



Thursday, 15 December 1960,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Decision concerning procedure	1285
Agenda items 12, 29 and 74:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and VII (paragraph 645 only))	
Economic development of under-developed countries:	
(a) International flow of private capital: re- port of the Secretary-General and recom- mendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;	
(b) Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General;	
(c) Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and com- ments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;	
(d) Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary- General	
Land reform	
Reports of the Second Committee and the Fifth Committee	1286
Agenda items 28, 30, 31 and 32:	
Progress and operations of the Special Fund Programmes of technical assistance:	
(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council;	
(b) United Nations assistance in public ad- ministration: report of the Secretary- General;	
(c) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Tech- nical Assistance	
Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General	
Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Second Committee	1286
Agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Terri- tories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Ter- ritories:	
(a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self- Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;	
(b) Information on economic conditions;	

(c) Information on other conditions;	
(d) General questions relating to the trans- mission and examination of information;	
(e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Terri- tories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary- General	
Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General	
Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Ter- ritories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General	
Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self- Governing Territories: report of the Secre- tary-General	
Report of the Fourth Committee	1289
Agenda item 38:	
Study of principles which should guide Mem- bers in determining whether or not an obliga- tion exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Special Committee es- tablished under General Assembly resolu- tion 1467 (XIV)	
Report of the Fourth Committee	1289
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda (continued)	
Third report of the General Committee . . .	1294

President: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

Decision concerning procedure

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second and Fourth Committees.

AGENDA ITEMS 12, 29 AND 74

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and VII (paragraph 645 only))
Economic development of under-developed countries:
(a) International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;
(b) Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary- General;

- (c) Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;
- (d) Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General

Land reform

REPORTS OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/4648) AND THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4633)

AGENDA ITEMS 28, 30, 31 AND 32

Progress and operations of the Special Fund

Programmes of technical assistance:

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council;
- (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance

Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General

Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/4649)

Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the reports of that Committee (A/4648 and A/4649) and then spoke as follows:

1. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: At its 645th meeting the Second Committee, acting on a suggestion made by its Chairman, decided to divide the agenda items referred to it into two main groups: first, those dealing with general economic questions, and in particular economic development — that is, items 12, 29 and 74; and, second, those dealing in a particular sense with operational programmes—that is, items 28, 30, 31 and 32. The Committee envisaged a general discussion for each group of items, after which the draft resolutions that had been submitted were to be considered. Due to pressure of work, however, it was decided later in the session that the general debate on the second group of items was not to be held, and that any general statement that delegations wanted to make could be made in the course of the discussion of the draft resolutions.

2. The report on the first group of items—items 12, 29 and 74—including the draft resolutions adopted in the Committee, is contained in document A/4648, which I hereby commend for approval.

3. The report on the second group of items—items 28, 30, 31 and 32—including the draft resolutions adopted thereon, is contained in document A/4649, which I also hereby commend for approval.

4. The PRESIDENT: Before we consider the twelve draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in the first of its reports (A/4648), I call on the representative of the United States.

5. Mr. PAYNE (United States of America): I believe that the intent of the amendment in document A/L.330 and Add.1 is clear. It is widely recognized that both public and private capital have an important role to play in accelerating the economic progress of the developing countries. Indeed, the title of the draft resolution and operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 recognize the importance of both these sources of foreign funds. By adding the words "and capital" after the words "international assistance" in operative paragraph 1, we would bring it into line with the overall purpose of the draft resolution. In the view of the delegations sponsoring this amendment, such a change would be a significant addition. We earnestly hope that the other members of the General Assembly will lend their support.

6. Mr. B. K. NEHRU (India): The amendment just introduced by the representative of the United States has been sponsored by India and a number of the sponsors of the original draft resolution, which is now numbered VIII in the report of the Second Committee, dealing with the acceleration of the flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries.

7. It would perhaps be helpful to the Assembly if I were to explain the reasons which have led the Indian delegation and the sponsors of the original draft resolution to submit this amendment.

8. Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution mentions only international assistance, although operative paragraph 2 refers specifically to capital and technical assistance, whether through public or private channels, whether bilateral or multilateral, or through international organizations. We believe that the explicit mention of capital in paragraph 1 would improve that paragraph. Secondly, we believe that the addition of these words would enable some delegations which found difficulty in supporting paragraph 1 in Committee to support it here.

9. For these reasons, we and the other delegations have sponsored this amendment.

10. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to consider the twelve draft resolutions recommended in the report of the Second Committee (A/4648).

11. Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. May I take it that it has also the unanimous approval of the Assembly?

Draft resolution I was adopted.

12. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II concerns economic and social consequences of disarmament. In this connexion the Assembly has before it the report of the Fifth Committee on the financial implications of the draft resolution. This report of the Fifth Committee is in document A/4633.

13. I now put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution II, on which a separate vote has been requested.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to 13, with 23 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

14. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If there is no

objection, I shall take it that it is also unanimously approved by the Assembly.

Draft resolution III was adopted.

15. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV was also adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that this is also approved by the Assembly.

Draft resolution IV was adopted.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

16. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it as adopted by the Assembly.

Draft resolution VI was adopted.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 71 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.

17. The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution VIII, which deals with the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries. An amendment to this draft resolution has been submitted by Burma, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, the Federation of Malaya, India, Japan, Nigeria, the Sudan, Thailand, the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America [A/L.330 and Add.1]. This amendment reads:

"In operative paragraph 1, add the words 'and capital' after the words 'international assistance'."

The amendment was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

18. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested on the phrase in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution VIII reading: "so as to reach as soon as possible approximately 1 per cent of the combined national incomes of the economically advanced countries."

The words were adopted by 40 votes to 7, with 32 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to none.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

19. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to draft resolution X. I will put to the vote, first, sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 1, on which a separate vote has been requested, and then the draft resolution as a whole.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution X was adopted by 91 votes to none.

20. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now turn its attention to draft resolution XI, which was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If I hear no objection, I would propose to record it as having been approved by the General Assembly.

Draft resolution XI was adopted.

21. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution XII was also adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If there

is no objection, I would propose to record it also as being approved by the General Assembly.

Draft resolution XII was adopted.

22. The PRESIDENT: One or two representatives have expressed a desire to explain their votes after the voting. I call on the representative of the United States.

