

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## TWELFTH SESSION

### Official Records



# 722nd PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 26 November 1957,  
at 10.30 a. m

### NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 35:	
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) Information on economic conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955;	
(e) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General	
Reports of the Fourth Committee and of the Fifth Committee . . . . .	515
Agenda item 12:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and V):	
Report of the Second Committee . . . . .	523

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

### AGENDA ITEM 35

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) Information on economic conditions;
- (b) Information on other conditions;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
- (d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955;
- (e) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

### REPORTS OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/3733) AND OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/3736)

1. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to present the report of the Fourth Committee [A/3733] on item 35 of the agenda of the General Assembly. The report was adopted unanimously by the Fourth Committee at its 701st meeting.

2. The four draft resolutions adopted by the Fourth Committee for the approval of the General Assembly are annexed to the report. It will be noted that two of these four draft resolutions deal with questions relating to economic conditions in Non-Self-Governing

Territories. The reason is that the Fourth Committee, in the bulk of its discussions of conditions in the territories, was concerned mainly with the various aspects of economic development, as the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories [A/3647 and Corr.1] on which the Fourth Committee based its discussion, was devoted this year primarily to economic conditions in these territories, in conformity with the three-year work cycle of that Committee.

In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Fourth Committee.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee.

The draft resolution was adopted by 62 votes to 1.

4. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Belgium for an explanation of vote in connexion with draft resolution II.

5. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) (translated from French): On behalf of the delegations of France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands and on its own behalf, and with the consent of the Federal Republic of Germany, the sixth signatory of the Rome Treaty, the Belgian delegation reaffirms the reservation expressed on behalf of those six countries by the representative of France in the Fourth Committee with regard to draft resolution II on the economic development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

6. The General Assembly is now discussing the information transmitted by the Administering Authorities for 1955. At that time the treaty establishing a Common Market had not even been drafted. The Rome Treaty was signed in March 1957 and three of the signatories have not yet ratified it. Any discussion of the possible effects on the Overseas Territories of their association with the Common Market is therefore clearly premature.

7. The haste with which the Assembly has taken up this question is all the more unjustified in view of the fact that the United Nations has not hitherto shown any concern about the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with various economic groups such as that which binds the Commonwealth countries.

8. During the debate it was said that association with the Common Market might compromise the political future of the Overseas Territories. That concern was never expressed with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories dependent on the British Crown. Moreover, there is no justification for it, since events have shown that in the past the economic advantages available to certain Territories have not prevented them from achieving complete independence, as was the case with Ceylon, Ghana and the Federation of Malaya.

9. Draft resolution II "invites the Administering Members concerned to transmit to the Secretary-General information on the association with the European Economic Community of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration".

10. This recommendation is superfluous, since information on the economic situation in these Territories is supplied periodically. The recommendation is out of order if the intention is to invite the Administering Authorities to submit to the Secretary-General purely theoretical views on the possible future consequences of the application of the Treaty.

11. The European Economic Community is prepared to discuss, at the proper time and place and before the competent bodies, the various aspects of the Rome Treaty. In fact, article 229 of the Treaty empowers the Commission to ensure all suitable contacts with the organs of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and GATT, but those contacts cannot be ensured until the ratification of the Treaty by all the signatory States and the subsequent establishment of the Commission of the Community.

12. For these reasons the delegations of the five Member States concerned will vote against draft resolution II.

13. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution II submitted by the Fourth Committee.

The draft resolution was adopted by 57 votes to 12, with 9 abstentions.

14. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Colombia on a point of order.

15. Mr. CARREÑO MALLARINO (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): Under rule 73 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, my delegation wishes to raise a point with regard to the voting procedure which should, in the light of Article 18 of the Charter, be applied to draft resolution III, contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/3733], which is now before us.

16. The point raises a further more serious and important question, namely, the question of the competence of the General Assembly to deal with matters relating to information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in the absence of a complete classification of those Territories, in view of the possibility of conflict with provisions of the domestic public law of Member States. I shall try to put the matter as briefly and concisely as I can.

17. The relevant passages of Article 18 of the Charter read as follows:

"2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1 (c) of Article 86, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system, and budgetary questions.

"3. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting."

18. We are dealing with a question which is intrinsically important and which affects or may affect the constitutions of Member States and not in minor matters, but in questions of domestic public law. No sovereign State would for any reason whatsoever allow itself to be required to provide information on its provinces, districts, states or departments to the United Nations or to any other outside body as if it were being asked to submit reports on Non-Self-Governing Territories, for to do so would lead to the arbitrary disintegration of all Governments and all nations. The Powers which established the United Nations hardly anticipated that the Charter could be so grossly misinterpreted.

19. Article 2 (7) states:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII."

Thus, with the sole exception of Chapter VII, all the provisions of the fundamental law of our Organization are limited, governed and bound by Article 2 (7). Any interpretation which goes beyond that clear and peremptory limitation is ultra vires and unacceptable to the United Nations and to each and every one of its Members.

20. One has only to consider these points in relation to the draft resolution before the Assembly to realize the importance of the question, a fact that was recognized during the debate in the Fourth Committee by the sponsors of the draft resolution who themselves pointed out that the question was very important.

21. The committee which is now being proposed is in every respect more important than the Ad Hoc Committee which was to be set up last year, to which the two-thirds majority rule was considered applicable. If the two-thirds majority rule was applied at the eleventh session to the establishment of an ad hoc committee, it should apply a fortiori to the committee which is now being proposed. What makes the establishment of the proposed committee so serious and important a matter is the fact that its terms of reference convert it from a harmless procedural body into something very different. In that connexion, I would refer you to the statement by the Swedish representative on 20 February 1957 [656th meeting], during the eleventh session. The proposed committee is in fact to examine, discuss and interpret the fundamental laws of Member States, which would involve a threat to their sovereignty.

