

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1026th
 MEETING**

Thursday, 27 October 1960,
 at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 45 (Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi) (continued)</i>	153
<i>Agenda items 37, 39 and 41:</i>	
<i>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 (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;</i>	
(b) <i>Information on economic conditions;</i>	
(c) <i>Information on other conditions;</i>	
(d) <i>General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;</i>	
(e) <i>New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	153

Chairman: Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 45 (QUESTION OF THE FUTURE OF RUANDA-URUNDI) (continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received a request for a hearing concerning the future of Ruanda-Urundi. If there were no objections, the request would be circulated to the members of the Committee for consideration at a later meeting.

It was so decided.^{1/}

* Resumed from the 1022nd meeting.

^{1/} The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/444/Add.4.

AGENDA ITEMS 37, 39 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/4360-4368, A/4371, A/C.4/L.640/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2) (continued):

- (a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter (A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128 and Corr.1, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr.1, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER.A/15/vol.5);
- (b) Information on economic conditions (A/4371);
- (c) Information on other conditions (A/4371);
- (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 (A/4470);

Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4471 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) (continued)

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4473 and Corr.1 and Add.1, 2 and 3) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.640/REV.1 AND REV.1/ADD.1 AND 2) (continued)

2. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to continue its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.640/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2, as orally revised by the sponsors at the 1024th meeting.

3. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) recalled that for some years several non-African, non-Asian Powers had opposed the principle embodied in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, maintaining that the accession to independence of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should depend on the attainment of a certain economic, social and educational level. Iran had never accepted that view. At the current session, however, some of those Powers had indicated that they might be able to revise their position if the wording of the draft resolution were slightly modified. The Iranian delegation was willing to compromise on the form of the draft resolution in order to make it more widely acceptable, provided that the substance remained the same. It felt that the present formulation of that paragraph expressed the fundamental principle very clearly.

4. The draft resolution was an important one in that it stated for the first time an idea strongly held by a number of delegations, namely, that independence should not be delayed on the ground of inadequate economic, social and educational standards prevailing in the Territories. The Guinean amendments (A/C.4/L.644), which for the most part introduced mere drafting changes, expressed the same principle as the draft resolution and he would therefore not oppose them. He would, however, abstain in the vote, since he preferred the original formulation.

5. Mr. BA (Mali) recalled that at the 1024th meeting he had said that Mali regarded the draft resolution as a purely transitional measure which would prove unnecessary if a satisfactory declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was adopted and that, while he endorsed the draft resolution, he felt that the substantive problem was not to draw up an inventory of the progress achieved in a particular Territory or by a particular administering Power, but to put an end to colonialism.

6. While he accepted the Liberian amendment submitted at the 1024th meeting and also the Guinean amendments (A/C.4/L.644), he had serious reservations with regard to the amendment proposed by the Irish representative at the 1024th meeting, which he interpreted to mean that the Territories must have an adequate infrastructure if they were to have the right to independence. In his delegation's view, the right of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to independence was inalienable and was not subject to restrictions of any kind. The argument that independence should be postponed for any reason was a specious one, designed to enable the colonial Powers to retain control over their colonies. If the administering Powers had failed to provide the Territories with an adequate infrastructure, the Territories should be given independence and they could then seek international assistance. His delegation was under instructions to accept no compromise or half measures; it wanted immediate and complete independence for all Territories under alien domination and could not allow any postponement of that goal for any reason whatever. The draft had been substantially weakened by the revision of paragraph 5 which took account of the Irish amendment. His delegation preferred the original text of that paragraph. It would, however, accept the Guinean amendments. If those amendments were not adopted by a sufficient majority to demonstrate a general desire to put an end to colonialism, he would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution in its present form.

7. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) felt that there was general agreement on the basic purpose of the draft resolution and that many of the differences which had arisen had sprung from a tendency to read too much into mere words. A United Nations resolution on the Non-Self-Governing Territories must of necessity be a generalization applicable to areas with very different economic, social, educational and geographical conditions and cultural traditions. The main point was that, whatever economic, social and educational conditions prevailed in a Territory, those conditions should not retard its political independence. If the criterion of the existence of adequate economic, social and educational standards had been applied to Ceylon in 1948, for example, it doubtless would not have been considered fit for independence.

