



**CONTENTS**

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters IV and V) ( <i>continued</i> )..... | 241  |

**Chairman: Mr. G. F. DAVIDSON (Canada).**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters IV and V) (A/2430, E/2447, A/C.3/L.367 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.371/Rev.1) (*continued*)**

[Item 12]\*

**HUMAN RIGHTS (*continued*)**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY TWENTY POWERS (A/C.3/L.371/REV.1) (*continued*)<sup>1</sup>**

***Right of peoples and of nations to self-determination (continued)***

1. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) recalled that the Committee had had before it two draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.369 and A/C.3/L.371) relating to international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination. That proved the common interest demonstrated in the matter by twenty Member States and revealed the significance of the spirit in which the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.369 had withdrawn their text in order to join with the sponsors of the second draft resolution. The Afghan delegation, like other delegations which had submitted draft resolutions at the current or previous sessions, had always taken a deep interest in the question of international respect for the right of self-determination. The statements and votes of many delegations which had not submitted resolutions showed that they also were much interested. In submitting the joint draft resolution, of which he was one of the sponsors, he wished to stress the increasing and enthusiastic support of a growing number of Member States for the right of self-determination.

2. The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.371/Rev.1) before the Committee was simple and self-explanatory. It was based on General Assembly resolution 637 C (VII) and Economic and Social Council resolution 472 (XV). The Assembly and the Council had requested the Commission on Human Rights to prepare recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination. The Commission on

Human Rights had not been in a position to prepare the required recommendations at its ninth session and had stated that it had not had time. In that regrettable situation, which nearly all members of the Third Committee had deplored, it was essential to take all possible measures that would lead to fulfilment of the desires of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The Committee might achieve that purpose by adopting the twenty-Power draft resolution, which requested the Commission on Human Rights to give due priority to the preparation of such recommendations. The request was based on the previous requests made by the General Assembly and the Council to the Commission on Human Rights and also on the importance of the observance of and respect for the right of self-determination in the promotion of world peace and of friendly relations between peoples and nations. That consideration was the only aim of the United Nations.

3. As representative of Afghanistan, he wished to present some comments in support of the draft resolution. Every time the question of self-determination had been discussed, a few delegations had argued against it and had given the impression that they thought those who fought for the right were intending to express opposition to their political interests. Hence, the resolutions on self-determination had not been adopted unanimously, but only by an overwhelming majority. The time had come for an understanding to be reached on the matter. As a representative who had from the very beginning fought to ensure that that fundamental right should be included in the draft covenants and implemented by peaceful means, he wished to state once again that it had never been the intention of those who defended that right to do anything which might be against the interests of any other nation. His only aim had been, and would remain, that of doing something for the millions of people who did not enjoy the right. That was why, during the general debate, he had stated, in connexion with some examples given by certain representatives of peoples whose right to self-determination had been violated, that the Third Committee, which was responsible for dealing with human rights, should not deal with the question of the right of self-determination from any particular point of view or connect it with certain cases. It should not only be concerned with the fate of a certain people or only of those peoples whose voice had reached the Committee, but also of those whose voice had not reached it, although it could be heard all over the world.

4. The right of self-determination belonged equally to all peoples and all nations everywhere. The representatives of the peoples and nations who enjoyed that right were sitting on the Committee. The history of almost all the peoples and nations represented on the Committee was a history of almost similar circumstances, factors and results. The regrettable situation prevailing in different parts of the world showed that violation of

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

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the decision taken at the 524th meeting, the five delegations sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.369 withdrew their text and became co-sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by fifteen Powers (A/C.3/L.371).

the right to self-determination was a dangerous threat to the peace of the world. The right had been and was being violated, directly and indirectly.

5. In regard to that matter there were three groups in the Third Committee. The first comprised those who violated the right to self-determination. A second group comprised those who supported the first group not only by their votes, or sometimes not by their votes and statements at all, but indirectly by furnishing money and arms to suppress the will of the people and deprive them of their economic, political and even territorial rights on behalf of the supporters' own selfish political interests. The third group, the majority, was concerned to ensure that all possible measures should be taken to put an end to that policy and save the peoples of the world from bloodshed and hatred. Only the joint effort of the three groups could save the world.