22. For those reasons, I request that the two-thirds majority rule should be applied to the vote on this draft resolution, or, alternatively, that the Assembly should decide beforehand what voting rule should apply. But I would especially urge the General Assembly to consider whether or not it is competent, by

means of a draft resolution like the one before us, to require that a Member State should provide information on territories which are not internationally recognized as Non-Self-Governing Territories.

23. May I again cite the opening of Article 2 (7) of the Charter, which reads: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations ...". The use of the verb "authorize" implies a question of competence of extreme importance. In other words, we are about to vote on something on which we must first be certain that the General Assembly is competent to decide, because it involves the domestic public law of Member States.

24. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Colombia has raised a point of order upon which, of course, under the rules I must make a decision immediately. What in effect he has done is this: he has asked the Assembly if it is prepared to decide that with respect to this particular draft resolution a two-thirds majority is required. Of course, I am aware of the precedents in this matter, but I regard this as a matter for the Assembly itself to decide and I am prepared to put the proposal of the representative of Colombia to the vote, and it is one which will require, of course, a simple majority.

25. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish) (from the floor): I ask for the floor.

26. The PRESIDENT: Is this a point of order? I have made a ruling on the Colombian representative's proposal and I must put it to the vote immediately.

27. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish) (from the floor): I ask for the floor on a point of order.

28. The PRESIDENT: There cannot be a point of order now. A vote by roll-call has been requested on the Colombian representative's proposal.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Malaya (Federation of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France.

Against: Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana.

Abstaining: Ireland, Japan, Laos, Panama, Cambodia, Ecuador, El Salvador.

The proposal was adopted by 38 votes to 36, with 7 abstentions.

29. The PRESIDENT: We can now proceed to the vote on draft resolution III submitted by the Fourth Committee. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union Of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Argentina, China, Ecuador, Ireland, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Philippines, Thailand.

The result of the vote was 41 in favour, 30 against, and 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

30. Mr. GOMES DE OLIVEIRA (Brazil) (translated from French): I propose first to refer to the resolutions concerning South West Africa. In this matter Brazil bears a special responsibility, for not only was its representative Rapporteur of the Committee on South West Africa but in the debate in the Fourth Committee, Brazil was among the first to support the proposal made by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee. As you know, the Fourth Committee's draft resolution, which was later adopted by the Assembly [resolution 1143 (XII)] provides for the establishment of a Good Offices Committee to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa and my country's responsibility in the matter has been further increased by its recent appointment to that Committee, together with the United Kingdom and the United States. I should like to take this opportunity to express to you, Mr. President, my delegation's deep appreciation of the honour that appointment has bestowed on our country.

31. I now turn to the Fourth Committee's draft resolution III concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories for which my delegation was unable to vote. In this connexion, I should like to make a number of comments to explain our position in this matter. First, we must recognize the strenuous efforts that have been made by the United Nations and by all the nations represented here to improve the conditions in which the international community lives and has its being. On the one hand are the efforts to ensure peace by a closer union of men and peoples and, on the other, again with the purpose of consolidating peace, the concern for the welfare of the less-developed peoples and the efforts, through the Trust-

eeship System and the special arrangements applicable to Non-Self-Governing Territories, to ensure their economic, social and political advancement with a view to enabling them to attain the independence that is their right.

32. The working classes in the industrialized countries at the cost of, in some cases, bloody strikes succeeded in improving their conditions of life and work. By dint of hard efforts, the peoples created the conditions necessary for their independence and, at the price of costly revolutions, succeeded in emancipating themselves and establishing themselves as free nations. Even today, nearly two-thirds of the world's population are engaged in a tragic struggle to extricate themselves from the slough of underdevelopment and attain a less depressed standard of living, consonant with human dignity.

33. The life of the peoples has been one of continuing effort and we must recognize that the rate of progress has been too slow to satisfy the needs of our time. We are therefore in duty bound to accelerate it, for otherwise we will force these peoples and masses hungering for independence and a better life to take the road of subversion and chaos. We must improve their living conditions if we genuinely wish to preserve the political and economic system based on democracy and free enterprise that is our ideal.

34. Just as individuals should be prompted in their mutual relations by a sense of human solidarity, so nations must assist each other to advance and not rely on a process of development which, while undoubtedly natural and inevitable, would be too slow and consequently dangerous if each of them had to advance alone. So far as the political life of peoples is concerned, it was fortunately understood in time that instead of clinging to the old colonialism it was necessary to encourage the political education of the peoples that were not yet ready for independence, and prepare the ground for them so that they might shape their own future and direct their own affairs.

35. All these things are impossible, except in an organization like the United Nations, in which the nations come together to study, considering the world as a whole—of which this institution is the true symbol—and examine common problems in a noble and generous spirit based on a community of ideas and ideals with the end of promoting the advancement and well-being of all peoples without exception. But all these efforts, the modern world's thirst for progress, in particular the sensational discoveries which are opening outer space to us and enabling us to explore other worlds, all of this would be useless without one essential condition, peace, without which the constructive labours we are witnessing would be impossible.

36. Such is the task of bodies like the Fourth Committee with which we have endeavoured to co-operate to the fullest possible extent. Nevertheless, we found ourselves obliged to vote against the draft resolution now under discussion. Our position now is the same as it was in the Fourth Committee and merely reflects our belief that this resolution will not serve the purposes for which it is intended. There is no gainsaying that we should be extremely embarrassed if we had, despite our feelings and against our better judgement, to lend our support to proposals which might be detrimental to Portugal's interests.

37. In our view, in the present international situation, the United Nations' greatest need is to find harmonious formulas that will enable it to attain positive results. Our present position, although opposed to our position in the vote on draft resolution VI concerning South West Africa [709th meeting], is based on the same considerations; the resolution before us is not inspired by the same spirit of harmony.