8. Much of the discussion had arisen from a tendency to see dangers where none in fact existed. The Committee should beware of employing methods which would defeat its own objective and should avoid adopting resolutions which would prove impossible to implement, for that would be the surest way of bringing the United Nations into disrepute. He, for his part, would be reluctant to introduce into a good, harmonious draft resolution words which would tend to widen differences and introduce elements which were better left out. Some Administering Members might perhaps be using pretexts to impede the political independence of their Territories, but others were not. The draft resolution, however, must cover all Territories and in that sense its purpose was better served by the text as it stood.

9. He failed to see any substantial difference in meaning between the draft resolution and the Guinean amendments. The purpose of those amendments was undoubtedly to ensure that the Territories should not be kept from independence purely because their economic, social and educational standards were inadequate, but the present text of operative paragraph 5 was merely another way of saying precisely the same thing. He therefore appealed to the representatives of Guinea and Mali to reconsider their positions, since it was important for the draft resolution to be placed before the General Assembly by the largest majority possible.

10. Ireland was the only one of the Western European countries which had recently been subjected to alien domination; it would be churlish not to recognize the sincerity and integrity of the motives of the Irish delegation in submitting its amendment. Indeed, realizing the spirit which had prompted that amendment, virtually all the sponsors of the draft resolution had been willing to alter their original text.

11. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), replying to the remarks of the representative of Mali at the 1024th meeting, did not agree that a legal analysis of the wording of operative paragraph 5 was superfluous. On the contrary, before the Fourth Committee approved a draft resolution it should know the full meaning of every word in that resolution. It was for that reason that he had raised the question of the interpretation of Article 73 of the Charter, to which reference was made in the preamble of the draft resolution. As there was no mention of the word "independence" in that Article, he had thought that, for the sake of accuracy and consistency with the draft resolution on participation of the Territories in the work of the United Nations, which had been approved at the Committee's 1022nd meeting, it would be well to insert the words "self-government or" before the word "independence".

12. There were three points in the draft resolution with which his delegation was particularly satisfied. The first was the statement in operative paragraph 3 welcoming the progress achieved in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was only proper that in its work for the betterment of mankind the United Nations should give credit where credit was due, but the paragraph did not fail to point out that a substantial number of Territories remained in political subjection. The fact was that never before had so many people been liberated in so short a time. The adoption by the United Nations of the doctrine of the sacred trust had done much to further that movement. The

Administering Members deserved some measure of recognition for their efforts to promote the advancement of their Territories.

13. The second point to which his delegation attached importance was to be found in operative paragraph 6. The Administering Members should be encouraged to do even better in the future than they had done in the past because, while there had been progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, that progress had not been sufficient.

14. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of paragraphs 3 and 6.

15. The third point in the draft resolution with which his delegation was in agreement was covered by operative paragraphs 7, 8 and 9. The Philippine delegation, like the great majority of delegations, regretted the failure of the Administering Members to transmit information of a political and constitutional character on the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He would not suggest the insertion of the word "voluntarily" before the words "transmitting information" in paragraph 9 because he felt that Article 73, subparagraphs a and b, implied, though they did not specifically state, that to enable the United Nations to perform its supervisory functions information of a political and constitutional character should and must be transmitted.

16. At the same time he dissociated his delegation from the attitude adopted by some of the sponsors of the draft resolution who refused to admit that any benefits could result from the administration of dependent territories by Administering Members.