6. The Afghan delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously, by a humanitarian vote cast without any kind of political prejudice and in the interests of fulfilment of the sole purpose of the United Nations, which was the promotion of world peace, friendly relations between peoples and nations and respect for the dignity of the human person.

7. He reserved the right to speak later if the need arose.

8. Miss MAÑAS (Cuba) recalled that the principle of the right of peoples and nations to self-determination had already been set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. The attitude of Cuba to the question was well known. The draft resolution, of which her country was one of the sponsors, was a procedural text which should be adopted unanimously. The fact that one-third of the members of the General Assembly expressed a desire that the Commission on Human Rights should give due priority to the preparation of recommendations on the question revealed the deep concern of the United Nations to achieve the purpose to which the draft resolution was directed.

9. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) said that his delegation had always defended the right of peoples and nations to self-determination and had gladly agreed to join in submitting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.369. It had even more gladly accepted the invitation from the sponsors of the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.371 to join them in submitting that proposal. It was a very unassuming proposal; it did not make substantive recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights, but merely invited it to give priority to a question which was of concern to the whole world. The Mexican delegation therefore hoped that would be adopted unanimously, or at least by a large majority, since it was based on consideration of the importance of the observance of and respect for the right to self-determination in the promotion of world peace and of friendly relations between peoples and nations.

10. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) said that it was a well-known fact that a certain number of nations were still under foreign domination and deprived of freedom and the right to self-determination. The United Nations was based on the principle of protection of that right and it was its duty to protect the subjugated peoples which were fighting for freedom and had placed all their hopes in the Organization. It was therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to be faithful to its mission and to assist in the realization of national

aspirations by taking measures calculated to achieve the purposes of the Charter. His delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, thought that any delay would have regrettable consequences. The best means of defending the cause of human rights was to give priority to the consideration of recommendations concerning respect for the right of peoples to self-determination. His delegation hoped that the entire Third Committee would support the draft resolution and thereby show itself worthy of the trust reposed in it by the subjugated peoples.

11. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that the right of peoples and nations to self-determination was of vital concern to millions. His delegation had supported Assembly resolution 637 C (VII) very strongly at the seventh session. The Commission on Human Rights should accord the highest priority to the proposed recommendations. He had accordingly joined in sponsoring the joint draft resolution before the Committee. The civilized world, reacting against the brutality and inhumanity of war had proclaimed its adherence to a noble ideal of freedom and respect for human rights and dignity at the conclusion of the war. But as time passed some States unfortunately took refuge in legal pretexts to block any action when application of the principle conflicted with their immediate interests. The League of Nations had often been hamstrung by that kind of manoeuvre: the same should not happen to the United Nations. The Charter was explicit; Article 1 expressly recognized the right to self-determination and Article 55 set forth the motivating principles and the means to be used for ensuring respect for it in order to secure peace and peaceful and friendly relations among nations. The map of Asia and Africa showed that many peoples were still deprived of that essential right. Although he could supply specific instances in connexion with Morocco, Tunisia, Central Africa, Indo-China and other territories, he would confine himself to pointing out that the problem was acute and urgent. The sincerity of States would be judged by the extent to which they helped the non-self-governing peoples to fulfil their aspirations. India had only recently attained independence after long and persistent endeavours. It perhaps understood better than other nations the deep and ardent longing for self-government imbuing peoples still in subjection and thus strongly appreciated their claims. Subjection was as repugnant to peoples as slavery was to individuals. The non-self-governing peoples were insisting on attaining their independence. The United Nations should help them to achieve that ideal, the sooner the better, and appropriate means should be found to apply the accepted principles.

12. The Commission on Human Rights had been unable, for lack of time, to prepare the recommendations it had been asked to make. The General Assembly might therefore be tempted to embark on the work itself, but it was better for an expert body to remain responsible for it and for the Assembly to confine itself to asking that body to give it priority. The wording of the operative part of the twenty-Power draft resolution left the Commission on Human Rights free enough to choose the most suitable order of preference for undertaking the completion of the recommendations. The Committee should not bind the Commission by strict instructions, but should simply impress on it that the matter was urgent and should be given priority. The Committee should not consider in detail the legal and technical

difficulties that might arise, since they fell within the Commission's purview. It was to be hoped that the draft resolution would thus receive the whole-hearted support of a very large majority.

