

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1419th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 12 December 1962,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 54:

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV): report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (continued)

Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)..... 611

Chairman: Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO
(Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 54

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV): report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (A/5160 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/C.4/582, A/C.4/588, A/C.4/589; A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.760, A/C.4/L.761) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.759 AND ADD.1, A/C.4/L.760, A/C.4/L.761) (continued)

1. Mr. JENSEN (Norway), speaking in explanation of the votes cast by his delegation at the previous meeting, observed that the Norwegian Government regarded the emergence of colonial peoples to self-determination as the most important political development of the time and felt that administering Powers could best secure the peaceful completion of that inevitable process by fulfilling their obligations under the Charter and by seeking constructive co-operation with the United Nations. As Norway's Minister for Foreign Affairs had told the General Assembly (1126th plenary meeting), the Norwegian Government and people were deeply concerned over the rejection of United Nations assistance and services in certain situations in Africa. Since the final choice facing the administering Powers was not between denying or granting the right of self-determination but rather between the attainment of legitimate aspirations through peaceful means or through violence, the administering Powers which now declined to co-operate should recognize the potentialities of the United Nations.

2. Although the Norwegian delegation had often overcome reservations concerning individual parts of draft resolutions on colonial questions and had supported such resolutions as a whole because of its aims and principles, it had felt constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 because of the ambiguous wording of operative paragraph 7.

The rejection of the suggestion made by the Swedish representative at the 1415th meeting, and of the Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.762), which, if accepted, would have brought the wording of operative paragraph 7 into line with the interpretation given by the Guinean representative at the 1415th meeting, had seemed to confirm the absence of agreement among the sponsors themselves concerning the interpretation to be given to that text. In those circumstances the Norwegian delegation had been constrained to vote against operative paragraph 7 and to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, since it had not wanted to lend its support to a decision in which an operative paragraph dealing with a matter of great importance was couched in ambiguous language. Had the Swedish suggestion or the Italian amendment been adopted, the Norwegian delegation would have voted in favour of operative paragraph 7 and of the text as a whole.

3. His delegation felt that the criticism of Portugal's allies implied in certain preambular paragraphs reflected a misunderstanding of the relationship between members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). All the members of that defensive alliance were interested in ensuring that support given for the purpose of promoting the well-known aims of the alliance was not put to other uses. The Committee had already been told that measures had been and were being taken to prevent such a diversion, and the Norwegian Government, for its part, had stopped delivering arms to Portugal.

4. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.762) because it was fully in accord with the purposes which draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 was trying to achieve and completely in agreement with the statements made by the sponsors of the latter text. His delegation had abstained on the ninth preambular paragraph and on the last part of operative paragraph 7 for reasons similar to those which he had explained in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), when the latter had been considering draft resolutions on Mozambique and on Angola couched in similar language.^{1/} On those occasions his delegation had clearly stated its position concerning certain issues which had no direct bearing on the question of substance but related to the scope of the problem and to procedural matters. Just as his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions on Mozambique and Angola in the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), it had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 since it was convinced that that resolution was in accord with its own traditional policy in colonial matters.

^{1/} See A/AC.109/SR.99 and 114.

5. Mr. McINTYRE (Australia), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote, stressed that Australia regarded Portugal's policies in Africa as utterly wrong. Although there was much in draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 with which his delegation agreed, and although it recognized that the sponsors had made great efforts to produce a text which could command the widest possible measure of support in the Committee, it had had reservations concerning the last three preambular paragraphs, and operative paragraphs 1, 3, 4 (e), 7 and 8, for reasons already explained by a number of delegations.

6. The Australian delegation's main objection related to operative paragraph 7. Firstly, it was of the opinion that such a paragraph was out of place in a draft resolution dealing with the question of the non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV); that was why it had abstained on the first part of the paragraph. Secondly, it found the wording of the second part of operative paragraph 7 completely unacceptable: the words used could have no other meaning than that of calling for a complete ban on the provision of all arms to Portugal, and his delegation could not agree that the United Nations had the right to impose such a ban on the movement of military supplies between partners of defensive alliances. While a number of sponsors, including the Guinean and Ghanaian representatives, had given satisfactory interpretations of the phrase in question, it had been obvious from the discussion in the Committee that a number of supporters of the text gave a completely different interpretation to those words. As the Netherlands representative had pointed out at the previous meeting, it was the words of the draft resolution that really mattered. That was why the Australian delegation had voted against the second part of operative paragraph 7 and had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

7. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 on the basis of the position and views set out in its statement in the general debate at the 1403rd meeting. It had voted in favour of operative paragraph 7, taking into account the explanations given by the Guinean representative at the 1415th meeting.

