

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SR.52
2 July 1962

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York
on Wednesday, 16 May 1962, at 11.10 a.m.

CONTENTS

Northern Rhodesia: Report of the Drafting Sub-Committee on
Northern Rhodesia (A/AC.109/L.14) (continued)

PRESENT:

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------|--|
| <u>Chairman:</u> | Mr. COULIBALY | Mali |
| later, | Mr. JHA | (India) |
| <u>Rapporteur:</u> | Mr. RIFAI | Syria |
| <u>Members:</u> | Mr. PLIMSOLL | Australia |
| | Mr. NONG KIMNY | Cambodia |
| | Mr. GEBRE-EGZY | Ethiopia |
| | Mr. NATWAR-SINGH | India |
| | Mr. IVELLA | Italy |
| | Mr. SOLTYSIAK | Poland |
| | Mr. NGAIZA | Tanganyika |
| | Mr. Taieb SLIM) | Tunisia |
| | Mr. MESTIRI) | |
| | Mr. OBEREMKO | Union of Soviet Socialist Republics |
| | Mr. CROWE | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| | Mr. BINGHAM) | United States of America |
| | Mr. BLAKE) | |
| | Mr. VELAZQUEZ | Uruguay |
| | Mr. SILVA SUCRE | Venezuela |
| | Mr. ILIC | Yugoslavia |
| <u>Secretariat:</u> | Mr. PROTITCH | Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories |
| | Mr. CHACKO | Secretary of the Committee |

NORTHERN RHODESIA: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING SUB-COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN RHODESIA
(A/AC.109/L.14) (continued)

Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Rapporteur, submitted the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee on Northern Rhodesia (A/AC.109/L.14). The report consisted of two sections: one contained the recommendations and conclusions of the majority of the members of the Committee and the draft resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly, while the other was a minority report included at the request of the United States representative.

The first part of the report, which would include a description of the constitutional situation in Northern Rhodesia and would outline the different views that had been expressed during the debate, was not yet ready. It would be circulated to the members of the Committee in due course and would be incorporated in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

Mr. ILIC (Yugoslavia) considered that the conclusions of the report satisfactorily reflected the views of the majority of the members of the Committee regarding the political and constitutional situation in Northern Rhodesia and the question of the Federation. His delegation fully supported the conclusions, the recommendations in paragraph 22 and the draft resolution in paragraph 23.

Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) wished to reiterate two reservations his delegation had made at the meetings of the Sub-Committee.

In paragraph 21 of the report the Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly should, as a matter of urgency, fix a date for the independence of Northern Rhodesia. No doubt that recommendation was subject to the wishes of the indigenous population, but the delegation of Venezuela, which as a matter of principle would hesitate to fix a precise date for the achievement of independence by any country, was the more reluctant to do so in the present case in view of the fact that nearly six months would elapse before the next regular session of the General Assembly and that it was impossible to foresee what the situation would be at that time. His delegation would not therefore determine its attitude on that point until the seventeenth session.

(Mr. Silva Sucre, Venezuela)

His delegation's second reservation related to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution included in the report. Sub-paragraph 4 (iv) of the joint draft resolution (A/AC.109/L.11) had originally called for the withdrawal or reduction to the very minimum of the armed forces of the Federation from Northern Rhodesia. As the result of an amendment submitted by the Soviet Union, the sub-paragraph now called simply for the withdrawal of those forces. While it endorsed the principle of that amendment, his delegation would support the amendment only on condition that the provincial forces in Northern Rhodesia were adequate for the maintenance of law and order and therefore provided a guarantee that the elections would take place in an orderly manner.

His delegation supported the report of the Sub-Committee subject to those two reservations.

The minority report was couched in more moderate language, advocated less drastic measures and included in its first paragraph certain terms which were not entirely acceptable to his delegation. He therefore preferred the majority report, though he considered that there was no fundamental contradiction between it and the minority report.