38. The United Nations is a democratic forum in which the peoples may come together and discuss matters freely not in order to widen the differences between them but in order to discover the common denominators that permit them to harmonize their efforts for the greater good of each of them and of all mankind.

39. Mr. PRADO (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): I should like to explain briefly the position of my delegation with respect to the procedure applied for the vote on draft resolution III.

40. Since the Fourth Committee has consulted the Sixth Committee regarding the voting procedure applicable to questions relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories, and since it does not yet know the opinion of the body of jurists working in the Sixth Committee and still studying the matters brought to their attention, it is only logical to abstain from expressing an opinion which might prejudice the subject of the consultation.

41. For that reason, my delegation abstained, and reserves the right to express its views when it deems it appropriate if a similar situation should arise in this Assembly.

42. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution III, which it co-sponsored in the Fourth Committee.

43. My delegation maintains its position with regard to the indisputable competence of the General Assembly to deal with all the matters referred to in the text of the draft resolution. On the question of the majority required to adopt this draft resolution, my delegation voted for a two-thirds majority in accordance with the instructions of its Government; but it is obvious that the result of the vote, 38 votes to 36, will undoubtedly oblige all of us, in our future work, to reconsider the views we have held until now and to review this whole question.

44. I should now like to state most clearly that in voting for draft resolution III my delegation supports the full competence of the Assembly to deal with colonial questions as well as with the problems of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Charter is clear on the point. The provisions of the Charter are basically expressions of the rights of peoples, social units, sectors of humanity, which should have the opportunity not only to voice their complaints in this General Assembly of the United Nations, but to find a forum in which the human rights which the Charter considers to be fundamental to the dignity of the human person are always respected, appreciated and upheld.

45. Therefore, in voting in favour of this draft resolution, my delegation has fully maintained the principle of the Assembly's competence to consider these questions.

46. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): When the Fourth Committee debated the matter referred to in draft resolution III just voted upon, the Spanish delegation explained precisely why it proposed to vote against it. The reasons were, in fact, the same as those by which we were actuated last year when the problem of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories was discussed. We shall not weary you by repeating the arguments we used then; however, we should like to make one exception and repeat something that has already been said.

47. The text of the draft resolution which was submitted to the Assembly today for a decision has an air of juridical candour, a tone of simple ingenuousness which is almost touching. However, certain delegations, among them the delegation of Spain, have been led to suspect that the seemingly innocent exterior of the draft resolution hides a very definite, positive political purpose, in spite of the commendable talent with which its sponsors have endeavoured to eliminate any cause for alarm in their statements and arguments. Why should we be suspicious? The answer can be found in the statement made by Mr. Garin, the distinguished head of the Portuguese delegation, on 20 February 1957 at a plenary meeting of the eleventh session of the General Assembly, in which he said:

"When my country was admitted into the United Nations, together with fifteen other States, the Secretary-General, reviving a practice originally adopted and subsequently forgotten, addressed a letter to my Government inquiring whether, for the purposes of Article 73 of the Charter, the Portuguese Government had under its administration or responsibility any territories which had not yet attained self-government. In a letter dated 8 November 1956, my Government replied that it did not administer any territories to which that Article of the Charter could be applied. Not without surprise, my delegation saw that, on the initiative of a small number of delegations, the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly raised doubts about the terms of the Portuguese reply, seeking, at the same time, to question or to deny its foundations. My delegation could not fail to express its profound astonishment at such conduct. As a matter of record, none of the replies given by any of the other new Members recently admitted was discussed or singled out for scrutiny. Furthermore, no doubts have ever been raised about any of the replies given by any of the other Member States from 1946 to this date, that is to say, during the entire existence of the United Nations.

"In the light of this, my delegation has very strong reason to state that the reply of the Portuguese Government has been subjected to discriminatory treatment—treatment to which no other Member State has ever been subjected. Thus, for the first time in this Assembly, on a matter of this nature, the word of a Government has been questioned and challenged." [656th meeting, paras. 68 and 69.]

Unfortunately, subsequent developments have not invalidated the Portuguese delegation's statement.

48. This explains why our initial suspicion has not been dispelled, and why our misgivings have not left us. On the contrary, they have been growing, despite the high principles expressed by the Mexican representative in the Fourth Committee. . .

49. The PRESIDENT: I do not want to interrupt the representative of Spain unnecessarily, but this is not the general debate; he wanted to give an explanation of his vote but he does not seem to me to be doing so. I should be glad if he would confine his remarks to an explanation of his vote instead of reopening general debate.

50. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): I was merely explaining why Spain voted against this draft resolution, and giving the reasons.

51. With your permission, Mr. President, I was saying that we suspected that the draft resolution on which we have just voted had a political motive in regard to one Member State, namely Portugal.

52. As I have just recalled, the Portuguese delegation declared at the time that according to its Constitution, that is to say, according to the fundamental law of Portugal, which is a free and sovereign State, it does not administer any Non-Self-Governing Territories, and consequently Article 73 of the Charter does not apply to it.

53. In accordance with the principle that the United Nations shall not interfere in the domestic affairs of any Member State, we believe that no action should be taken which might infringe the inalienable rights of the Portuguese State and nation to regulate its national affairs.

54. That is why we voted against draft resolution III; likewise because Spain believes that Portugal is serving the cause of peace and international coexistence with the same integrity and sense of honour it has displayed throughout its history.

55. Mr. KILSMO (Sweden): The Swedish delegation voted against draft resolution III.

56. It is well known to this Assembly that the question of principle involved in this resolution has been a controversial matter for many years. Constant efforts have been made by a number of delegations to interpret Chapter XI of the Charter in a manner that would give the Assembly exclusive competence to decide when a territory should be considered non-self-governing within the meaning of Chapter XI, and, more specifically, when a Member State should have the obligation to transmit information under Article 73 e. Others hold the view that it is for each Member State to decide whether the constitutional arrangements between them and their territories do or do not warrant the transmission of information to the United Nations. The Swedish delegation has concurred in the latter opinion.