23. Mr. PAYNE (United States of America): Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution I originated with a proposal which stated simply, "Recommends further that the sovereign right of every State to dispose of its wealth and its natural resources should be respected". The United States then suggested the addition of the words "in conformity with the rights and duties of States under international law". During the Committee's vote on this draft resolution, the representative of Cuba requested a separate vote on that part of paragraph 5 which had been suggested by the United States. Fifty-four delegations voted in favour of that language, with no votes against and twenty-six abstentions. The representative of Cuba explained his abstention on the grounds that in the context of the resolution his delegation interpreted the phrase "in conformity with the rights and duties of States under international law" as qualifying the sovereign rights of a State over its natural resources. My delegation, which was among those supporting this phrase, agrees with the interpretation of the representative of Cuba that it is a qualifying phrase. We disagree with him in that we believe that this qualifying phrase is just and necessary in this context.

24. With nations, as with individuals, the exercise of rights must not mean an abuse of the rights of others. This fact was recognized by the General Assembly in resolution 1314 (XIII), in which there was established the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources. In paragraph 1 of that resolution the General Assembly decided that:

"... in the conduct of the full survey of the status of the permanent sovereignty of peoples and nations over their natural wealth and resources, due regard shall be paid to the rights and duties of States under international law and to the importance of encouraging international co-operation in the economic development of under-developed countries".

25. A good example of the rights and duties of States under international law was given to us by the representative of the United Arab Republic when speaking on 5 December before the Second Committee [704th meeting]. I shall conclude by quoting what he said:

"My country did not expropriate and did not confiscate, neither today nor yesterday, foreign enterprises. My country practised the right of every sovereign State to nationalize foreign enterprises against complete, just and prompt compensation."

26. It is with this understanding that my delegation supported paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. We were also pleased to support the resolution as a whole.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) (translated from French): My delegation voted against sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution II on the study of the economic and social consequences of disarmament because it considers that the effect of

this provision is to prejudice the scope and the result of the studies which will be entrusted to the Secretary-General.

28. There is no ground for asserting at this moment that the cessation of capital investment would inevitably result in structural imbalances in national economies or, similarly, to argue that certain measures rather than other measures might correct such imbalances, if they arose.

29. Although it objects to this paragraph in the draft resolution, my delegation voted in favour of the text as a whole. In this connexion we would like to pay a tribute to the representatives who, during the preliminary proceedings, took the initiative in proposing to the Second Committee, and then to the General Assembly, the text of this draft resolution. It is our belief that the study of the economic and social consequences of disarmament does carry in its train certain promises that the General Assembly could not fail to emphasize. True, we would rather have had this study undertaken as a sequel to real progress being made simultaneously in the disarmament problem, since, in fact, our objective is disarmament in the strict sense of the term and the study of its economic and social consequences should follow the principal decision. However, as the discussion at present stands, we wanted to associate ourselves with all the delegations who, by entrusting this study to the Secretary-General, desired to a certain extent to express their faith in the future. Speaking for ourselves, we are happy that this draft resolution has been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly.

30. Mr. BURGER (Union of South Africa): In the vote in committee my delegation, together with some others, abstained when draft resolution VIII, on the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries, was put to the vote.

31. The Assembly has just adopted an amendment to operative paragraph 1 which changed the character of the resolution to an extent that made it possible for my delegation to join in a unanimous affirmative vote. What swayed my delegation was the fact that the major capital-exporting countries of the world found it possible to support the resolution in its present amended form.

32. However, in voting for the draft resolution my delegation no more than joined the others in expressing the hope that the flow of international assistance and capital will be increased substantially so as soon to reach approximately 1 per cent of the combined national incomes of the economically advanced countries. In fact, my country has for many years favoured measures designed to promote the flow of private capital.

33. I must make it clear that, in joining in support of the resolution, my delegation in no way committed my Government to an outflow of capital or assistance to any percentage of our own national income.

34. My country is still a net capital importer. It is still a developing country; inside our frontiers we have extensive under-developed areas which absorb many millions in public and private funds every year. The shortfall in our capital requirements is made up of loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other financial institutions in the United States and elsewhere on

terms which many speakers in the Second Committee have described as onerous. For this reason, briefly stated, my delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution does not and cannot involve any commitment for my Government.

35. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): The Cuban delegation asked for a separate vote to be taken on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution I and abstained in the voting on it because the sovereign right of States to dispose of their wealth and natural resources cannot be subject to any limitation; otherwise it would cease to be a sovereign right.

36. Nevertheless, we voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole on the understanding that, in doing so, it did not in any way imply—and it does not in our judgement imply—a commitment on the part of my Government as regards the legitimate exercise of its sovereign rights.

37. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba, accordingly, reaffirms its right to nationalization and to any other measure that may be beneficial to our people and will exercise that right, as it has exercised it, without impediments of any kind.

38. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Assembly to turn its attention to the report of the Second Committee contained in document A/4649.

39. Does any member wish to explain his vote on any of the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee?

40. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation abstained in the Second Committee and will abstain in the plenary meeting on draft resolution III which relates to contributions to the Special Fund and to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

41. We have noted that a number of delegations declared in their explanations of vote in the Committee that they did not regard their support of this draft resolution as in any way constituting a commitment to increase their contributions to these two funds. We cannot take a similar view of the meaning of this draft resolution.

42. The United Kingdom is at present contributing to these two programmes at the rate of \$8 million a year toward the accepted target of \$100 million a year, which has not yet been reached.

43. A vote for this resolution would, in our opinion, have constituted for us a moral obligation to increase our contribution at the next pledging conference to a similar proportion of \$150 million. We are not ready at this stage to make a commitment to take such a step.

44. The PRESIDENT: As no other member of the Assembly desires to explain his vote on any of the seven draft resolutions contained in document A/4649, I propose to put these draft resolutions to the vote.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 72 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 86 votes to none.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 84 votes to none.

45. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolutions VI and VII were adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. Therefore, unless I hear any objection, I shall regard them as adopted unanimously by the General Assembly as well.

Draft resolutions VI and VII were adopted.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 39, 40 AND 41

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories:

- (a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;
- (b) Information on economic conditions;
- (c) Information on other conditions;
- (d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
- (e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General

Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/4650)

AGENDA ITEM 38

Study of principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV)

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/4651)

46. Mr. BOEG (Denmark), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I appear before the General Assembly as Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee in full awareness of the heavy pressure of time under which the Assembly is now labouring. For that reason I shall be very brief and shall refrain from going into any detailed comments on the reports of the Committee. For the same reason, I shall, with the approval of the President, adopt the same procedure as was adopted by the Rapporteur of the Second Committee—in other words, I shall briefly comment upon the two Fourth Committee reports at the same time.

47. The first of the two reports presented to the Assembly today by the Fourth Committee [A/4650] relates to agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41, pertaining to information from Non-Self-Governing Territories and various related questions. This is a procedural report outlining the deliberations which took place in the Fourth Committee on these items. The Committee has presented a joint report on these items because it decided to debate them jointly since the four items are so very much interrelated.