Mr. IVELLA (Italy) said that the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee represented a serious effort to embody the views of the members of the Committee. The Italian delegation had reservations only regarding some of the language used and the fact that a draft resolution had been submitted, which did not appear to be the most appropriate method.

Contacts between the political parties with Mr. Kaunda, on the one hand, and the Administering Power on the other would no doubt lead to an improvement in the situation if no outside pressure were applied. The Committee should therefore refrain from drawing rigid conclusions. If conclusions were essential, they should be presented in the form of the minority report submitted by the United States delegation. That text went far towards meeting the requirements of the petitioners, which were supported by most members of the Committee, and it accurately interpreted the general feelings of members in so far as they wished to co-operate in order to help the people of Northern Rhodesia.

He therefore noted with satisfaction that the minority report would be transmitted to the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should approve the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee, including the minority report appearing in annex I. The whole document would then be transmitted to the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the Chairman's apparent suggestion that the Committee should approve the minority report, which expressed the views of only one delegation, that of the United States. All the other members of the Sub-Committee had opposed it. The Committee was therefore not called upon to approve the minority report. The Chairman should merely submit for the Committee's approval, with or without a vote, the conclusions and recommendations of the majority report.

Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) said that he was very disappointed in the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee and dissented from the views expressed by the majority. He did not feel that the approach set out was realistic or likely to secure the co-operation of the Administering Power or encourage the various elements in Northern Rhodesia to come together in agreement.

There was a great deal of agreement in the Committee on the objective to be attained in Northern Rhodesia. That objective was self-determination based on the will of the people regardless of race, colour, or religion. There was agreement on the part of the Administering Power and most other Members of the United Nations on that score. However, there was disagreement on the method of achieving the objective.

It was clear that no one defended the status quo in Northern Rhodesia as something to be perpetuated. There was everywhere to be found a process of change and evolution, and colonial territories were no exception. The essence of the United Kingdom approach was not only the objectives of the Charter but the fact that the United Kingdom Government recognized that the present position was only one stage in a whole process of transition.

The Drafting Sub-Committee spoke about immediate independence and asked the General Assembly to fix a date. That was outside the competence of the United Nations. In addition, immediate independence in general was not an instant solution to all problems. It was necessary to obtain general acceptance by the various communities in Northern Rhodesia of the measures to bring about independence

/...

(Mr. Plimsoll, Australia)

and preserve the machinery of government and economic structure. It was possible to give immediate independence at the cost of economic chaos and political strife, but that was not in the interests of any of the various groups in Northern Rhodesia.

The United Kingdom was trying to make sure that the situation in Northern Rhodesia evolved as rapidly as possible towards independence and it needed to test out the political climate. In such a programme it was necessary to accept the possibility of mistakes being made. Steps would have to be taken that would be short of the most desirable. But they would be taken as a matter of political necessity and compromise. Individual governments had to make compromises, and compromises should be accepted as part of the evolution of colonial territories. It was not reasonable or constructive for the Committee to lay down conditions or programmes. They would have to be worked out on the spot. There were differences inside the African community between different parties, and differences even inside individual parties. Thus the United Kingdom should not be chided if in Northern Rhodesia all groups did not accept a certain course at present.

The delegation of Australia did not think that the Committee in attempting to impose specific courses on the United Kingdom was setting a pattern for United Nations actions that would encourage the co-operation of the Administering Powers. A majority of countries during recent meetings of the General Assembly on Angola had said that if Portugal started some movement towards independence, Portugal would find the United Nations co-operative. In the case of Northern Rhodesia, it seemed to him that the Committee was in danger of indicating that it did not intend to differentiate between Governments that were co-operating and those that were not. He could not see that much recognition had been shown of the genuine motives and objectives of the United Kingdom Government. Some of the unfortunate developments in Northern Rhodesia were not due to the unwillingness of the United Kingdom to take the right measures, but to its inability to persuade all those concerned in Northern Rhodesia to go along with the programme. The United Kingdom was grappling with the situation, trying not only to reach the objective of self-determination and independence but to preserve and strengthen the economic and social structure of the new state. In a situation such as the

/...