57. If, however, an effort is to be made towards reaching agreement, the Swedish delegation has not found the course indicated in the draft resolution practicable. Since it is the view of the Swedish delegation that this controversy constitutes essentially a legal issue, it could best be resolved by getting an authoritative interpretation carrying legal weight. The normal procedure in such a case would be to seek an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice. The Swedish Government considers that such a step might be justified at some stage.

58. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): Before the vote was taken on draft resolution III, the representative of Colombia pro-

posed that the two-thirds majority rule should be applied. The representative of Colombia submitted his proposal on a point of order and you, Mr. President, correctly treated it as a proposal which was how the representative of Colombia himself described it implicitly at the end of his speech.

59. It was on that understanding that my delegation asked to be allowed to speak on the matter when you laid the Colombian delegation's proposal before the Assembly. We greatly regret, Mr. President, that you did not feel able to give us the floor and we feel bound to place on record our disagreement with your ruling.

60. I wish also to state for the record that my delegation, which understood the Colombian representative's proposal in the same way as you did yourself, was unwilling to interrupt the Colombian representative by rising to a point of order, as we would have been entitled to do under the last portion of rule 73 of our rules of procedure.

61. I should now like to explain my delegation's vote. In the language of everyday life, all the questions with which the United Nations deals are important and the delegations here present certainly may have very different ideas concerning their relative importance. Nevertheless, whatever the meaning of the word "important" in ordinary speech, it is used in a special technical sense in Article 18 of the Charter. The legal meaning of the expression "important questions" in Article 18 (2) is questions on which decisions must be made by a two-thirds majority, which is why the two-thirds majority rule applies even to relatively minor matters, if they are included in any of the categories of questions mentioned in that paragraph. The point is not therefore whether a question is important in the ordinary sense, but whether it is important within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. In our opinion, this was not the case with draft resolution III.

62. Article 18 (2) states:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: . . ."

There follows an enumeration of questions to which the two-thirds rule applies in all cases. The list includes no reference to Non-Self-Governing Territories, from which it follows that Article 18 (2) does not apply to voting on proposals concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories.

63. It has been argued that because the English text of the relevant portion of the paragraph says: "These questions shall include. . .", the list of questions requiring a two-thirds majority is not exhaustive and that the list may therefore include questions other than those expressly mentioned.

64. This interpretation is, however, impossible in the light of the French and Spanish texts of the Charter, and no one will deny that where equally authentic texts differ and one of them is ambiguous, the interpretation must be based on the texts which are not ambiguous. In fact, the Spanish text says: "Estas cuestiones comprenderán" and the French text "sont considérées comme questions importantes". Both texts make it clear that the enumeration is complete. Indeed, if

that were not the case, paragraph 3 would be pointless; it says:

"Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting."

65. It should be noted that the paragraph talks of "other questions" and "additional categories of questions". These expressions can only refer to questions on categories not enumerated in Article 18 (2) of the Charter; in other words "other questions" means questions other than those enumerated in paragraph 2 and "additional categories of questions" means categories other than those enumerated in paragraph 2.

66. Article 18 (2) and (3) deal with voting in three cases. The first case is that of important questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority; these questions are, as I said, enumerated in paragraph 2. The second case is that of "other questions". Obviously these questions could not be designated in the Charter as unimportant, and it was surely for that reason that the term "other questions" had to be used. In this case a simple majority is required. The third case is that of the determination of additional categories and here again only a simple majority is required.

67. It was in the light of the three types of vote envisaged in Article 18 that we examined the Colombian representative's proposal.

68. It is evident that questions concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories are not included in the list in Article 18 (2). Consequently the request for a two-thirds vote on the draft resolution concerning the transmission of information must have been made under paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 provides that an additional category must be determined if the two-thirds rule is to apply.

69. A question necessarily arises which the Colombian representative will have to answer himself, as we have concluded the debate on this question. Does his proposal mean that the determination of an additional category of questions is being suggested, in this case the category referred to in the title of draft resolution III, i.e., a category concerned with the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter? If so it would have been well if the delegation making the proposal had explained to the Assembly the meaning and consequences of its proposal, the repercussions of which would obviously be considerable. The delegation making the proposal ought also to have explained precisely which questions would be included in the category which it apparently wished to create.

70. In this connexion, I should like to remind you of the point to which the representative of Mexico drew our attention at the eighth session [59th meeting] and again at the eleventh session [657th meeting] of the General Assembly. At the eighth session the delegation of Mexico proposed a motion requesting that any questions relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories might always be decided by a simple majority. The motion was adopted.

71. Finally, I should like to state my delegation's views concerning the draft resolution itself. What is the purpose of this draft resolution, to which the two-thirds majority rule was applied as though it dealt

with one of the questions enumerated exhaustively in Article 18 (2)? It simply proposes to invite the Secretary-General to prepare a summary of opinions regarding the transmission of information and to decide to establish a committee to study the summary, to consider the question of the transmission of information and to report on the results of its study to the General Assembly at its thirteenth session.

72. Plainly the draft resolution was a procedural rather than a substantive proposal and was intended to facilitate consideration of questions concerning the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter at the next session. No one, I believe, can argue that the preparation of a summary is a substantive question; it is merely a procedural matter, as is the proposal in operative paragraph 2. There is no question of the committee being asked to take any decision whatsoever.

73. We believe the proposal of the representative of Colombia to be based on faulty premises and we voted against it.

74. On the other hand we have no doubt whatsoever concerning the competence of the General Assembly to examine questions concerning Chapter XI of the Charter and we take satisfaction in noting that the Assembly would have approved draft resolution III by a majority of forty-one votes to thirty if the two-thirds majority rule had not been applied.