48. As a result of its deliberations, the Committee is submitting seven draft resolutions to the Assembly.

In connexion with these draft resolutions there is one point which is not immediately apparent from the report and which I believe deserves special mention. That is the fact that in the voting on each of these seven draft resolutions as a whole, not a single negative vote was cast in the Fourth Committee.

49. Another point to which I would like to draw special attention relates to paragraph 60 in document A/4650. Normally, consideration of an item is concluded by the Assembly once a report has been presented by a Committee and resolutions have been adopted. However, as members will see, the Fourth Committee decided that in view of the relation between this subject and the resolution which the Assembly adopted yesterday on colonialism [resolution 1514 (XV)], the items should be kept open so that, should the Fourth Committee so desire, it may consider them further at the resumed fifteenth session.

50. Finally, in connexion with document A/4650 I would like to make one small technical point. An error has crept into the text of this report, and I should now like to give the Assembly the corrected text. In paragraph 3, the sentence beginning with the words "The representative of Mexico ..." should read as follows: "The representative of Mexico restated the position of his Government regarding any change in the status of British Honduras (Belize)".

51. I now turn to the report contained in document A/4651. This report covers agenda item 38 and deals with the principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter. As a result of the deliberations on this subject in the Fourth Committee, two draft resolutions are submitted to the Assembly.

52. Draft resolution I deals with the principles which should apply in this context, and in an annex to this draft resolution twelve principles are listed. I might mention that these twelve principles, with one modification in principle IX (b), are exactly the same twelve principles as those which were proposed to the Fourth Committee by the Special Committee of Six established by this Assembly last year under resolution 1467 (XIV).

53. Draft resolution II deals with the concrete application of the principles.

54. With these brief remarks, I have the honour to submit, for the consideration and approval of the General Assembly, these two reports together with the draft resolutions attached thereto.

55. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Indonesia, who desires to explain his vote before the vote is taken.

56. Mr. PADMADISASTRA (Indonesia): Before a vote is taken on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/4650 and A/4651 on questions regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories falling under Article 73 e of the Charter, permit me, under definite instructions of my Government, to express my Government's position with regard to that part of the territory of my country on which the Government of the Netherlands, on the false assumption of having sovereignty over the territory, has submitted information.

57. For the sake of our proceedings, I would not venture an all-out debate on this question in this

Assembly. Members may recall the exhaustive debates on this question at past sessions of the General Assembly and are well aware of the long-standing unresolved dispute which has caused so much bad blood between two Members of this Organization. What is more—and you may recall the statements in this Assembly of President Sukarno [880th meeting], of my Foreign Minister [888th meeting] and of Mr. Luns, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands [886th meeting]—relations between the two nations have lately further deteriorated, due to the sending of reinforcements by the Netherlands to that territory.

58. Today, I would limit myself only to the following points relevant to our documents.

59. The first point concerns the question of submission of information on West Irian by the Netherlands Government, allegedly under the provisions of Article 73 e of the Charter.

60. Article 73 e, as a sub-paragraph of Article 73 of the Charter, pertains to Non-Self-Governing Territories. West Irian is not a Non-Self-Governing Territory. It was a residency, that is, part of a province of the former colony of the Netherlands Indies. The Netherlands renamed the "Netherlands Indies" as "Indonesia" by an Act of 3 September 1948 amending the Constitution, so that West Irian therefore is nothing but a residency of Indonesia. The Netherlands Government recognized Indonesia as an independent State, after more than four years of warfare, on 28 December 1949, and on 28 September 1950 [289th meeting] the independent Republic of Indonesia was admitted unanimously as the sixtieth Member of our Organization.

61. West Irian, as a residency of Indonesia, is therefore only part of one of the provinces of another Member State of the United Nations and is by no means a Non-Self-Governing Territory. If the people of the territory continue to be barred at this time from enjoying the same rights and privileges as those living in the other provinces of Indonesia, it is only because of the Dutch military occupation of the territory.

62. I therefore wish here and now, on behalf of the Government and people of Indonesia, to submit a strong protest against the presence of Netherlands occupation forces in West Irian and the designation of that part of Indonesia as a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

63. My second point has to do with the assumption of Netherlands sovereignty over West Irian.

64. If I have shown that there are no legal or other arguments for the designation of West Irian as a Non-Self-Governing Territory, much less is there any basis for the assumption by the Netherlands Government of responsibilities in connexion with Article 73 of the Charter with regard to West Irian. As a Member State of the United Nations, the Netherlands Government, in the years 1947, 1948 and 1949, submitted to the Secretary-General, pursuant to Article 73 e of the Charter, information on the Non-Self-Governing Territory of the Netherlands Indies. As I said earlier, the Netherlands Government in 1948 replaced the designation of "Netherlands Indies" in all laws and regulations by the new name of "Indonesia". With the recognition of Indonesia as an independent Republic by the Government of the Nether-

lands on 28 December 1949, and its admission to the United Nations on 28 September 1950, the Netherlands ceased to have any obligation whatsoever in connexion with Article 73 e of the Charter with regard to the entire territory of Indonesia. The Netherlands Government knows this well. Consequently, it ceased the submission of information on Indonesia. There is no basis, therefore, for the Netherlands to start anew submitting reports on a part of her former colony that if recognized without any reservations as an independent Republic in 1949 and whose membership in the United Nations it sponsored and welcomed in September 1950.

65. Could it not be interpreted, then, that by submitting information on West Irian the Netherlands Government has conquered new territory in this part of the world? Further, with the submission of information on West Irian, is not the Netherlands Government actually suggesting that the United Nations accept this conquest?

66. My delegation wishes to state that the continued occupation by the Netherlands of a part of Indonesian territory is also in flagrant violation of earlier agreements, to the effect that the political status of West Irian should be determined by negotiations between the representatives of the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands.

67. The action of the Government of the Netherlands in continuing occupation of this territory beyond 27 December 1950 was a unilateral solution of a dispute and cannot but be regarded by Indonesia as an illegal action on the part of the Netherlands. My Government, as the Assembly may well be aware, has requested the General Assembly to seek a peaceful solution through negotiations, in accordance not only with the provisions of earlier agreements between the two parties but also in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, to which both the Netherlands and Indonesia adhere as Members. As no such peaceful solution has been possible, because of the refusal of the Netherlands to negotiate, my Government at this stage cannot but protest, in the strongest possible terms, against this unilateral illegal action of the Netherlands in continuing the occupation of Indonesian territory.