17. With regard to operative paragraph 5, as the word "independence" was not to be found in Article 73 it was not correct to state, as did the draft resolution, that independence was the necessary goal of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore, he was puzzled by the fact that paragraph 5 made no mention of political standards in the Territories, which would have been in accordance with Article 73 a and b. He could hardly credit that the intention of the sponsors was that people should be granted independence regardless of the state of economic, political and educational advancement they had reached. One of the most serious problems the United Nations had had to meet and would have to meet for some time to come was the tragic situation in a Territory which had been granted freedom without sufficient political preparation. The United Nations had had to dispatch large military forces to the former Belgian Congo and had so far spent some \$60 million, and he understood that, according to the Secretary-General's plan, it would be many years before the United Nations could be relieved of its responsibility for placing the Republic of the Congo on a solid basis. Was that situation to be reproduced in other Territories? If so, the burdens, financial and otherwise, would be borne not only by the sponsors of the draft resolution but by all Member States. Article 73 b laid down that the Administering Members should assist the people in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples; that last clause was completely ignored by paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

18. His delegation deplored attempts to discredit or even to destroy the United Nations. Small coun-

tries such as his own and many others had no better guarantee of their security and freedom than the co-operation of the entire international organization. It was owing to the United Nations that the Philippines and other small countries could take their place as free and sovereign Members of the community of nations.

19. His delegation's vote on the other paragraphs of the draft resolution would be guided by what it considered to be practicable and attainable under Article 73 of the Charter.

20. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) pointed out that according to the records of the San Francisco Conference the delegate for the Philippines, when accepting Article 73 b in its revised form, had said that self-government might express the ultimate happiness for some peoples but that other peoples might find the ultimate happiness in independence and that the Charter should not bar the avenue to happiness for such peoples.^{2/} Moreover, he had interpreted the wording of Article 73 b as meaning independence. The only comment made on that statement had been by the United Kingdom delegate, who had said that his Government had never ruled out independence as a possible goal for dependent territories in appropriate cases.

21. The inclusion of the word "independence" in the draft resolution had not given rise to any objections on the part of any of the colonial Powers, and it was worthy of note that such objections were coming from the Philippines.

22. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the view expressed by the Philippine delegate at the San Francisco Conference about the meaning of the word "self-government" had represented only his individual opinion and not that of the Conference as a whole.

23. Mr. Zaid RIFAI (Jordan) fully endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of Ceylon and Iran with regard to the amendments proposed by the delegation of Guinea.

24. Mr. CABA (Guinea) said that his delegation would prefer operative paragraph 3 to begin "Notes that progress has been achieved ..." rather than "welcomes the progress ..." because it did not consider that the Committee should congratulate the Administering Members on the manner in which they had administered the Non-Self-Governing Territories. All the members of the Committee were opposed to colonialism and felt that it should be liquidated as soon as possible; he could not therefore see what objection there could be to that amendment.

25. With regard to paragraph 5, his delegation's amendment was not a mere matter of wording but related to the substance of the matter. The sponsors admitted that they had weakened the draft resolution by the deletion of the words "under no circumstances". The Guinean amendment was weaker than the original text and he hoped the sponsors would be able to accept it.

26. As far as paragraph 6 was concerned, the United Nations had repeatedly and vainly requested the Administering Members to transfer more powers to the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories. The time

^{2/} See United Nations Conference on International Organization, II/4/43.

had now come to use stronger language and his delegation had therefore proposed that the word "Requests" should be replaced by "Urges".

27. With regard to his delegation's amendment to paragraph 7, he said that the General Assembly had several times requested the Administering Members to transmit information on political and constitutional development in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and should not appear to condone their failure to do so.

28. He adjured the sponsors to realize that it was impossible to negotiate or compromise with the Administering Members, since their interests were always contrary to those of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

29. Mr. SALL (Senegal) expressed the view that the amendments proposed by the representative of Guinea added nothing essential to the draft resolution. At the time the Charter had been drafted the word "self-government" had been generally acceptable; in 1960 it no longer corresponded to political reality in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The word "independence" now represented the aspirations of those peoples. It would be a mistake to adhere too rigidly to the wording of the Charter, which had been to some extent outstripped by events. The use of the word "independence" in the draft resolution was not a violation but an adaptation of the Charter.