13. U BA SHIN (Burma) remarked that he had no wish to enter into an historical analysis of the right to self-determination; all the material was to be found in the documents of the United Nations organs which had concerned themselves with it. He would, however, remind the Committee that the General Assembly had called upon the Economic and Social Council in resolution 421 (V), part D, to request the Commission on Human Rights to study ways and means which would ensure the right and to prepare recommendations on it. The Commission had been unable to comply with that request for lack of time. At its sixth session the Assembly had adopted by 33 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions, resolution 545 (VI), in which it had decided to include in the international covenant or covenants on human rights an article on the right of all peoples and nations to self-determination. Burma had been one of the sponsors of the original draft resolution. It had thought that, as the principle of the self-determination had already been set forth in the Charter, an article on it should of course be included in a covenant on human rights, should such an instrument be drawn up.

14. The Burmese delegation had always hailed the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as one of the outstanding achievements of the United Nations. Every effort should be made to ensure the enjoyment by everyone of the rights therein proclaimed. Article 21 of the Universal Declaration stated that the will of the people was the basis of the authority of government. Recognition of the right to self-determination was the logical corollary of that principle. International peace and security, too, could not fail to gain from it. Respect for individual rights was closely linked with the right of peoples to self-determination, and the former could not be secured without the latter.

15. The Commission on Human Rights had given the matter as much consideration as could have been wished at its eighth session, but it had lacked time and had been able to deal with only a small part of its agenda. It had apparently been given too great and too complex a task. Two of the three steps necessary for the completion of its work still remained to be taken: the covenants by which States would explicitly bind themselves to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the measure of implementation guaranteeing to the international community that the rights were actually respected. The drafts prepared by the Commission at its eighth session did not seem to have been adequate and the General Assembly in resolution 637 C (VII) had requested the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to continue preparing recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, and particularly recommendations relating to the steps which might be taken by the various organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in that connexion. For lack of time, the Commission on Human Rights had not complied with the request at its ninth session.

16. The Commission was not to be blamed and certainly none of the sponsors of the draft resolution had intended to blame it. Everyone was well aware that the matter was extremely complex and that time would be required to work out a text that would satisfy the

proponents of the varied trends of thought involved. But, pending the completion of the draft covenants, the United Nations should certainly be able to do something by way of recommendations on international respect for the right of peoples and of nations to self-determination, particularly with regard to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. Actuated by that conviction, the Burmese delegation had joined nineteen others in sponsoring the draft resolution requesting the Commission on Human Rights to give due priority to the preparation of such recommendations at its tenth session and the Secretary-General to transmit to it the summary records of the debate on the matter.

17. Mrs. MARZUKI (Indonesia) said that her delegation had always been an advocate of the right of self-determination and accordingly had co-sponsored the draft resolution on the subject.

18. The question of the recommendations had been discussed at length since the General Assembly had adopted resolution 421 (V), part D. The Commission on Human Rights had embarked at its eighth session on the two-fold task given it by the Assembly in resolution 545 (VI). Indonesia had supported that decision on the inclusion in the draft international covenant or covenants on human rights of an article on the right of all peoples and nations to self-determination and on the preparation of recommendations. By adopting resolution 637 C (VII), the General Assembly had shown that its feelings in the matter had not changed.

19. The United Nations had passed the stage of dwelling on the basic importance of the right of self-determination, but it should be stressed that respect for that right was the prerequisite to respect for the other human rights and for the maintenance of peace. International respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination might contribute to the prevention of another war, or at least to the reduction of sources of conflict among nations. The United Nations should not complacently reiterate the principle, but should tackle the problems, the solution of which would make it possible to pass from theory to practice. Until the measures of practical implementation of the right of self-determination were defined, the principle would remain meaningless and States would continue to interpret it to suit their own purposes.