(Mr. Plimsoll, Australia)

present one it was not advisable to proceed on a majority vote. The Committee needed to bring along with the Administering Power and the various major currents of opinion. If the United Nations showed it was not taking due account of the realities of the situation, that could have a bad effect on all those persons whose support was needed in co-operation with the United Nations. Unrealistic decisions by the Committee strengthened the tendency to say that political co-operation with the United Nations was not possible. That would be a pity, because there was great scope for continuing co-operation.

In Northern Rhodesia there was a good chance of a fairly rapid and successful outcome. It seemed to be a State where there would not be a persistently obstructive minority and where habits of co-operation were evolving.

For all those reasons the Australian delegation was opposed to the report of the majority. The minority report proposed by the United States was in general an approach that the Australian delegation thought was fruitful. It recognized the difficulties in the way of the Administering Power and gave some recognition to the fact that the United Kingdom was taking steps to meet the difficulties and that the objectives of the United Kingdom were on the whole objectives that the majority of the Committee could approve.

Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) endorsed the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee. His delegation shared the concern expressed by the representative of Venezuela regarding operative paragraph 4 (iv) of the draft resolution, but felt that the wording clearly indicated that the withdrawal of the federal armed forces would be for the sole purpose of guaranteeing an atmosphere of electoral freedom. Similarly, the report clearly showed that a date for independence could not be fixed until the inhabitants had had an opportunity of expressing their wishes.

The minority report was unobjectionable in substance. Although it differed in tone from the majority report, it met the essential objectives, which were those of all the members of the Committees.

The CHAIRMAN consulted the Committee with respect to the adoption of the report. If there was no objection, he would consider that the Committee approved the Sub-Committee's report.

/...

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) requested the Chairman to specify that it was the majority report which the Committee approved. Delegations which had expressed opposition to the minority report could not very well be asked to approve it; yet that was precisely what they would appear to be doing if they adopted the report as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Ethiopia that it was the majority report which the Committee would be asked to adopt. Once it had decided that matter, he would consult it, if necessary, regarding the advisability of appending the minority report as an annex.

Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) formally moved that separate votes should be taken forthwith on the majority and minority reports.

Mr. BLAKE (United States of America) said that it was his understanding that the Committee would have to consider other sections of the report which were to be placed before it at a later stage.

In general, the United States delegation shared many of the views expressed by the majority of the members of the Drafting Sub-Committee. It had reservations, however, regarding the tone of the report and the inclusion of a draft resolution. It considered that an evolution was already taking place in Northern Rhodesia and would proceed more and more rapidly. Nevertheless there was clearly room for improvement in the situation. His delegation's views in that respect had been incorporated in annex I of the report, which laid down a number of principles reflecting a realistic view of the situation. He drew the Committee's attention to each of the points set out in annex I. All the members of the Committee shared the views expressed in the annex and they should therefore be reflected in the report of the Committee, for they could only strengthen it. The United States delegation felt that the report as it stood, with the inclusion of annex I, would enlighten the General Assembly on the question of Northern Rhodesia as to varying views of certain delegations.

Mr. Jha (India) took the Chair.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as all the delegations that had asked to speak had now done so, the report of the Sub-Committee should be put to the vote in accordance with the Tunisian

representative's motion: i.e. the Committee would vote first on the conclusions and recommendations and on the draft resolution, and then on annex I. The annex represented the views of only one delegation.

Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had only received the Sub-Committee's report the previous day and his Government had not had time fully to prepare its comments. He presumed that the other Governments represented in the Committee were in the same position. Furthermore, the members of the Committee were being asked to approve a report from which an important section was missing, namely, the section summarizing the progress of the debate and the statements of the various delegations. The absence of that section materially affected the balance of the report, which at present had only an introduction and conclusions. In the circumstances, it was questionable whether it should be considered at all.