30. In reply to the remarks made by the representative of Ireland at the previous meeting, he said that the attainment of independence by the Non-Self-Governing Territories was the fulfilment of a political and psychological revolution which should not be identified with economic and social revolution. The peoples today, whatever their state of preparedness, wished to affirm their dignity as human beings; thus the attainment of independence should not be deferred because of economic or social considerations.

31. He hoped the Committee would approve the draft resolution.

32. Mr. HOEL (Norway) said that his delegation's chief difficulty in accepting the draft resolution as it stood arose from the wording of paragraph 5. Different interpretations of the text had been heard, but his delegation could only read it to mean that economic, social and educational standards were of no real importance in the development of a Territory towards independence. It could not subscribe to that conclusion, which it considered to be contrary to all practical experience. His delegation supported the final goal sought by the sponsors, the granting of independence to all dependent peoples. It considered that the United Nations had an important role to play in assisting both the dependent peoples and the Administering Members to ensure the peaceful completion of that process. The United Nations could render assistance most effectively, however, by recognizing the practical lessons of past and present experience. If the present text of paragraph 5 were approved by the Committee his delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. Adoption of the amendment proposed by the delegation of Guinea would not change the position of his delegation.

33. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation felt that the

resolution should stress the absolute necessity of granting independence to all dependent territories without delay. Operative paragraph 5 was therefore of great importance. The peoples of the dependent territories, particularly in Africa, had been exploited and kept in a state of backwardness which was later used as a pretext for not granting them freedom.

34. He entirely agreed with the representative of Mali that only free peoples could advance rapidly in the educational, economic and social spheres. The achievements of such countries as Guinea, Ghana, the United Arab Republic and others were sufficient proof that independence alone would ensure progress.

35. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

The motion was adopted.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would vote on each of the Guinean amendments (A/C.4/L.644) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.640/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2, and then on the paragraph of the draft to which it referred.

37. He put to the vote first the Guinean amendment to operative paragraph 3, whereby the first part of that paragraph would read: "Notes that progress has been achieved in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and ...".

The amendment was adopted by 25 votes to 17, with 37 abstentions.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Guinean amendment to paragraph 5, whereby the second half of that paragraph would read: "The inadequate level of economic, social and educational development in the Territories should never serve as a pretext for deferring their accession to independence".

At the request of the representative of Guinea, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroun.

Against: Chile, Italy.

Abstaining: Ceylon, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Cambodia, Canada.

The amendment was adopted by 32 votes to 2, with 51 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment by Guinea to paragraph 6, whereby the word "Re-quests" would be replaced by the word "Urges".

The amendment was adopted by 39 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended, was adopted by 61 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment by Guinea to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, whereby the words "with regret" would be inserted after the words "Further notes".

The amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 12, with 34 abstentions.

Paragraph 7, as amended, was adopted by 59 votes to 3, with 19 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the proposal by Guinea that the word "Prie" should be replaced by the word "Invite" in the French text of paragraph 9 should be regarded as a matter of translation, not requiring a vote.

It was so agreed.

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.640/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2, as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of Jordan, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was approved by 61 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

43. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed in the spirit which imbued it. His country had for some time been providing political information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories which it administered. His delegation's vote did not mean that it would necessarily have expressed its thoughts in the same way as the sponsors; in operative paragraph 4, for example, it would

have preferred the language of the resolutions on the cessation of transmission of information,^{3/} in which the General Assembly "took note" rather than approved the action.

44. With regard to operative paragraph 5, he wished to make it perfectly clear that another factor not mentioned in the text was equally important, namely the freely expressed will of the people of a Territory to associate with another State; if, as his delegation believed, independence included such free association, then it had no quarrel with the wording. The main point was that the peoples concerned should freely express their will; when that was the case, independence or independence through association were both equally acceptable. The General Assembly's decision about the wording of the questions to be put to the inhabitants of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration^{4/} seemed to support his delegation's view that independence included self-government.