68. My third point is the designation of West New Guinea as "Netherlands New Guinea". This new name was only established by the Netherlands in the amendments to the Constitution of 10 September 1956. It has come to the attention of the Government and people of Indonesia that even United Nations documents pertaining to the territory of West New Guinea bear the denomination of "Netherlands New Guinea". In view of the considerations mentioned earlier, such a designation is, of course, totally unacceptable and causes nothing but feelings of bitterness, discontent and unrest among all strata of our people in Indonesia as well as in sympathizing nations.

69. My delegation, of course, can only speak for Indonesia, and wishes to protest against this unilateral designation of the territory. We hope that at least United Nations documents will not use that title, which creates the impression of biased opinion on the issue.

70. The objective and neutral designation for the territory of West Irian since 1949—as the issue indeed was recorded for the first time in United Nations documents in that year—has been "the Residency of

New Guinea (Irian)⁷⁰. This is the accepted title by both parties concerned and does not provoke any prejudice on the issue. Members of this Organization are aware of the still unsolved problem between the Governments of the Netherlands and Indonesia on the political status of this territory. In the absence of any solution, my delegation believes that changes in the accepted title are not desirable, much less since these changes have met with the strong opposition and protests from one of the interested parties. A unilateral change in 1956, in the midst of the dispute, without the consent of the other interested party, runs counter to the United Nations tradition of being objective in such political matters and does harm only to the prestige of our Organization.

71. Lastly, I would like to reiterate my Government's position with regard to an argument that has been advanced by the Government of the Netherlands in the matter of the submission of information on West Irian. The Netherlands raised the argument that if West Irian is administratively reunited with the rest of Indonesia the United Nations will no longer receive information on that territory under Article 73 e of the Charter. Aside from the fact that West Irian is not a Non-Self-Governing Territory but is part of an independent Member State of the United Nations, the absurdity of the argument of the Government of the Netherlands is obvious.

72. West Irian, when administratively reunited with free Indonesia, will be as open to the world and to all other media of information, including those of the United Nations, as are the other provinces or parts of Indonesia. This is not the situation on West Irian under the present legal military occupation of the Netherlands. It is because of the isolating policies of colonial Powers that the Charter provides for the transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such information is desirable only as a means of keeping some kind of check on the policies of certain colonial Powers. It certainly is not an end in itself, since otherwise no territory would ever be independent, on the ground that this would end the transmission of information to the United Nations under Article 73 e of the Charter. Not only the absurdity but indeed the perversion of the very principles and purposes of the Charter, implicit in such an argument, is typical of that conception, as was also pointed out yesterday [947th meeting] by the representative of Indonesia in regard to the question of the declaration on colonialism and, therefore, needs no further elaboration.

73. The fact that the Netherlands has raised this argument confirms the belief that it is their intention to hold on to West Irian indefinitely, keeping the people within their colonial grip. On the other hand, when fully restored to the Republic of Indonesia, the people of West Irian will be able to work in freedom, building up their country together with the people in the other provinces of Indonesia.

74. In voting for the draft resolutions in documents A/4650 and A/4651, my delegation wishes to reiterate that the territory of West Irian is not a Non-Self-Governing Territory but is part and parcel of Indonesia. Any of the resolutions contained in those documents, including the attached twelve principles in document A/4651, therefore, are not applicable to the territory of West Irian.

75. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands in the exercise of the right of reply.

76. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I am sure it must be becoming very boring for the members of the General Assembly to hear the Indonesian delegation air its views on Netherlands New Guinea on all suitable and unsuitable occasions. I must say that I personally consider this an unsuitable occasion, and I shall therefore not answer the remarks made by the representative of Indonesia.

77. Suffice it to say that my Government has submitted reports on Netherlands New Guinea for ten years now, that these reports have always been gratefully received by the Assembly and have been discussed in the Fourth Committee and in the plenary meetings; and my Government intends to go on doing this and to go on submitting these reports until the time when the population of Netherlands New Guinea will have itself decided about its future.

78. The PRESIDENT: May the Chair, for its part, remind the members of the General Assembly that, in considering the reports of Committees, interventions are limited to explanations of vote unless the procedure provided for in rule 68 of the rules of procedure is resorted to. In explanation of vote it is not in order to go into the substance or the merits of the reports made by the respective committees unless a due motion has been made under article 68. Explanations of vote should be limited to explanations of vote.

79. Since no other representative wishes to explain his vote before the voting takes place, I propose now to put to the General Assembly the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee in document A/4650.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 69 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

80. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III concerns racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories. A vote by roll call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India.

Against: None.

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

Draft resolution III was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VII, which concerns offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, was adopted unanimously by the Fourth Committee. If there is no objection I would propose to record it as being approved also by the General Assembly.

Draft resolution VII was adopted.

82. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, who has expressed a desire to explain his vote after the voting.

83. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on the third of the resolutions which have just been adopted—draft resolution III about racial discrimination in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

84. It is a matter of great regret to my delegation that the Fourth Committee did not submit to the General Assembly a draft resolution on this subject to which we could have given our whole-hearted support. The United Kingdom Government entirely supports the spirit of this resolution, and most of the things in it are things which we would subscribe to without any qualification whatsoever. Nevertheless, my delegation found itself in the position of having to abstain on this resolution because of our great respect both for the spirit and the letter of resolutions adopted by the United Nations. We do not make a practice of voting for a resolution unless we are convinced that we can carry it out completely both in the spirit and the letter.

85. In two places this resolution calls for immediate action which, taken literally, would not, in our belief, necessarily produce the desired effect. In particular, operative paragraph 2 makes no provision for the continuance in force of legislation of a differentiating character which is still required in some Territories for the protection of the interests of the indigenous people. Operative paragraph 3 asks not only that there should be no discrimination between races in voting rights, but that there should be the immediate grant of universal franchise. This goes beyond the scope of removing racial discrimination.

86. In some of the Territories for which we are responsible we have been introducing a progressively widening qualitative franchise, a franchise which gives the vote very widely to the people of the Territories and which is on a non-racial and non-discriminatory basis. This we believe to be the right way of proceeding in these Territories and we could not, therefore, vote for the resolution.

87. Finally, I must repeat once more that we are absolutely opposed to racial discrimination and are

dedicated to the task of removing it as quickly as possible by all means which are in our power. Even though we would have preferred to see this resolution passed in a form for which we ourselves could have voted, nevertheless we shall continue to do everything that we can in the Territories for which we are responsible to eradicate racial discrimination and thereby to achieve the principal objective of this resolution.