Since other members of the Committee, however, had decided to voice their comments, he would like to make a few observations, and, in doing so, to note that the Sub-Committee had been unable to produce a unanimous report. In the first place, he considered that the account given in paragraphs 11 to 23 was in some respects entirely unacceptable. It was stated in paragraph 11, for example, that the Committee felt that immediate steps should be taken to end the Federation, and, immediately afterwards, that it did not want a Federal Review Conference to be held until an African majority government had been formed. It was difficult to see how those two statements could be reconciled.

Furthermore, the Committee was asked to give currency to reports of the most dubious authenticity on the basis of allegations made by one or two delegations.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 added further to the unbalance of the report. Anyone reading paragraph 19 would be led to believe that the United Kingdom Government had done very little to put an end to discrimination in the Territory. Yet Sir Patrick Dean had told the Committee on 24 April that the abolition of all discrimination remained the objective of the United Kingdom Government's policy - a statement which should appear in the report. Similarly, the first sentence of paragraph 20, on the subject of employment in the copper mines, took little account of the substantial progress reported earlier by the United Kingdom delegation on of the undertakings already given in that connexion. The report give the

/...

(Mr. Crowe, United Kingdom)

impression that the United Kingdom Government was doing nothing regarding the employment conditions of Africans. Yet a Commission had just been sent to the Territory to study the causes of a recent strike in the copperbelt, the African unions' demands and the general employment conditions in the copper mining industry.

With regard to paragraphs 21 to 23, he very much regretted that the Committee should have thought fit to urge the Assembly to fix a target date for the independence of Northern Rhodesia. He noted that some members of the Drafting Sub-Committee had entered reservations on that point. As the United Kingdom delegation had already said, its Government considered that the date for the Territory's independence should be fixed through negotiations between the Territory's elected leaders and the Government of the United Kingdom. Such negotiations would only be harmed by arbitrary outside interference. He therefore asked the Committee most urgently to drop that recommendation.

Finally, the ~~last~~ phrase of paragraph 22, sub-paragraph (1v), would be quite unacceptable to any Government which held responsibility for law and order.

The United Kingdom delegation was therefore unable to accept either the report or the recommendations and the accompanying resolution. It was not within the competence of the United Nations to make specific recommendations for future courses of action in a Territory for which the United Kingdom Government was responsible, and that Government could not consider itself bound by such recommendations. The recommendations contained in the report were, moreover, unnecessary and undesirable. The situation in Northern Rhodesia was developing along the lines desired by the majority of the Committee, and the minority report was more in accord with the Committee's real wishes and the tenor of the debate. The United Nations should await the result of the forthcoming elections - in which Mr. Kaunda's party and other parties had said that they would participate and which the United Kingdom Government hoped would lead to the formation of a responsible African Government - before trying to look beyond that. The Committee should not foster the impression that there was a crisis but instead should support the United Kingdom's efforts to avoid a crisis. To speak of urgency, as the report did, was as misplaced as it was inexact, and he urged the Committee to weigh the effects which the report might have. The Committee could not interfere in the internal affairs of dependent territories. Interference in the negotiations which were to take place would only harden the attitude of those concerned. It was easy

/...

(Mr. Crowe, United Kingdom)

to state impeccable principles, but members of the Committee represented responsible Governments, and Governments knew that problems were not solved by the mere enunciation of principles. He feared the report would only make the solution of the problem more difficult.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that he failed to see how the United Kingdom representative could state at one and the same time that his Government had not had time to study the Sub-Committee's report and that the report was unacceptable to his delegation. He should logically have reserved his position.

He recalled, in connexion with the United Kingdom representative's remarks concerning the incompleteness of the report, that the missing section of the report would consist of the statements of representatives, who would have ample opportunity to comment on the subject.