45. As his delegation understood it, operative paragraph 5 meant that independence should not be delayed solely on the grounds referred to in the text. His delegation looked forward to the day when all peoples would be free or self-governing and was convinced that in many cases more progress was made in economic, social and educational matters after independence than before it; nevertheless, certain minimum economic, social and educational standards were essential to the functioning of a modern State.

46. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole and had voted against operative paragraph 7 because no obligation to provide information on political developments existed under the Charter. The fact that his country no longer administered any Non-Self-Governing Territories was no reason for it to abandon its view that it was essential to comply with the Charter both in the letter and the spirit; that was not mere legalism but common sense. If the United Nations was to accomplish its task of basing international order on peace and co-operation, the first essential was to abide by the undertakings given. In the past, his country had transmitted information about the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration. They had achieved independence and were none the worse for the fact that information on political developments had not been provided.

47. Mr. ANSTENSEN (Canada) said that his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution, with the general intention of which it agreed. The wording of the text was ambiguous: it would have been better if direct reference had been made to the words of the Charter, Article 73 of which referred to self-government, not to independence. The objectives were self-government and self-determination; but without self-government there could be no self-determination.

48. Operative paragraph 3 was unfair to the great majority of Administering Members and his delegation could not accept the implication that the majority of them had failed to fulfil their obligations. It also objected to operative paragraph 5 because it seemed to deny what was fully recognized by the Charter,

^{3/} General Assembly resolutions 748 (VIII), 849 (IX), 945 (X) and 1469 (XIV).

^{4/} See General Assembly resolutions 1352 (XIV) and 1473 (XIV).

namely, that political, economic, social and educational progress was necessary before full self-government could be attained. In general, the Canadian delegation associated itself with the views expressed by the representative of Norway in respect of paragraph 5. It would have been understandable had operative paragraph 9 urged the Administering Members to assist the General Assembly in assessing the progress of the Territories towards the objectives of the Charter. If it had done so without, as it seemed to him, attempting, by implication, to re-write the Charter, his delegation could have supported that paragraph.

49. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) observed that his delegation endorsed the broad principles underlying the draft resolution, which, in its view, was a commendable attempt to provide the Administering Members with guidance on a number of basic points derived from the experience of the past fifteen years. Since all agreed that the dependent countries should achieve independence and freedom, he had hoped that the sponsors would have been able to word the proposal in such a way as to meet his delegation's known views. They had been unable to do so and in consequence his delegation, to its regret, had been unable to give the proposal its unreserved support.

50. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10 of the draft resolution had occasioned his delegation no difficulty, although the Guinean amendments had rendered them somewhat less satisfactory. The most important of his delegation's reservations concerned paragraph 9 in association with paragraphs 7 and 8. Article 73 e of the Charter clearly referred to economic, social and educational conditions; if the intention had been that information on political conditions should be provided, the Article would have said as much. His country carried out its obligations under the Charter and could not support a resolution which urged it as an Administering Member to take action for which the Charter did not provide.

51. If times had changed, it had been because the Administering Members had shown good faith and had granted independence to Territories which they had administered. He appreciated the point that information regarding political developments was necessary in order to understand the background of economic, social and educational problems; but anyone wishing to ascertain what political developments had taken place in the Territories under United Kingdom administration could readily do so by consulting the voluminous documents available on the subject. The lack of such information, as far as the United Nations was concerned, had not prevented their progress to independence.

52. With regard to operative paragraph 5 and in view of the statement by the representative of Byelorussia, he wished once more to make it perfectly clear that his Government did not consider that independence should be delayed because of continuing economic, social and educational problems. The original formulation of the paragraph had given the wrong emphasis and his delegation had appreciated the efforts of the sponsors to meet its views. He had assumed the Guinean amendment to that paragraph to mean that inadequate economic, social and educational developments in a Territory should not be used as a pretext for deferring independence unless that inadequacy had some basis in fact.

53. In view of the position of his delegation with regard to the transmission of information on political developments, he had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but since there was much in it which met with his delegation's approval, he had been able to abstain.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.