75. May I say in conclusion that the last fact I mentioned is an indication of the moral value of the draft resolution and of the general feeling concerning the appropriateness of the resolution and the competence of the Assembly. In this situation, the attitude of those delegations which have chosen to use the two-thirds majority rule as a screen to obscure the real problem appears to us most unwise.

76. The PRESIDENT: I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that we are dealing with explanations of vote on draft resolution III. The Assembly has decided that a two-thirds majority was required for that draft resolution so the question is now closed.

77. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I request the President to allow me to explain my vote on the Colombian delegation's proposal. Have I the right to do so?

78. The PRESIDENT: I do not want to prevent discussion, but I think that if we get into a long debate on these matters, with which the Members of the Assembly are thoroughly familiar, we shall be here for a very long time. I allowed the representative of Guatemala to conclude his observations on the matter, but I think that, strictly speaking, they were irrelevant because we are dealing with explanations of vote in connexion with draft resolution III. Having said that, I leave it to the good sense of the distinguished representative.

79. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): My delegation registers a formal objection against the manner in which we were made to vote on the Colombian representative's proposal. We were entitled to discuss that proposal and also to request the Colombian representative to give us the juridical basis of his proposal in the Charter, a request which would have placed him in an extremely difficult position.

80. Furthermore, the record will show that the Colombian representative ended his statement with the request that, first of all, the Assembly should take a decision on the question of its own competence, a fact which, I respectfully observe, the President entirely overlooked in putting the proposal to the vote.

81. Various representatives requested permission to speak but the President saw fit to deny it. We were entitled to discuss the two aspects of the Colombian proposal and my delegation would then have been in a position to submit a formal amendment to it. The President denied us the recourses to which we were entitled. The only positive result we shall have achieved in today's proceedings is that they have furnished an object lesson which I think will be very useful to the jurists on the Sixth Committee in connexion with the questions we have put to it regarding what happens in this Assembly hall when, as we have always maintained, a vote is permitted that is contrary to the United Nations Charter.

82. The Secretary-General has frankly and officially informed us in the introduction to his annual report [A/3594/Add.1] of the real atmosphere prevailing with regard to the voting, a fact which should be considered by all of us. The feeling is that it is legitimate, even though at times the implications may be extremely serious, for some representatives to seek to enlist the votes of others as a normal diplomatic procedure. Obviously in an organization as friendly as this, we have the duty to assist other delegations in maintaining their position, but only to the extent that such action is compatible with the position, prestige and good name of our own delegations. The defeat of a proposal like the draft resolution III that has just been defeated, although it had obtained the minimum required by the Charter for such votes, a defeat achieved by recourse to a procedure without any basis in the Charter, using the votes of some of the very delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution, clearly represents a threat to the prestige of the United Nations. I venture to make this suggestion in view of the point made in the Secretary-General's report. It is appropriate to note such occurrences now that our attention has been directed to this danger.

83. We have asked only what is stated in the Charter, one of whose most sacred functions is to safeguard Members against any action which might adversely reflect on their reputation, their dignity, and their mutual understanding.

84. Mr. KADRY (Iraq): In explaining the vote of my delegation on draft resolution III, may I say that Iraq has, from the very inception of the United Nations, taken a consistent stand on the application of Chapter XI of the Charter with a view to establishing the most scrupulous adherence to the letter and spirit of the Charter. We have at present in Chapter XI machinery which places all Member States under the obligation to work together in order to assist the dependent peoples to achieve self-government. One of the main cornerstones of this arrangement for the objective examination by the General Assembly of the application of the principle and the carrying out of this sacred trust is the transmission of information on the development of dependent peoples. Chapter XI, therefore, acknowledges the right of all dependent peoples to have information on the stages of their

development towards the achievement of the aim set forth in the Charter communicated to the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

85. The Charter lays down the principle that the interest of the dependent peoples shall be paramount and one of the main guarantees of the application of this principle is the assurance given to those peoples in the Charter provision for the transmission and examination of information on the various phases of their development. In the long run, it is by their own efforts that the dependent peoples will achieve the goal of self-government and independence. The guarantees provided in the Charter are designed to assist them to achieve that end by peaceful rather than violent methods.

86. In the life of the populations of the dependent territories, the passage of one or two years is an insignificant price to pay for the ultimate application of the Charter through peaceful means, and if the present draft resolution has been defeated this year, we are confident the time will come when it will at last be possible to study objectively the strict application of the provisions of the Charter, as provided in draft resolution III.

87. My delegation will continue, in coming sessions, to maintain the same attitude. In conclusion, may I remind you that my delegation stated from this rostrum on a similar occasion during the tenth session of the General Assembly that we should not hesitate to raise this question again next year and, if necessary, the year after that. One year and one session has since gone by. We look forward to the work of the coming session to reassert the authority of the United Nations on matters concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories.

88. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) (translated from French): The voting procedure followed this morning makes it very difficult for me to confine myself to an explanation of vote as the President has suggested. I shall have to make a few preliminary remarks.

89. In view of the President's sound advice and his urging that the Committees should speed up their work, many delegations were beginning to wonder at the delay in bringing this item before the General Assembly. We were therefore very happy to hear that the President had been able to satisfy himself that the necessary conditions had been fulfilled and that it was now possible for the General Assembly to take up this matter at a plenary meeting.

90. The representative of Colombia, invoking rule 73 of our rules of procedure, raised a point of order. You applied this rule, with the possible exception of the last part of it, which states "a representative rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion", which is precisely what the representative of Colombia did.

91. You then, for the second time, ruled on a point of order without even knowing what the point of order was. You will remember the first case; I shall not speak about that. I should like the record to show that I cannot endorse such a way of proceeding where this question is concerned.

92. In the past, Mr. President, your predecessors allowed us to discuss similar motions and it is to be hoped that next year we shall have the opportunity

of discussing this motion, if it is proposed again, as it may well be; in fact, it certainly will be, since my delegation will submit this draft resolution again next year and, as has been said, perhaps the year after.