8. Mr. COOLS (Belgium) expressed his delegation's regret at having had to vote against a draft resolution which, in the minds of the sponsors, was designed to promote the implementation of the fundamental principle of self-determination in the territories under Portuguese administration. That negative vote could not be interpreted as opposition to the principle of self-determination itself, to which Belgium firmly adhered and which it had applied in the African territories for which it had been responsible. His country hoped that the Portuguese Government would find appropriate methods of bringing each of its territories to self-determination as rapidly as was consistent with orderly and peaceful development, and that, conscious of its responsibilities and in its own interest, it would show greater readiness to co-operate with the United Nations.

9. His delegation, which had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1742 (XVI), had been unable to do the same in the case of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 because the latter included provisions which went too far and whose wording was not

in conformity with the spirit of the Charter. That applied in particular to the second part of paragraph 7. His delegation had voted in favour of the first part of that paragraph and understood the motives which had prompted the sponsors to retain the second part as it stood. It could not but note, however, that there was a discrepancy between the wording of the text and the interpretations given by certain sponsors and, equally, between some of those interpretations; and that the Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.762), which had sought to make the language of that part more precise, had been rejected, to the Belgian delegation's great regret. The Belgian Government had serious misgivings concerning the scope of operative paragraph 7 and feared that it might prejudice its freedom of action in defence matters and the right of States to fulfil obligations under defence treaties concluded within the framework of the Charter itself.

10. In the circumstances, the Belgian delegation had had no alternative but to vote against the draft resolution.

11. Mr. BOEG (Denmark), speaking in explanation of his vote at the previous meeting, said that his delegation fully supported the principle of self-determination and attached the greatest importance to the early exercise of that right by all territories which were not yet self-governing. Hence, it was strongly opposed to the Portuguese Government's policies in the matter and had voted in favour of the resolutions adopted on the item under consideration at the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions of the General Assembly, just as it had voted in favour of resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI).

12. It was a matter of regret to his delegation that it had been unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 despite the fact that the basic approach of the resolution was fully in agreement with Denmark's position. The Danish delegation had not been able to support operative paragraph 7 because, despite the explanations offered by some of the sponsors, the sponsors as a whole had not found it possible to adjust the wording of the paragraph to conform with those explanations, as had been suggested by the Swedish delegation, and because the Committee had rejected the Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.762) designed to achieve the same objective.

13. His delegation had therefore been obliged to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

14. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that, although his delegation would have preferred a text without any ambiguities, it had voted in favour of operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1, bearing in mind the explanations given by several sponsors, particularly the representatives of Guinea and Ghana, who had clearly stated at the 1415th meeting that what the sponsors intended was not to prevent the sale and supply of arms to Portugal within the NATO framework but to ask Member States to ensure that such arms would not be used for the repression of indigenous peoples in the Portuguese territories concerned.

15. Mr. SONN VOEUNSAI (Cambodia) explained that, although his delegation had no objection to the Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.762), it had voted against it because the objective of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 had been to ensure that Portugal was prevented from using the arms supplied

to or bought by it for purposes of repression and the Italian amendment would have tended to impair the effectiveness of the appropriate measures. Despite its shortcomings, the text as it stood put an end to the possible use by Portugal of foreign arms for purposes of repression.

16. Mr. KIDWAI (India) pointed out that, while operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.759 and Add.1 might have been better worded, its wording and the wording of the draft resolution as a whole had been the result of a compromise and the sponsors had agreed not to accept any further changes. They had also agreed that the spokesmen for the group would explain the correct interpretation of the text. The authoritative interpretation of operative paragraph 7 had therefore been given by the Guinean representative at the 1415th meeting. It had been on the clear understanding that that was the meaning of the paragraph that the Indian delegation had agreed to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

17. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/C.4/L.760 and to the relevant amendments submitted by the delegations of the USSR (A/C.4/L.763) and the United States of America (A/C.4/L.765).

18. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.760, announced that the delegations of Iran, Mali, Niger, Somalia, Tanganyika, Togo and Uganda had requested that their names should be added to the list of sponsors.

19. The draft resolution was self-explanatory; it dealt with an important aspect of the problem the Committee had been debating. Referring to operative paragraph 1, he pointed out that a similar training programme had been established for South West Africa at the previous session, by General Assembly resolution 1705 (XVI), and a number of countries had offered scholarships to the people of that Territory. In connexion with operative paragraph 2, he drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.4/593) concerning the financial implications of the draft resolution. With regard to operative paragraph 3, he said that the sponsors were aware that the specialized agencies were working in the territories under Portuguese administration in certain fields of activity, but they would like them to intensify their programmes in co-operation with the administering Power. Operative paragraph 5 had been inserted because it had been pointed out to the sponsors that some universities might be uneasy about their Governments' granting scholarships to people of the territories instead of the universities themselves doing so direct. With regard to operative paragraph 7, the sponsors hoped that no difficulties would be put in the way of the acceptance of scholarships by people of the territories.

20. Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) submitted the amendment (A/C.4/L.763) proposed by his delegation to draft resolution A/C.4/L.760. A similar provision had been included in a number of resolutions which had been adopted by the General Assembly and his delegation hoped that the sponsors would accept the proposal.

21. Mr. FRAGOSO (Portugal) wished to state his delegation's position with regard to draft resolution A/C.4/L.760.

22. The preambular paragraphs completely ignored the situation in the educational field in overseas

Portugal, as also some of the findings of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration, whose report (A/5160 and Corr.1 and Add.1) admitted the progress that had been achieved in recent years thanks to the efforts of the Portuguese Government. In view of those facts, to talk of "the incapability and unwillingness of the Government of Portugal", a phrase which appeared in the seventh preambular paragraph, was a gross travesty of the truth and clearly showed that the draft resolution was an attempt to force assistance for ulterior motives. His delegation had already stated that Portuguese Africa did not fear comparison with most African regions in the matter of educational facilities. It rejected the allegations that had been made in that connexion. The Portuguese Government was making great efforts to improve educational facilities; the progress already made and the future possibilities by no means justified the label of inadequacy, particularly when the situation in some neighbouring territories was considered. It was surprising that more concern should be shown for the Portuguese territories than for other regions and communities which were in greater need.

23. Furthermore, inasmuch as the draft resolution attempted to interfere in the internal administration of a Member State, his delegation had no doubt that neither the Secretariat, nor any of the specialized agencies, nor any Member State could lawfully carry out the provisions of the operative paragraphs.

24. Lastly, the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution were based on Article 55 of the Charter. As he had already said in the course of the debate, the Portuguese Government had been making great efforts to increase educational facilities and to achieve the highest possible standards of teaching at all levels. The objectives of Portugal's policy coincided in that respect with the purposes of the draft resolution and his Government had always shown readiness to co-operate in the spirit of Article 55 to promote the well-being and progress of all peoples. In his delegation's view, however, it was not within the competence of the Fourth Committee to make recommendations connected with Article 55. Chapter IX of the Charter dealt with international economic and social co-operation, which was in the province of the Economic and Social Council, with which his Government had always co-operated both directly and through the regional economic commissions.

25. For all those reasons his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and, should it be approved, reserved his Government's position in regard to it.

26. His delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.761, in accordance with its position in relation to the setting up of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration.

27. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that in his delegation's view draft resolution A/C.4/L.760 was on the whole constructive, though he did not agree with all the language in which it was couched, particularly in the preambular paragraphs.

28. He submitted an amendment proposed by his delegation (A/C.4/L.765) calling for a new operative paragraph to be added to the draft resolution. The new paragraph requested the Government of Portugal to co-operate in the implementation of the resolution and his delegation felt that it filled a gap that might have been due to an oversight.