With regard to paragraph 11, there was no inconsistency in its wording. It stated that the existing Federation had been imposed on Northern Rhodesia against the will of the African majority of the population and that it should therefore be dissolved. That meant that in Africa there must be Governments which reflected the will of the majority. The report accordingly went on to say that until that end had been attained in Northern Rhodesia there should be no review of the Federal Constitution, since the result of such a review would in no way change the situation.

The United Kingdom representative had also said that the report contained unproven allegations. In the Drafting Sub-Committee, however, the United Kingdom observer had been asked whether, to his knowledge, one of the statements thus criticised had been made, but he had preferred not to reply. It was because of the uncertainty left in the minds of the Committee by that silence that it had spoken only of the "statement attributed to" Sir Roy Welensky.

With regard to discrimination and the employment conditions of Africans, he considered that the Sub-Committee had reproduced the exact views of the majority in its conclusions. It had duly noted the progress made, but in the view of the majority that progress was not sufficient to be regarded as satisfactory.

The United Kingdom representative had further stated that the Sub-Committee had tried to create an atmosphere of crisis. That was a serious and unfortunate allegation. The United Kingdom representative knew full well that the report was a sober one, that it expressed the majority opinion and that it contained nothing inflammatory.

/...

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

He then proposed that the majority report should be put to the vote in accordance with the proposal made by the representative of Tunisia.

After a procedural discussion in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia), Mr. SOLTYSIAK (Poland) and Mr. NGAIZA (Tanganyika) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that since there had been no motion for the closure of the debate, the Committee should not vote on the Tunisian proposal until it had heard those representatives who had not yet spoken.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that he wished to allay the fears of those representatives who were concerned about the fate of the minority report. In his view, even if the report was rejected by the Committee, it would be mentioned in the Committee's report to the General Assembly. There was even a good possibility that it would have to be reproduced in full.

Mr. NGAIZA (Tanganyika) said that in his delegation's opinion the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Sub-Committee's report were sensible and had been formulated in very mild terms. His delegation had no real objection to the conclusions and recommendations of the United States delegation, but unfortunately they were neither strong enough nor very specific.

His delegation wished to assure the Administering Power that it had no intention of interfering in that Power's internal affairs and was merely endeavouring to ensure that the Committee fulfilled the duties entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

He considered that if no other representative wished to speak, the Committee should adopt the Tunisian delegation's proposal.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Tunisian representative to be kind enough to formulate his proposal in more specific terms.

Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said that he proposed that paragraphs 1-23 of the report should be put to the vote first, after which the Committee would vote on annex I.

/...

The CHAIRMAN asked the Tunisian representative whether he proposed that the Committee should approve paragraphs 1-23.

Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said that he did.

Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) recalled that when he had been in the Chair, he had said that the Committee ought to vote on the report proper, since the annex represented the opinion of only one delegation. The Committee should therefore approve or reject the report proper, and then vote on the question of attaching it to the minority report contained in the annex. His delegation endorsed the Tunisian representative's proposal.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that it had been his impression that the Committee would vote first on paragraphs 11-23 of the report and then on the annex. A vote by the Committee was called for on paragraphs 11-23, which contained conclusions and recommendations, and on the annex, but paragraphs 1-10, which constituted the introduction and would still need certain amendments in the light of the current discussion, need not be voted upon at that stage.

The CHAIRMAN considered that the Syrian representative's remarks were very apt. He saw no point in approving, for example, the simple statement of fact in paragraph 9. On the other hand, the Committee ought to vote on the conclusions and recommendations of the majority report and on the minority report.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that he did not altogether agree with the Syrian representative. As far as the Chairman's opinion on paragraph 9 was concerned, the Ethiopian delegation felt that there was some interest in recording that the Sub-Committee had agreed to include the United States proposal as an annex. If paragraph 9 was adopted, it would simply mean that, at the procedural level, the Drafting Sub-Committee had had to take certain facts into account. Since that was the case, the Ethiopian delegation supported the Tunisian delegation's proposal to put paragraphs 1-23 to the vote.