93. The justice of our cause is beyond question. We hope that the procedural machinery will be equally useful to us next time, for this year too we have gained some experience in this matter.

94. We voted against the proposal of the representative of Colombia for the simple reason that draft resolution III, to which the two-thirds majority rule was applied, merely seeks to establish a procedure which might subsequently be followed for dealing with matters of substance. For us, it was merely a question of the General Assembly's right under Article 22 of the Charter to establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

95. There is no need for us to explain our vote in favour of the draft resolution. This is a matter on which my delegation has always maintained a consistent attitude. We very much regret that the draft resolution has not been adopted, but that will not prevent us from having the same debate in the General Assembly next year.

96. Before leaving the rostrum, I should like to take note of the Swedish representative's statement that the most appropriate way of dealing with this matter would be to submit the question to the International Court of Justice.

97. The PRESIDENT: There is only one observation of the representative of Yugoslavia on which I feel called upon to comment. I seem to draw the inference that he was suggesting that I had delayed the debate on this item. Anybody who knows me and who knows the state of business of the Assembly will reject that suggestion.

98. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) (translated from French): I should like to explain my vote on the Colombian representative's proposal. My delegation voted against the proposal, because we consider that Article 18 (3) of the Charter is quite clear: it prescribes a simple majority for all questions relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories. We therefore consider it undesirable that this obvious truth should be disputed.

99. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): My delegation voted against draft resolution III, which the Assembly has just rejected. We do not wish to tire the Assembly with an analysis of the intentions and the real purpose of the draft resolution. These were very clear to all who listened to the debate in the Committee. This real purpose would have been enough to induce my delegation to vote against the draft resolution; but there were other and equally valid reasons.

100. First, we believe the draft resolution to be discriminatory, since it has to be understood in the context of the debates preceding it.

101. Secondly, the draft resolution represents an attempt to reopen a question on which the Assembly took a clear stand during the last session. The Assembly has just confirmed the very same stand by a conclusive vote, and my delegation does not believe



that there can be any doubt in the minds of any of us from this moment on, as there could not have been, in all fairness, after the vote taken at the last session.

102. On the other hand, we firmly believe that the rejected draft resolution would have run counter to the Charter, violating both Article 2 (7) and Article 73 e itself, since the application of this last provision is not in keeping with the scope and substance of the draft resolution.

103. For these reasons, my delegation found it necessary, as it did in Committee, to vote against the text that the Assembly has just rejected.

104. One last word: I do not believe it is appropriate or that it befits the high dignity of this Organization to indulge in insinuations or to pass judgement on the attitude of any delegation. Nor does it appear to my delegation to be wise to voice such feelings, trying to make of any single delegation the scapegoat for the rejection of a proposal which the Assembly did not approve.

105. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon): I shall be very brief. The position of my delegation in respect of all matters which come under Article 73 has always been consistent. In respect of the resolution on which we have just voted, my delegation, both in the Fourth Committee and in the Assembly, and at the last session as well as at this session, has adopted a position which, I submit, is consistent with the principles of the Charter.

106. May I be permitted to say that my delegation endorses every word uttered by the representative of Mexico with regard to the procedure that has been followed this morning. However, the vote of 41 to 30 shows the desire—the increasing desire, I should say—of this Assembly to arrive at an objective and just interpretation of Article 73 and matters pertaining to it and that is a fact which will fortify us in the years to come, when we shall repeatedly bring forward this resolution until we achieve victory.

107. I am constrained to add one other remark. We witnessed this morning, if I may say so with great respect, the deplorable spectacle of a delegation which did not take part in the proceedings of the Fourth Committee, which had withdrawn from the proceedings of the Fourth Committee and in fact generally from the proceedings of the Assembly, appearing here to cast its vote against the resolution which had been adopted by the Fourth Committee. I refer to the delegation of the Union of South Africa. Speaking for my delegation, I say that it was a spectacle which we deplore and which we hope other delegations will take into account.

108. The PRESIDENT: I will now put to the vote draft resolution IV submitted by the Fourth Committee.

The draft resolution was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

## AGENDA ITEM 12

### Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and V):

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/3740).

Mr. Hadwen (Canada), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the report of that Committee.

In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Second Committee.

109. The PRESIDENT: The Second Committee has recommended the adoption of four draft resolutions under this item. I would ask Members who wish to explain their votes to deal with all these draft resolutions in the course of one statement.

110. Mr. HASSAN (The Sudan): My delegation regards draft resolution I submitted by the Second Committee, calling for the prompt establishment of an economic commission for Africa, as a very important step in the economic development of the African continent. It is both a timely and a reasonable step, and the draft resolution therefore deserves the full support and the unanimous vote of the General Assembly.

111. This is indeed a historic decision. It is a milestone in the history of all African countries and territories, as well as in the records of the twelfth session of the General Assembly. In my statement in the Second Committee introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the twenty-nine sponsoring States, I made it clear that we were not calling for anything new. Three similar organizations have already been created by the United Nations: for Europe, Latin America, and Asia and the Far East, respectively. The establishment of an economic commission for Africa is very much overdue.

112. As long ago as October 1949, the Secretary-General received a communication from the World Federation of United Nations Associations recommending that the Economic and Social Council should request him to make a preliminary study of the economic situation of Africa in all its aspects and of the desirability of establishing an economic commission for Africa on lines similar to the already existing regional economic commissions.

113. Again, in 1951, the Group of Experts, in its report [E/1936] urged the establishment of an economic commission for Africa.

114. It therefore remains for this twelfth session of the General Assembly, under the wise guidance of our President, to adopt this historic resolution, so that this day may come to be known in African history as the day when the United Nations recognized the needs and aspirations of all the people of Africa. Let it be known that there is no dark continent in this modern age of the United Nations.