88. The PRESIDENT: The report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 38 [A/4651] has already been presented to the Assembly by the Rapporteur. As no representative has asked to explain his vote before the two draft resolutions in this report are put to the vote, I propose now to put to the vote draft resolution I.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Chile, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad.

Against: Portugal, Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, France, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 69 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

89. The PRESIDENT: The Chair has received some requests that separate votes be taken on parts of draft resolution II. It might be helpful to the Assembly if I asked those proposing these separate votes to come to the rostrum and explain the separate votes that they wish to have.

90. Mr. IMAM (Pakistan): I have asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution II in document A/4651. This paragraph contains a list of territories to which this resolution would apply. We are not in a position to give our support with regard to all these territories. For this reason, we have asked that a separate vote be taken on the territories listed in items "(a) The Cape Verde Archipelago" to "(f) Mozambique" and a separate vote on the territories listed in the remaining items, from "(g) Goa and dependencies, called the State of India" to "(i) Timor and dependencies".

91. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Pakistan has asked for two separate votes, one on the list of territories from (a) to (f) inclusive and another on the

list of territories from (g) to (i) inclusive, in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution II [A/4651]. I propose now to put this draft resolution to the vote. I would ask the Assembly to vote first on the inclusion in the draft resolution of items (a) to (f), inclusive, in operative paragraph 1.

Items (a) to (f) were adopted by 57 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

92. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the Assembly the second separate vote which was asked for, which concerns the territories listed in items (g) to (i), inclusive, in operative paragraph 1.

Items (g) to (i) were adopted by 55 votes to 5, with 28 abstentions.

93. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the Assembly draft resolution II as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad.

Against: France, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Canada.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 68 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions.

94. The PRESIDENT: Two or three members of the Assembly have expressed a desire to explain their votes after the voting. I call first on the representative of Spain.

95. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) (translated from Spanish): The Spanish delegation wishes to have it placed on record in the Assembly that it abstained on draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee in document A/4651 because, though the principles set out therein contain valuable ideas, the draft seems to us to be confused, imprecise and open to erroneous interpretation.

96. We voted against draft resolution II contained in the same report because we did not think it fair that, without the elementary formality of publishing and circulating the text of the previous draft resolution that the Assembly has just approved (draft resolution I in document A/4651), conclusions prejudicial to a specific country should be drawn from that text.

97. Nevertheless, the Spanish delegation would point out that, had separate votes been taken, it would have reaffirmed the position which it took in the Fourth Committee and, consequently, it would have voted in favour of the fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 4.

98. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): I wish to explain briefly the vote my delegation cast in regard to draft resolution II, contained in document A/4651, which the Assembly has just adopted.

99. In the view of my delegation, the resolution assumes in respect of Chapter XI of the Charter, and particularly in regard to Article 73 e, an interpretation which goes beyond the explicit terms of the Charter. It is our firm conviction that, as opposed to Chapters IX and X on the one hand and Chapter XII on the other, Chapter XI does not place and cannot be understood as placing upon Member States obligations which those States themselves are either not willing to undertake or not allowed to undertake in accordance with, and as a result of, their own constitutional law, which they, and they alone, are in a position to and have authority to interpret and apply.

100. The text of the resolution just approved is the outcome of a different interpretation which runs counter to the provisions of the Charter and, consequently, in our opinion is a clear violation of the basic law of our Organization.

101. On the other hand, the resolution ascribes to the General Assembly a competence which the Assembly does not possess. In fact, never in the past has the Assembly claimed to have competence to determine the legal and political status of any territory, nor has the Assembly ever claimed to have competence to impose on Member Governments the transmission of information on territories which, having no status subject to international jurisdiction or accountability, fall within the exclusive responsibility of Member States and for whose political status they alone are responsible. The General Assembly is not entitled to question replies from Governments of Member States in regard to the status of territories under their national sovereignty, and such replies, given in conformity with national and constitutional law, have to be accepted by the Assembly, which is not authorized by the Charter to impugn them. The resolution takes a different view, and by doing so is exceeding the competence of the Assembly, and this has not been the practice of the Assembly since the very beginning of this Organization.

102. If the Assembly now assumes a different attitude, and does so only in respect of a particular country, one is entitled to state that the Assembly has embarked upon a course of action which represents a clear discrimination against that country. This fact was clearly established during the debate on agenda item 38 in the Fourth Committee, when the report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter [A/4526] on the principles which should guide Members in determining their obligations under that Article and the draft resolution I am now commenting upon were discussed. In reality, although many delegations stated that the report should be widely and generally applied, the fact is that such a report, which is a guide for Member States and not the

Assembly as such, was used solely for the purpose of questioning and attacking the replies of two Member Governments—in particular, the Portuguese reply—and it never occurred to delegations that were we to make a proper assessment of the principles of the report, then an opportunity should have been given to all Member Governments to study the report in its final text, something which the Fourth Committee simply refused to do.

103. We cannot escape the conclusion, therefore, that there was a purpose of discrimination against some countries, thereby violating the principle of the equality of Member States which is embodied in the Charter.

104. My delegation thinks it only right to point out that the views I am expressing are not held by my delegation alone. With regard to the correct interpretation of Article 73 and, in the context of its application, in respect of the voluntary obligations which may stem therefrom, and again on the question of the competence of the Assembly, many other delegations both in past sessions and at this session have expressed views similar to those which I have just outlined. I do not propose to take the time of the Assembly and I shall refrain from making any quotations, but I would draw the attention of members to the statements which were made at the 1049th meeting of the Fourth Committee in explanation of votes cast in respect of the resolution I am referring to by some delegations—among others, the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Belgium—and all were to the effect that the resolution which has now been approved is not in conformity with a correct interpretation of Article 73 nor in accordance with the competence of the General Assembly, since it does not have competence in this case.

105. This opinion was also held by many other delegations as recently as the fourteenth session, but they have changed their attitude at this session for reasons of their own, reasons which, unfortunately, remain unknown to us.

106. Finally, it is the duty of my delegation to refer to another point. Whatever the interpretation any of us may hold as to the meaning of Article 73, and whatever the views anyone may have as to the competence of the Assembly in this matter, it has been made abundantly clear, both in the Fourth Committee and in this Assembly, that Article 73 does not apply to Portugal and that, therefore, no obligations may be placed on my Government in connexion with the implementation of that provision. Any attempt in an opposite direction means a flagrant violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

107. I do not wish to comment in detail on the actual text of the resolution. My delegation believes that the reasons which I have just set forth are sufficient to explain the stand of my delegation. Those were the reasons which compelled my delegation to cast a negative vote.

