student remained in his own country, the diploma he received on completing his studies would be recognized there, while the diploma he received elsewhere would not necessarily be recognized in his own country.

54. He pointed out that in the Belgian Congo all the education that the indigenous inhabitants were capable of assimilating was provided free of charge. During the current year the administering Power had opened the first Congo university, in which there were as many instructors as pupils. That university could receive all indigenous inhabitants qualified to take university courses.

55. With regard to the proposals before the Committee, his delegation would be able to support the United States amendment and the United Kingdom amendments, but not the draft resolution as a whole.

56. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt), as a co-sponsor of the joint amendments, had no objections to the United States amendment. He agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the third amendment submitted by the United Kingdom should be incorporated in the nine-Power amendments. Thus, paragraph 7 would be divided into three sub-paragraphs: a sub-paragraph (a) containing the first part of the paragraph 7 proposed by the nine Powers, a sub-paragraph (b) consisting of the second part of that paragraph, and a sub-paragraph (c) consisting of the paragraph 7 proposed by the United Kingdom.

57. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom), replying to the Yugoslav representative, reaffirmed that his delegation did not object to the addition of its paragraph 7 to the original text or to the nine-Power text. That, however, did not commit his delegation on paragraph 7 of the joint amendments.

58. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) agreed with the Venezuelan representative's suggestion that the sponsors of the amendments should meet in order to draw up a joint draft.

59. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) supported the nine-Power amendments as a whole but considered that the second of those amendments should be further clarified so that the offers might be awarded by preference to the indigenous inhabitants of the territories. The third amendment was incomplete in mentioning only UNESCO, because scholarships might also be of concern to other specialized agencies.

60. He could not support the United Kingdom amendments, because he opposed the adoption of a text which might give rise to difficulties in the granting of scholarships.

61. He would support the United States amendment if its author agreed to the insertion of the words "so far as possible" between the words "in consultation" and the words "with the Administering Members".

62. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) drew attention to the wording of the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Information. Although English was not his mother tongue, he thought that that text was verbose, vague and confusing. He objected in particular to the use of the word "facilities", which he regarded as applicable only to material means but which was used in the draft to denote scholarships and fellowships. He read out a number of passages which he had drafted and which would be an improvement on, for example, the first and third paragraphs of the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part. He thought that the text should be referred to a drafting group, which, in endeavouring to reach an agreement on the substance of the question, would also improve the wording.

63. The CHAIRMAN hoped that the Committee itself could settle the matter, but thought that the situation had become somewhat confused. He was prepared, if the members of the Committee so desired, to request the sponsors of the various amendments to meet and draw up a text which would not present any difficulties. He pointed out, however, that the Fourth Committee

was considerably behind the other Committees in its work and had not yet completed consideration of any items on its agenda.

64. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) thought that the situation was quite clear and considered that the Committee should proceed to a vote immediately.

65. Mr. SINGH (India) believed that the differences between the sponsors of the amendments did not concern the form but the substance of the matter and that nothing would be gained by a meeting between them. The Committee should therefore proceed to the vote immediately. The wording of the draft resolution might not be perfect, but the important point was for it to be carried out in the proper spirit.

66. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) formally proposed the postponement of the vote until after the sponsors of the amendments had met.

67. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), supported by Mrs. SHELTON (Cuba) and Mr. SINGH (India), pointed out that in the afternoon a number of the Committee's members wished to join in the last respects paid to Mr. Azmi. She therefore proposed that the Committee should cancel its meeting and meet on the following morning.

68. Mr. U HLA AUNG (Burma), supported by Mr. PIGNON (France), thought that a vote should be taken immediately.

69. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the proposal by the representative of Yemen, namely that the vote should be postponed.

*That part of the proposal was adopted by 23 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.*

70. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that under the Yemen proposal the sponsors of amendments had also been requested to meet and draw up a joint text.

71. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. SINGH (India) and Mr. RIFAI (Syria) observed that the authors of amendments could not be forced to meet if they did not wish to do so and that they certainly could not be compelled to submit a joint draft.

72. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) stated that he would not insist upon a vote being taken on the second part of his proposal.

73. The CHAIRMAN announced that the meeting scheduled for the afternoon would be cancelled.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.