20. Despite the Purposes and Principles clearly proclaimed in the Charter, some nations refused to heed the non-self-governing peoples' yearning for independence until riots and bloodshed occurred. The agenda of the Security Council and of the political committees of the General Assembly showed that the United Nations had not yet been able to turn the moral principle recognized in the Charter into an effective legal commitment. Instances like those of Morocco and Tunisia were to be deplored.

21. The draft resolution was explicit and clear. It simply recognized the continuing need for recommendations on the subject. She regretted that it had been necessary to present a draft resolution along such lines again, but, as was well known, the Commission on Human Rights had not had time to comply with a previous Assembly decision. Resolution 545 (VI) had been adopted in 1951 in somewhat similar circumstances, after the Commission on Human Rights had been unable to comply with resolution 421 (V), part D. The existing draft could be regarded as a sequel to resolution 637 C (VII), and the procedure proposed was similar to that followed in 1951. The draft resolution



was therefore not new either in substance or in procedure, and her delegation hoped that the great majority would support it.

22. Mrs. PINTO DE VIDAL (Uruguay) pointed out that her delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, had affirmed the right of peoples and of nations to self-determination at previous sessions. In signing the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco, Member States had accepted the obligations laid down by Articles 1, 55, 73 and 79, which dealt with the principle of self-determination and the responsibilities of the administering Powers towards the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Third Committee had already studied the question fully, and the summary records of its debates were an important source of legal information. In the modern world, where a major legal evolution was in progress, the principle of the right of peoples and of nations to self-determination was essential, first because it corresponded to the economic and social development of peoples, secondly because it made the individual feel that he was participating in his country's development, and thirdly because it was a condition for the maintenance of peace. If peace was to be ensured, the dependent peoples would have to be given their freedom, and for the sake of peace it was sometimes worth while to lose some territory.

23. The fact that twenty delegations had sponsored the joint draft resolution showed the good will prevailing among the members of the Committee. Her delegation was sure that the draft resolution would be adopted, and it was to be hoped that the vote would be unanimous.

24. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) reminded the Committee that twice in contemporary history the major Powers had called upon nations throughout the world for help and had promised them the right to self-determination. President Wilson's message in 1918 and the Atlantic Charter in 1941 had contained such promises. Unfortunately, once the danger was past, the promises had been forgotten. The Powers had fully understood that oppressed peoples would be susceptible to an invitation to join in a war which they could espouse as their own and which was to bring them their independence.

25. International history recorded the well-known fact that, once a people acquired national consciousness, it aspired to unity. Such was the case in small countries like his own, which had devoted itself to the unification of all the South Slavs in the entity currently known as Yugoslavia. All nations, young or old, wished to live in freedom, even if that freedom meant hard material conditions.

26. The modern world had recognized the right to self-determination as the fundamental human right which had to be implemented. Some nations, however, persisted in disregarding the evolution they had witnessed and in practising power politics; they thought they were still at liberty to deal arbitrarily with the territory they had seized. They were even astonished at the hostility shown them by the populations which rose against such obsolete practices and refused to remain at the mercy of the occupying Power. The Powers concerned should realize that the clock could not be put back, and that henceforth they might not decide the fate of any nation, however small.

27. They must understand that there were ways and means at their disposal to solve disputed questions,

provided the necessary good will was forthcoming. There was no lack of peaceful means, provided only that the parties approached the questions in a spirit of conciliation and strict fairness and on an equal footing.

28. It was a matter for regret that so far the countries had shown hardly any of the necessary good will. Otherwise there would be no reason for the annual recurrence of a General Assembly resolution limited to an appeal for the peaceful settlement of disputes. But, in neglecting those appeals and in keeping populations which aspired to independence in subjugation on the specious pretext that they had not yet achieved their maturity and were incapable of self-government, the Powers stood to lose more than gained. They ran the risk of provoking open hostility, especially when peoples were ready to shed their blood for their cause, a disposition which itself showed their mettle.