108. In view of the decision taken by the Assembly, however, it is my duty categorically to reserve the position of my Government, as my delegation did in the Fourth Committee [1048th meeting], in respect of this resolution.

109. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft

resolution II which has just been adopted. My delegation adheres to its view that it is not for the General Assembly to express an opinion whether or not an obligation exists to transmit information under Article 73 e in any particular case.

110. In resolution 1467 (XIV), the General Assembly expressed the opinion that it would be desirable for it to enumerate the principles which should guide Members—I repeat, Members—in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e. For this reason we were unable to vote for or against this particular resolution, since to do either might have been taken as an expression of opinion on the substance of the matter dealt with in the resolution. We therefore abstained.

111. I should, however, like to make two comments upon this resolution. The latter part of the third preambular paragraph states that the denial of the right of dependent peoples to self-determination constitutes a threat to international peace. This language seems to my delegation to be exaggerated. It is not clear to us in any case precisely what it means. The words "a threat ... to international peace" are words which in the United Nations should, in our view, be used with extreme care and only in circumstances where they have a more precise meaning. We question whether the use of these words was justified or necessary in this resolution, and we regret that these words were included.

112. My other comment is the following. This resolution singles out from all the Members of the United Nations the Government of Portugal. The Government of the United Kingdom has a long-standing friendship with Portugal, a friendship which is as strong today as it has ever been. Our treaty relations with Portugal date back to the fourteenth century, and in all those six hundred years our countries have enjoyed the closest ties and have remained amicably at peace with one another. A resolution singling out Portugal is therefore naturally distressing to us. This resolution, moreover, deals with a matter which in our view it is for the Government of Portugal rather than the General Assembly to determine. For that reason we were unable to support it.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (continued)*

THIRD REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4634)

113. The PRESIDENT: As members of the Assembly will see, in paragraph 7 of its report [A/4634] the General Committee makes two recommendations: (1) that the Assembly should recess the fifteenth session on 20 December 1960, and (2) that the Assembly should resume the fifteenth session on 7 March 1961.

114. The amendment proposed by Bulgaria [A/L.329] relates to the second of these two recommendations, and I would therefore propose that the Assembly should turn its attention first to the first recommendation, which concerns the recess date.

115. As members of the Assembly are aware, despite the great efforts of the Main Committees, the situation resulting from the current state of the work of the session makes it impossible to complete the consideration of the agenda by 17 December, which is the

*Resumed from the 910th meeting.

date previously fixed by the Assembly as the closing date of the session. As the situation stands now, the Second, Third, Fifth and Sixth Committees are expected to complete their work before the end of this part of the session, but the other Committees, that is to say the First, the Special Political and the Fourth Committees—and perhaps also the Fifth Committee, at least on a stand-by basis—will have to resume their work after the recess. In paragraph 7 of its report, therefore, the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it should recess on 20 December instead of 17 December.

116. I might point out at this juncture, because this was a point on which considerable stress was laid at the meeting of the General Committee [132nd meeting], that in recommending this change of date the General Committee was *ipso facto* recommending to the Assembly a reversal of its previous decision to fix 17 December as the closing date of the session.

117. I shall ask the Assembly first to express itself on the date now recommended for the recess of this part of the fifteenth session, that is to say 20 December 1960 instead of 17 December 1960.

118. Since there is no objection to this recommendation, I shall take it that the recommendation is approved.

It was so decided.

119. The PRESIDENT: I now come to the second recommendation made by the General Committee: that the Assembly should resume its session on 7 March 1961. This recommendation was made by the General Committee on the understanding that the question of the new closing date for the session would be fixed by the Assembly after reconvening. In connexion with this recommendation to resume on 7 March, the Assembly has before it two documents to which I would invite attention.

120. The first is document A/4647, containing a report of the Secretary-General on the financial implications of the resumed session. The second, which requires special attention at the moment, is document A/L.329, which contains an amendment by Bulgaria which would replace the words "7 March", the date recommended by the General Committee as the date of resumption, by the date "23 January".

121. I would ask the Assembly to decide the date of the resumption of the fifteenth session on the basis of these two proposals which are before it.

122. I call first on the representative of Bulgaria who submitted the amendment to the report of the General Committee.

123. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has proposed an amendment [A/L.329] to the third report of the General Committee [A/4634]. This amendment consists in replacing, in recommendation (2) in paragraph 7, the words "7 March" by "23 January". In other words, the proposal is to decide to fix 23 January as the date for resuming the work of the fifteenth session.

124. There are several reasons why, in our delegation's opinion, it would be very important not to interrupt our work for as long a period as nearly three months. In the first place, it should be pointed out that there has never been such a long interruption

in the history of our Organization. It might well be asked whether there are any really valid reasons that make it necessary to have such a long interruption of the present session. If we take a closer look at the situation as it is at present, it cannot but be realized that precisely the contrary is true. Hitherto, the General Assembly has never left such a large number of important and even urgent problems undiscussed and undecided.

125. The long list of these questions is known to all delegations but I would still like to mention several of the more important ones so that the Assembly should fully realize the decision it is about to take.

126. To begin with, there are a whole series of problems concerning Africa. Yesterday, as you know, the General Assembly adopted unanimously a declaration on the final abolition of colonialism [resolution 1514 (XV)]. This resolution provides that immediate, concrete steps will be taken with a view to achieving this noble objective of liberating all the colonial peoples. The discussions on this question have clearly shown that the execution of this task is regarded as urgent by the great majority of delegations. It was also noticeable, however, that on the very day that this resolution was voted, the representatives of certain colonial Powers tried from this rostrum to give a curious kind of interpretation to certain provisions of this resolution.

127. This has certainly caused grave concern as regards the strict and loyal application of this resolution and proves the necessity for the General Assembly, and more especially the Fourth Committee, to set to work as soon as possible preparing the implementation of the immediate measures envisaged in this historical document.

128. You have noticed even today that many reservations were made on some of the decisions we took also regarding colonial problems. There are, besides, several other questions which closely affect the young nations of Africa. The Assembly has not even had an opportunity of starting the discussion on the question of the economic or other assistance to be given to these countries, in spite of the urgency claimed—and rightly so—for the discussion and solution of these problems. If I remember aright, the United States delegation itself also stressed how urgent it was to give priority to discussing these problems.

129. I should also not omit to emphasize that such burning questions as the policy of "apartheid" in the Union of South Africa and the situation in Oman have not been touched on either. And no one can possibly deny both these are cases of serious and bloody disputes, involving flagrant breaches of the basic principles of the Charter—in a word, that they concern elementary rights in the life of thousands and thousands of human beings.