115. The discussions in the Second Committee have convinced all of us that this proposed commission would make a real contribution towards the promotion of the economic and social development of the African countries and territories. We never conceal the fact that it is our aim to have an economic commission with full responsibilities and terms of reference on the lines of the three other regional economic commissions. We sincerely hope that this newly-born commission will command, through the record it establishes, the same respect as the other three regional commissions.

116. We are fully aware that this African commission, with its headquarters and secretariat in a geographically central position in Africa, will be the clearest visible link between the African countries and territories and the United Nations, and it will enable us to adopt a common approach in facing common problems

of economic progress. In this way, we hope that it will accelerate our economic growth.

117. Within the broad framework of economic development, Africa must therefore look to the development of a market economy. Like other under-developed countries, heavily dependent on the production and export of primary commodities, the countries of Africa must also strive to diversify their production and build up of industries. Economic research and basic fact-finding will be essential to provide the tools of economic planning and programming. Technical assistance will be needed over a wide field in order gradually to repair the shortage of skills. Finally, with the achievement of political independence comes a growing recognition of economic independence and the value of mutual discussions of common problems, the exchange of ideas and experience, and the adoption of friendly and co-operative attitudes.

118. With these facts in mind, this draft resolution was thoroughly discussed in the Second Committee. The result of the vote, according to the report now before us [A/3740], was 71 in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions. The abstaining Powers were Belgium and the United Kingdom. These two countries are of special significance to us. Their affirmative vote would not only mean the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution but would also contribute to its force.

119. I should like to assure the delegations of the United Kingdom and Belgium that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution would be very happy to see them change their former stand and vote in favour of the establishment of an economic commission for Africa. We should also look forward to their co-operation and participation in this important organization.

120. Finally, let it go down in history that the United Nations takes African problems seriously and is fully conscious of its responsibilities and obligations towards the African people. If this draft resolution is adopted unanimously, the children of Africa will learn that the United Nations has given them another effective instrument for raising the standards of living in their countries.

121. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union would, in the first place, like to make a number of observations in connexion with the vote on draft resolution II (A/3740) entitled "Expansion of international trade". We voted against this draft resolution in the Second Committee for the same reasons that prevent us from supporting it in plenary meeting in the General Assembly. During the discussion in the Second Committee we showed why this draft resolution is unacceptable not only to us, but to what is very nearly a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

122. Allow me to make a few additional comments on this problem.

123. The operative paragraphs of the resolution provide for what amounts to United Nations approval of two organizations or of agreements between these organizations—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the Organization for Trade Co-operation (OTC). Simultaneous approval is in fact sought for an agreement relating to the establishment and existence of two organizations with which the United Nations is and has been entirely unconnected.

124. Draft resolution II is juridically untenable not only because the United Nations has never been connected with the two organizations, but also because neither the Agreement on GATT nor the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Co-operation has ever been submitted to it for consideration. What we are asked to approve in the draft resolution is thus completely unacceptable both from the legal point of view and, if the United Nations is truly interested in the development of international trade, from the point of view of substance.

125. This was quite properly emphasized by many delegations in the Second Committee. It should be noted that the sponsors of the draft resolution themselves were unable to explain the substance and purpose of their text and to clarify the meaning of a number of paragraphs. How then, it may be asked, can the delegations of many other countries vote for the text? It is thus no accident that a number of delegations in the Committee, including those of Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Ceylon, appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution not to place the Committee in a difficult position and to withdraw their text in view of its obscurity, its juridical impropriety and because it fails to reflect the true aspirations and wishes of most of the delegations.

126. We are asked, by adopting this resolution, to approve a narrow organization, exclusive in character, with a complicated system of delays and difficulties blocking the admission of members. Can such a system satisfy the majority of the Member States, desiring as they do the establishment of a truly universal international trade organization?

127. No, such a narrow, exclusive organization does not suit them. It is well worth noting that the group of countries sponsoring this draft resolution actually proposed to force its decision on the majority of Member States in complete disregard of their interests.

128. As a number of delegations quite rightly pointed out in the Second Committee, the main defect of the draft resolution is that it serves mainly the interests of the industrially developed capitalist countries and disregards those of the under-developed countries. This point was made by the representatives of Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and others, and it is by no means a coincidence that half the members of the Committee either abstained in the vote on the draft resolution (twenty-one members), were absent (twelve) or voted against it (seven).

129. By adopting such a text we should in fact directly or indirectly block the development of international trade, not promote it. At the same time we should prevent the establishment of a universal international trade organization, which is now clearly needed.

130. Although it is entitled "Expansion of international trade", draft resolution II might more appropriately be called "Measures for reducing international trade". This draft resolution can only hamper the promotion of international trade and is in fact designed to prevent the establishment of a truly universal international trade organization comprising the greatest possible number of countries.

131. The draft resolution would have us approve the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Co-operation, an offshoot of GATT, which is a very long way from

fulfilling the requirement of universality. Some of the clauses in this Agreement constitute definite obstacles blocking participation by a wide range of countries and restate the restrictions to be found in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

132. The USSR representative in the Second Committee stated that the USSR would not object either to an entirely new universal international trade organization or to a radical revision and re-drafting of the OTC statute being used as a basis for the establishment of such an organization. The USSR might participate in a truly universal international trade organization regardless of whether it is established as something new or on the basis of a radical reform of the existing Organization for Trade Co-operation.

133. If we truly seek an expansion of trade and the removal of obstacles to it, we must approach the establishment of a universal trade organization under United Nations auspices in a bolder spirit.

134. The proposal submitted in the Second Committee by the Bulgarian delegation recommending that the Secretary-General should convene a conference of experts of the countries concerned to study possibilities for developing international economic co-operation and establishing a universal trade organization was, it should be noted, designed to ensure the speediest and most rational possible solution of this vital question.