29. Some States, none the less, had realized the importance of the right of peoples to self-determination, and had benefited from their perspicacity. Others were seeking solutions which, while paying lip-service to the right, would not substantially alter their relations with the oppressed peoples.

30. The struggle for independence, indeed, appeared in different guise in different regions. The first claim put forward by some peoples which were unable to exploit their own natural resources was for economic freedom; others wished to set up a completely indigenous government; in some countries again there were reprisals or an open struggle which had been going on for years. The various movements were called progressive by some and subversive by others; they were ascribed to foreign influence, but no attempt was made to determine their underlying causes. Self-determination movements were not necessarily a sign of progress, but, unless they were exploited by outside interests and became a threat to peaceful international relations, such aspirations would always receive the support of freedom-loving countries. Moreover, it was essential to take into account the practical application of the principles on which the right of peoples to self-determination was based, and to be consistent in applying them.

31. There was no call to resuscitate the question of the General Assembly's competence; the Commission on Human Rights had not had time at its ninth session to consider recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination. That made the question all the more urgent. As Yugoslavia was no longer a member of the Commission, he took that opportunity to state his delegation's position: such recommendations were a necessary means of promoting the right of peoples to self-determination and should form the basis for further implementation measures; they should be prepared as a matter of urgency, with particular attention to the existing situation in the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. They should also include transitional measures, such as participation of the indigenous population in the legislative and executive organs, which would allow the populations to attain a full measure of self-government. Further, they would be incomplete without a provision for the preparation of annual reports on respect for the right to self-determination in the various countries, including the colonial territories; the reports should show the extent to which the population in each territory exercised the right.

32. The recommendations should also aim to give the territories their economic independence, an important condition of the implementation of the right of peoples to self-determination; and time limits should be set for the granting of self-government. As the Commission on Human Rights would be dealing not with specific cases, but with general principles, it would be able to set those time limits provided it took into account such considerations as the existing list of factors, including those approved by the Fourth Committee, which it could use as required, bearing in mind the timing and local conditions involved in particular cases.

33. Lastly, the Commission should consider whether the populations' wishes could best be ascertained through the United Nations, by a plebiscite, or by some other democratic procedure. The recommendations should also set forth the different methods applicable to different types of cases. A plebiscite, for instance, was not applicable to every case; certain conditions had to be met if it was to have real meaning.

34. By considering the fundamental right of peoples to self-determination the Third Committee could assist the Commission on Human Rights in its complicated task. That right was indeed the basic human right, without which the others could not be implemented. He therefore felt that it was essential for recommendations to be prepared and he unreservedly supported the draft resolution.

35. Mrs. WASILKOWSKA (Poland) pointed out that her delegation had supported the inclusion of an article on the right of peoples to self-determination in the covenant. That right was closely bound up with the maintenance of world peace, and it was no longer possible to plead the inequality of peoples and the immaturity of the populations of certain territories. Contemporary history, furthermore, showed plainly enough that disregard for the aspirations of peoples could only lead to disturbances. Poland had long struggled for its freedom, and she had sympathy and understanding for the feelings expressed by the oppressed peoples.

36. She would accordingly vote for the draft resolution.

37. Mr. HUIZI AGUIAR (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote for the twenty-Power draft resolution.

38. Its attitude was in keeping with the history of Venezuela, which had won the right to the free determination of its political life thanks to the heroic efforts of Simón Bolívar, the Liberator, and of the group of men who had assisted him in his fight for freedom. They had striven for an ideal that clashed with their own interests, waiving privileges they might quite peacefully have enjoyed under the rule of the metropolitan country. But they had not been satisfied with liberating Venezuela and had extended their generous action to several American countries: some of the countries which were respected Members of the United Nations had thus acquired independence.

39. It was therefore natural that in the United Nations Venezuela should always have favoured the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, but always with restraint and with the hope of reaching a peaceful solution of problems which were at times extremely intricate. In supporting the draft resolution, his delegation was inspired with the utmost good will and bore in mind that the proposed text simply asked

the Commission on Human Rights, as the General Assembly had done in earlier resolutions, to go into the matter thoroughly and make the necessary recommendations. He did not doubt that the draft resolution, which was mainly concerned with procedure, would receive whole-hearted support.

40. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) stated that her delegation's position in the matter had not wavered and was, moreover, in every way in accordance with the Principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with respect for fundamental human rights. Prompted by Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter, the General Assembly had, in resolution 637 (VII) maintained the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination while contemplating measures for its implementation. Among other things, it had requested the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to continue preparing recommendations concerning international respect for the right.

41. She deeply regretted that the Commission on Human Rights had not been able to prepare the recommendations for lack of time. While it was true that adoption of the covenants would be no easy task, and was not in the offing, the implementation of the right to self-determination was urgent and could not be long postponed. In many cases delay, by shattering legitimate hopes, based on human justice—particularly in view of the fact that some peoples had already duly expressed their wishes—was likely to give rise to violent solutions rather than the peaceful settlements in keeping with the spirit and efforts of the United Nations.

42. Her delegation attached great importance to the fundamental freedoms; she would therefore vote for the draft resolution and hoped that practical recommendations for implementation of the right to self-determination might be adopted during the ninth session of the General Assembly, so that in the very near future that right might be given effect by the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned, as provided in resolution 637 A (VII).

43. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the resolution, not for purely political, but also and chiefly for humanitarian reasons. The right of peoples to self-determination was the foundation of all other rights. Moreover, it had been recognized by the most representative organ of the United Nations and included in the draft covenants on human rights.

44. The aspirations of the peoples reflected an irresistible juridical development, which ought to be better understood by certain States. It was not impossible to reach a solution by peaceful means. That was why the Commission on Human Rights was requested in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution to give due priority to the preparation of the recommendations. He hoped the draft resolution would receive the support it deserved.

45. He reserved his right to revert to the subject.

46. The CHAIRMAN said there were no more speakers on the list, and asked whether the Committee was ready to vote.

47. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thought that several representatives wished to speak on the subject, although they might not be prepared to do so immediately.

48. Under the operative part of the draft resolution, the summary records of the debate would be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights. Some delegations would surely wish to make their views known, instead of keeping silence and leaving their attitude open to any interpretation.

49. The debate on a humanitarian question of such great importance to millions of human beings should not be rushed. As full as possible an exchange of views seemed necessary so that the Third Committee could reach a conclusion in a calm atmosphere.

50. He would like to hear the representatives of the States which did not yet consider themselves able to recognize the right of all the peoples under their jurisdiction to self-determination and learn the reasons for their attitude. He would perhaps have to reply to them on certain points. He therefore thought it would be better to adjourn the meeting without closing the debate.

51. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that the Third Committee was not discussing the principle of self-determination, on which the General Assembly had already decided. The General Assembly had acknowledged that it was a fundamental right and had decided (resolution 545 (VI)) to include an article on the subject in the international covenant or covenants on human rights. The Commission on Human Rights had drawn up the text of the article<sup>2</sup> and during the general debate a number of delegations had said that it was satisfactory at the current stage. The Assembly had also adopted decisions (resolution 637 (VII)) for the implementation of the article.

52. The only question before the Committee was one of procedure: whether the Commission on Human

Rights should be requested to give priority to recommendations which the Assembly, at its seventh session, had requested it to continue preparing and to draw the Commission's attention to the interest the Assembly had shown in the matter at its eighth session and transmit to it the observations of delegations. In the circumstances, some representatives might think it unnecessary to speak. In any case, supporters and opponents of the draft resolution could define their positions later by explaining their votes.

53. He therefore suggested that the Committee should be asked whether there was any objection to putting the draft resolution to the vote at once and, if there were objections, which representatives still wished to speak.

54. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he wished to speak on the subject, but was not ready to do so immediately.

55. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the question was of considerable importance to a large number of representatives. It seemed too early to close the debate; it would be better to adjourn the meeting.

56. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee was not ready to vote. Five representatives were listed to speak at a later meeting. He wished to know whether he might consider the list closed.

57. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) asked for the list to be kept open.

58. The CHAIRMAN stated that the list was not closed; he urged any members intending to speak to do so at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fourteenth Session, Supplement No. 4*, chap. III.