130. I shall not dwell further on the importance and urgency of these and of several other questions, but I think it is difficult to find valid, conclusive reasons which would justify a decision to defer their discussion and their solution for so long.

131. Another reason why we feel an adjournment of the session until 7 March 1961 to be unjustified lies in the fact that several international conferences are scheduled for the months of March and April. There is, first, the spring session of the Economic and

Social Council, which on this occasion is of quite special importance because of the problems with which this principal organ of the United Nations will be faced as a result of the admission of seventeen new Members, all of them deeply interested in the problems of United Nations technical and economic assistance, of the industrialization of the under-developed countries and all the other economic and social problems.

132. Next, there is a conference on diplomatic intercourse and immunities which is scheduled to take place in Vienna from 2 March to 14 April.

133. When the question of the date for the resumption of the work of the fifteenth session was discussed in the Assembly's General Committee, some delegations asserted that these were conferences of specialists and therefore it would be no inconvenience to Governments to take part simultaneously in the work of these conferences and the work of the General Assembly.

134. That may be true but only for a small number of countries, which incidentally are favourably placed as regards the location of United Nations Headquarters, but we should think of the unfavourable situation in which many countries will be placed and the considerable difficulties they will face. We have all had occasion to realize the difficulties already experienced by several delegations during these last three months.

135. The third reason why our delegation considers that the work of the Assembly should be resumed as soon as possible is no less important. It would be desirable to be able to discuss and settle a large number of the questions on our agenda in January and February. If the proposal to resume our work on 7 March is adopted, we run the risk of giving world public opinion the unfavourable impression that our sessions drag on indefinitely, that our Organization is unable to make an effective contribution to the solution of international problems and is concealing its defects and its impotence behind a screen of interminable and fruitless discussions. This applies more particularly to the question of disarmament. We all know that this question is still in suspense; yet it should be settled, as otherwise the countries and peoples will find themselves in a situation where it will be impossible to foresee how the world will be able to develop in future.

136. We also had a proposal laid before us by certain countries that, as soon as the ordinary session closed, a special session should be held on disarmament. That is a proposal which, I feel, should be supported by every country. But it is essential that we should finish our work, which is equally important and should already be completed, before this special session.

137. For all these reasons, the Bulgarian delegation considers that special importance should be attached to the question of the date for the resumption of our work and it hopes that the Assembly will, in this connexion, take a decision which will reflect a serious attitude towards the tasks and problems facing our Organization. We invite all the countries to vote in favour of the amendment we have submitted and thus enable us to finish our work as soon as possible.

138. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The General Assembly has before it the recommendation of the General Committee that the present session should be recessed on 20 December and resumed on 7 March 1961. The United States supports that recommendation.

139. As regards the date of the recess, the Assembly's original closing date—not recess date, but closing date—was, as we all know, 17 December. It was my delegation's view during the General Committee discussion that we should adhere to that date. The General Committee, however, decided to recommend extending this part of the session to 20 December. The United States delegation is content with that recommendation, if the majority of delegations finds it convenient to continue our work for an extra three days.

140. As regards the date of resumption, ten members of the General Committee favoured 7 March, three voted against that date and the remainder abstained from the vote. The United States strongly favours the date of 7 March. We must to a certain extent take issue with the representative of Bulgaria by reminding him that the seventh session of the Assembly resumed extremely late in February—my recollection is that it was the very last day of February—of 1953.

141. We believe that a generous recess will be good for the General Assembly. For over three months we have been working night and day in a highly charged atmosphere. Furthermore, before this session began we worked hard in a special session of the Assembly. This has been a great physical and nervous strain on many representatives—I dare say on the great majority of representatives. Now, representatives are undoubtedly glad to make sacrifices in the knowledge that their work is important. But by the same token the very importance of their work requires that those who do it should not be too tired to think and act effectively. We sincerely believe that a long intermission will be good not only for the representatives as individuals but for the work in which we are all engaged. Not only will it give us a rest, but we hope that it will also help to dissipate some of the heated, and sometimes embittered, atmosphere which has been generated here in these hectic weeks, and will allow Governments time for reflection on the important issues which remain and time for the consultations which are already being hailed and which could start in the comparatively near future.

142. There are a number of very important international conferences scheduled for the early part of 1961. As the representative of Bulgaria has said, we should try to avoid conflicts with those other conferences, although some degree of conflict is perhaps inevitable. Actually that consideration has been taken into account in regard to the date of 7 March, and I believe that that date does meet the convenience of the great majority here. In passing, I may say that certain delegations seem to intend to press for a special session on disarmament immediately after the end of the regular session of the Assembly. According to those delegations, the regular session of the Assembly should resume on 23 January. But we should then face exactly the same possibility of conflicts with other important conferences.

143. Another consideration that has been raised is the expense of homeward travel from United Nations Headquarters for many delegations; this consideration was raised in the General Committee but, as I remember, has not so far been mentioned in the General Assembly. But under the Bulgarian proposal representatives would either have to stay in New York for more than a month or return home for consultations, vacations, and so forth. Now, the cost of bringing them

back to New York on 23 January would be exactly the same as the cost of bringing them back on 7 March.

144. Only three of the seven Committees will have to meet continuously during the resumed session, and we hope that at least one of them will not have to meet for more than a week; the Fifth Committee, as the President has said, will have to be available on a stand-by basis, perhaps, to consider the financial implications of the other Committees' work. It will therefore be unnecessary for Member States to send back complete delegations, and the expense will be correspondingly reduced.

145. On all those grounds the United States urges the Assembly to adopt the date of 7 March for the resumption of the session.

146. May I say, since I shall not be a representative to the Assembly next year, regardless of when the session resumes, that I hope that the session will reconvene in an atmosphere of harmony and that its work will prosper.

Mr. Nesbitt (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

147. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation seriously doubts the wisdom of the recommendation of the General Committee that the fifteenth session of the General Assembly should resume its work on 7 March 1961. We are of the opinion that this would mean an unnecessarily long break between the two parts of the session, which cannot be justified and is therefore undesirable.

148. We can recall some past sessions of the General Assembly, as, for instance, the sixth session in Paris in 1951 and the eleventh session in New York in 1956, when the Assembly resumed immediately after the New Year.

149. There is also the fact that on the agenda of the current session, particularly of the Committees dealing with political matters, there are still many important questions whose consideration brooks no unnecessary delay, and this fact, as already pointed out by the representative of Bulgaria, also speaks against any long break between the two parts of the session.

150. In the General Committee, some representatives claimed that a long break between the two parts of the session is desirable because of the change in the Government of the United States. Even if we admit that the change of the United States Government has an influence on various spheres of internal life in the United States, we see no reason why that change should be linked to the activities of the United Nations. On numerous occasions, it has been correctly pointed out that it is inadmissible for the activities of the United Nations to be influenced in any way by the political situation in the United States simply because the Headquarters of the United Nations is located in New York.