135. Draft resolution II, on the contrary, impedes the solution of this serious question and is in conflict with the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council on the subject. For these reasons we would ask for a separate vote by roll-call on operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, and we shall vote against this paragraph.

136. The USSR delegation will vote for resolution I in the Second Committee's report [A/3740], concerning the establishment of an Economic Commission for Africa, because it considers that the creation of such a commission may in some measure promote the economic advancement of the under-developed African countries which have attained national independence or are still fighting for it.

137. The USSR delegation will vote for draft resolution III submitted by Mexico and Romania, entitled "Bases for international economic co-operation". This draft resolution emerged as a compromise between the proposal of the Romanian delegation and the views of certain other delegations. The Romanian proposal laid down correctly formulated bases for a declaration of principles of international economic co-operation and was recognized during an animated debate in the Committee by many countries as corresponding to their interests; we continue to support it fully. We consider that draft resolution III affords a possibility for continuing work on a declaration of principles of international economic co-operation.

138. The USSR delegation will also vote for draft resolution IV, submitted to the Second Committee by Czechoslovakia, on the activities of the regional economic commissions. This draft was fully discussed and revised in terms acceptable to all countries. We regard this draft resolution as a useful reminder to the United Nations Secretariat and the regional economic commissions that while their work, like that of the specialized agencies, has not been without positive

features and results, they are still a long way from taking full advantage of all the existing opportunities for expanding international economic co-operation. Draft resolution IV is thus a very useful document.

139. Ato Yawand-Wossen MANGASHA (Ethiopia): My delegation has looked forward to the day when an Economic Commission for Africa would come into being. It was therefore a great satisfaction to us to note the almost unanimous recommendation of the Second Committee to the General Assembly for the adoption of draft resolution I. The Economic Commission envisaged in this resolution will no doubt accelerate the work of development in Africa. In its function, we hope it will be equal to the other three regional economic commissions of the United Nations.

140. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) (translated from French): I should like on behalf of my delegation to explain our vote on the third draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee for the approval of the General Assembly.

141. In view of the provisions of the Charter which stipulate that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic and social character and desirous of contributing to the strengthening of such co-operation, the Romanian delegation submitted a proposal in the Second Committee concerning the drafting, within the United Nations, of a declaration of the principles of international economic co-operation among the Members of the Organization. In making this proposal my delegation was guided by the following considerations.

142. In the first place, the practice of co-operation among States large and small, rich and poor, industrialized and under-developed, with planned economies and without, has proved that the establishment of economic relations on the basis of equitable principles is of profit to all. The Charter and a series of resolutions adopted by our Organization lay down, although not in a comprehensive or organized form, a series of principles and rules which should guide economic relations among Member States. Major groups of countries have already adopted instruments which state the principles of economic co-operation applicable in their mutual relations. I refer to the instruments adopted by the countries of the Americas and those published by the Bandung Conference.

143. Thus, more than half the Members of the United Nations have already drafted documents along these lines. In my delegation's view, the crystallization of these principles and their consolidation in a single document are essential as a means of ensuring that they are applied more effectively, more widely and more completely.

144. In the light of these considerations, my delegation believed that it would be to our common interest to adopt a declaration of economic principles that might form the basis of economic relations among the Member States.

145. It is our belief that these general principles cover every aspect of the question and should be adopted as the basis of relations among States. These principles are: respect for the economic independence of each State, complete respect for the right of each State to dispose of its wealth and natural resources, the ob-

servance of equality and equivalent exchanges, reciprocity in commercial relations, the granting, free of political conditions, of technical assistance and economic aid to under-developed countries, and the organization of wide contacts and an intensive exchange of experience in the technical, scientific and economic fields.

146. In elaborating these principles, my delegation was careful to ensure that they reflected the various opinions, and corresponded to the interests, of the great majority of the Member States of our Organization, in other words, both under-developed and industrialized countries.

147. In order to permit the numerous delegations which had expressed the desire to do so to examine the problem more thoroughly and to prepare themselves for future discussions, my delegation did not press for the adoption of its proposal at the present session.

148. In my delegation's opinion, draft resolution III represents a stage in the preparations for further discussion of this problem. We will vote in favour of this draft resolution because the document to be prepared by the Secretary-General, and a series of similar documents adopted outside the Organization, will doubtless enable the General Assembly to discuss the question constructively at its next session and to draft a declaration of principles acceptable to the majority of Member States.

149. It is certain that the adoption of so important a document, besides having positive economic repercussions, will favourably affect relations among Member States. It will mark a step towards the relaxation of tension, the improvement of international relations and the consolidation of peace.

150. My delegation will give due consideration to the interesting observations made in the course of the session. It will continue to examine this problem with

a view to presenting proposals likely to secure acceptance at the next session.

151. With regard to the other draft resolutions, my delegation will vote in favour of drafts I and IV, which are, in our opinion, constructive, and against draft resolution II.

152. Mr. Gopala MENON (India): The Indian delegation will vote for all four resolutions which are before us. It gives the Indian delegation particular pleasure to support these resolutions, as we pressed the view in the Committee that the time had come when the various specialized agencies, and the Economic and Social Council especially, should take steps to concentrate on concrete ways and means for integrating and mobilizing international effort for economic development, particularly for the under-developed countries. We find that these four resolutions in one way or another give expression to that specific desire voiced by our delegation. My delegation is also very happy that the Second Committee was able to approve draft resolution I; we hope that the resolution will now be adopted by the Assembly, so that an economic commission for Africa can be set up. We had the privilege of initiating this suggestion.

153. We feel that the time has come, in fact the time had come earlier, for an economic commission to be functioning in Africa because economic development must make great strides in Africa before that continent can come into line with other countries of the world. India is particularly happy that the Assembly will request the Economic and Social Council to give prompt and favourable consideration at its next session to the establishment of an economic commission for Africa. We share the hope of the African representatives that this commission will function in the same manner as other specialized organizations and assist the development of African countries.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.