Mr. IVELIA (Italy) said that his delegation was prepared to approve the Drafting Sub-Committee's report as a whole, but that if the Committee decided to come to a different decision on the report and on the annex, his delegation would have to reconsider its position. The report as a whole was a balanced document in which the views of the minority were given a hearing. If the annex was separated from the report, the Italian delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the report.

Mr. ILIC (Yugoslavia) said that in his view there was only one report, that contained in the twenty-three paragraphs of document A/AC.109/L.14. He therefore supported the Tunisian representative's proposal for a separate vote on paragraphs 1-23 inclusive, followed by a vote on the annex.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that it seemed logical to him that at that stage a vote should be taken only on the conclusions and recommendations of the majority and the minority.

Mr. NGAIZA (Tanganyika) endorsed Mr. Rifai's suggestion and asked the Tunisian representative to alter his proposal accordingly.

Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said that he accepted Mr. Rifai's suggestion and asked the Chairman to put it to the vote immediately.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 11-23 of the report (A/AC.109/L.14), the proposal being that the Committee approved the conclusions and recommendations contained in those paragraphs.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Mali, Poland, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India.

Against: Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

Abstaining: None.

Paragraphs 11-23 were adopted by 12 votes to 4, with no abstentions.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that since the Committee had approved the conclusions and recommendations and the draft resolution contained in the Drafting Sub-Committee's report, he saw no point in putting the views of the United States delegation to the vote at that stage. If the United States delegation had made a proposal, the Committee would be able to take a vote on it, although that would not be very logical since the Committee could not approve two contradictory reports on the same subject. In the final report, the

/...

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Rapporteur would note that a United States proposal had been made in the Sub-Committee but had been rejected by it. If the United States representative wanted to submit a proposal or a draft resolution to the Committee, the members of the Committee would certainly be willing to consider it. He did not see, however, that there was anything which called for a vote at that stage.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Syrian representative had proposed that the Committee should also vote on the minority report. That had also been, apparently, the Tunisian representative's original proposal.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that he was very surprised at the Soviet representative's remarks. He felt that the vote on the views of the majority ought to be followed by a vote on the minority report. As he saw it, the Tunisian representative's proposal had been that the Committee should vote on the minority report, regardless of the result of the vote on the majority opinion. He saw no reason why the minority report could not be approved in addition to the majority report, since it stated conclusions which could be adopted unanimously by the Committee.

Mr. NGAIZA (Tanganyika) and Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India) supported the United States representative's request.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation did not in any way wish to oppose a vote on the minority report but felt that if the United States delegation wanted its views to be included in the in the Committee's report as an individual opinion, there was no need to take a vote.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had always tried to conduct the proceedings in such a way that the Committee would not have to take votes. However, since the Committee had voted on the first part of the Sub-Committee's report, it should do the same for the second part.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the United States representative was asking for a vote on his delegation's views, the Soviet delegation would not oppose it, but he must first make such a request.

/...

Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) asked whether the Committee would be voting on the substance of the minority report or would be deciding if the report was or was not to be attached to the report already approved.

The CHAIRMAN explained that after voting on the report and the annex, the Committee would have to decide what was to be transmitted to the Assembly. It was then that the Committee would decide whether or not the minority report ought to be included in the event that it had not been adopted. If it had been adopted, it would be transmitted as a matter of course.

He asked the Soviet representative whether he proposed that the minority report should not be put to the vote.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that since the United States delegation had insisted on the report being put to the vote, the Soviet delegation would agree to that being done.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the minority report in annex I of document A/AC.109/L.14.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Australia, Italy, United States of America.

Against: Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Mali, Poland
Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics, Uruguay.

Abstaining: India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A minority report was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would decide at its next meeting whether or not the minority report would be transmitted to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.