151. For these reasons, to which we should also add considerations of the financial aspect of the matter, the Czechoslovak delegation holds the view that the break between the two parts of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly should be as short as possible. Therefore, the Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the proposal of the delegation of Bulgaria, contained in document A/L.329, that the second part of the fifteenth session be convened on 23 January 1961.

152. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): When we discuss the question of the future work of our session, we must bear in mind what it is that all States and peoples expect of the General Assembly and the fact that at this part of the session we are having no success in solving a number of serious and important problems, including, for example, the problem of disarmament—it seems that on this main problem we shall not succeed in finding an agreed solution. This fact compels us not to defer discussion of this and other problems indefinitely, and to try to find a basis for such agreed solutions as quickly as possible.

153. Accordingly, the Soviet Union delegation stated in the General Committee [132nd meeting], and considers it necessary to state again here, its view that we cannot postpone the resumption of the work of this session for a lengthy period. We think that the General Assembly should make every effort to reconvene as soon as possible in order to complete discussion of the urgent problems that were on the agenda of this session and that we have not been able to solve at this first part of the session. That is the first point we think should be made.

154. A second point to be brought out is this: if we organize our work as is now proposed and as was proposed by the majority in the General Committee, we shall have a session of meetings extending uninterruptedly over almost a whole year. Indeed, we are now working until December, after which there will be an interval of three months; the resumed session will begin immediately after that and will, it seems, continue until mid-April, bearing in mind the programme of work that has been indicated. Half a year will thus be taken up with the continuation of the previous session.

155. If, as is quite possible, the question arises of convening a special session on disarmament, we shall have to meet again at mid-year to solve this extremely important problem of general and complete disarmament, which concerns all States and which cannot be further postponed.

156. We believe that it is inadmissible to drag things out for a whole year in this fashion. That is why we consider it absolutely essential that we should organize the work of our resumed session as quickly as possible.

157. As for the fatigue to which the United States representative referred, I think that despite the fatigue which all representatives, including the United States delegation, are feeling, a month's rest will be sufficient, especially as Mr. Wadsworth said that in fact he and possibly his colleagues would not have to continue working at the resumed session since, as early as January, there will be new people with fresh energies. We accordingly believe that between now and 23 January we shall have quite enough time to rest and to prepare for the resumption of our discussion of those problems whose solution brooks no delay.

158. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy): When we tackle any issue in this Assembly, we always think of the interests of the United Nations as a whole: which solution is better for the work of the United Nations?

159. Millions of men all over the world are watching our work anxiously and are waiting for results. The question that faces us is only this: should there be a

one-month recess or a two-month recess? It seems to us that a longer interval would assure better results and the more efficient and expedient conduct of our work when we resume our session.

160. After such a long and tiring session, where there has been considerable tension, we sincerely think that, taking into account the fact also that many representatives have their homes and their Governments quite far away, a recess of two months is more appropriate than a shorter one. A recess of one month would not actually, to our mind, be particularly useful; it would be better in that case, since we are pressed for work, to stop for a few days only and then go on working. I say that, perhaps, *per absurdum*, because, as some members will recall, I strongly opposed resuming work immediately on 3 January, as was originally proposed, and I suggested that we should take up our work again on 7 March.

161. If we gave the representatives a shorter time within which to go to their countries and consult with their Governments, they would not have a sufficient opportunity for meditation, reconsideration and appraisal of the situation as a whole before coming back refreshed, perhaps with a new outlook which might lead to a constructive approach in the interests of all. If we only gave the representatives four weeks—because that is what it would amount to if we reconvene on 23 January as suggested in the amendment proposed by Bulgaria—they would hardly have the time in which to go to their far-away countries, have some deserved rest, and have the possibility of really reviewing the situation with their Governments. We all know how quickly time flies. It would be time again for them to leave for the United Nations, and they would resume work in more or less the same frame of mind in which they now leave.

162. Let us think also of the staff of the Secretariat and of the many experts concerned with the financial aspects, who have all been working very hard indeed.

163. Those are the main reasons why we strongly support the date of 7 March. In addition, I would appeal to all representatives to consider another aspect—the aspect of courtesy. I really sincerely feel that courtesy should be a rule in international relations as well as in private relations. We all know that the great democracy which is one of the biggest sponsors of the United Nations will have a change of administration in January. It is highly advisable, I think, that we leave the new Administration of the United States appropriate time for taking over, considering and adjusting itself to its new tasks.

164. I feel sure that if by any chance the country which is represented by the representative who preceded me or, for that matter, the country sponsoring the amendment, were to have a change of government, they would certainly appreciate it if we enabled them

not to have to attend a resumed session just at the time when they have a change of government.

165. I turn lastly to another issue. Since we are considering the report of the General Committee in document A/4634, I would refer to the last paragraph of that document, which mentions a proposal by the representative of Romania to adjourn the debate on another issue; and I would ask the socialist countries to consider that, as requested by Romania, the General Committee readily agreed to the postponement of the consideration of an item requested by three Western Powers, which Powers readily agreed to the adjournment, thus proving their willingness to avoid a new controversy. I hope that the socialist countries will return this kindness by accepting the date proposed by us for the resumption of this session of the Assembly. I am sure that many delegates will appreciate it.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

166. The PRESIDENT: There being no further speakers on this matter, perhaps the Assembly would now proceed to decide the issue. The Assembly has before it, in the first instance, the amendment to the General Committee's report submitted by Bulgaria [A/L.329]. This amendment proposes to substitute the date of 23 January, as the date of resumption, for the date of 7 March proposed by the General Committee. I put this amendment, first, to the Assembly.

The amendment was rejected by 49 votes to 12, with 17 abstentions.

167. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the Assembly the recommendation made by the General Committee in paragraph 7 of its report, that the Assembly should resume the fifteenth session on 7 March 1961.

The recommendation was adopted by 56 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

168. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the General Assembly to turn its attention briefly to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the General Committee's report [A/4634] dealing with a request for the inclusion of an additional item entitled "Review of the methods and procedures of the General Assembly" in the agenda of the fifteenth session. In paragraph 9 of its report the General Committee informs the Assembly that it decided, on the proposal of the representative of Romania, to adjourn debate on the proposed item on the understanding that the question of its inclusion remained on the Committee's agenda and would be considered at the beginning of the resumed fifteenth session.

169. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly also approves the contents of paragraphs 8 and 9 of the General Committee's report.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.