29. With regard to the USSR amendment (A/C.4/L.763), he would suggest that instead of the proposed phrase being inserted in operative paragraph 2 after the words "Requests the Secretary-General", which would have the effect of requesting the Secretary-General and the Technical Assistance Board and the United Nations Special Fund to perform the same task, the following words should be added after the phrase "United Nations programmes of technical co-operation": "notably the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund, so as to minimize the charge on the regular budget". That formulation would incorporate the USSR delegation's idea, with which the United States delegation entirely agreed, but would leave the ultimate responsibility in the hands of the Secretary-General, as it should be.

30. Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would like a little time to consider the United States sub-amendment to its amendment. In the meantime, in order to save time, the Committee might consider draft resolution A/C.4/L.761.

31. Mr. DIALLO (Mali), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.761, recalled that the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to assume the task previously performed by the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration. The latter Committee should therefore be discontinued, and that was the purpose of the draft resolution.

32. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) explained that since his delegation had been a member of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration, he would have considered it improper to vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution had it not been for the fact that he considered that paragraph to refer also to the members of the Secretariat who had worked with the Special Committee.

33. Moreover, in his delegation's view the question of the territories under Portuguese administration should in future be dealt with by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, since all colonial problems should henceforth be considered in the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It was also highly desirable to avoid duplication of work.

34. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) said that the amendment proposed by the USSR delegation (A/C.4/L.764), however laudable its objective might be, did not seem to his delegation to fit in with the draft resolution, whose main purpose was the dissolution of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration. He therefore reserved his delegation's position with regard to the amendment until the USSR delegation had explained it.

35. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) agreed with the representative of Guinea that the expression of gratitude in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be extended to the members of the Secretariat who assisted the Special Committee.

36. Nigeria, as a member of the Special Committee, wished to express its appreciation of the tributes paid to the Special Committee on its work. His dele-

gation would always be glad to serve on committees of the kind if invited to do so.

37. Mr. GONZÁLEZ CALVO (Guatemala) said that Guatemala, as a member of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration, was in the same position as Guinea. He associated himself with the remarks made by the Guinean representative, especially those with regard to the services performed by the Secretariat. His delegation would support the draft resolution.

38. Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) introduced his delegation's amendment (A/C.4/L.764) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.761. Similar provisions had been included in previous General Assembly resolutions. As a result of consultations with the sponsors of the various draft resolutions on the present item, he had come to the conclusion that the most appropriate place for the addition which he was proposing would be in the draft resolution now under discussion. Both the Special Committee's report and the records of the Fourth Committee's discussions on the report would be very useful to the various bodies mentioned in the amendment. He would also refer to the observations he had made in that connexion in his general statement at the 1404th meeting.

39. He associated himself with the gratitude which had been expressed to the Special Committee for the useful work it had done.

40. The CHAIRMAN put the USSR amendment (A/C.4/L.764) to the vote.

The USSR amendment was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.761, as amended.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.761, as amended, was approved by 84 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.760.

43. Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation accepted the formulation suggested by the United States for the USSR amendment (A/C.4/L.763) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.760.

44. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) thought that draft resolution A/C.4/L.760 should be acceptable to practically all delegations; France, at any rate, had always considered that United Nations assistance of the kind envisaged was a necessity, and his country's policy with regard to fellowships was well known. He felt, however, that the assertion regarding the "incapability and unwillingness" of the Portuguese Government to create indigenous cadres was unnecessary. The situation was one which was common to all under-developed areas and the inclusion of such criticism seemed out of place in a resolution which, if the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.765) was adopted, would seek the co-operation of the Portuguese Government. He hoped that the sponsors would feel able to revise the paragraph in such a way as to omit the words to which he had referred.

45. With regard to the French text of sub-paragraph (a) of the final preambular paragraph, he thought that the English word "sanitation" should be translated as "santé publique" rather than "salubrité".

46. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution were ready to accept the French suggestion regarding the seventh preambular paragraph, in order to render the text less controversial. The last part of the paragraph, after the words "Portuguese administration", would be revised to read: "with a view to forming in these territories indigenous cadres for the future administration of their independent countries". That did not mean that the sponsors withdrew their assertion that the situation was the result of deliberate policy on the part of Portugal.

47. Mr. WALL (United Kingdom) said that the acceptance by the sponsors of the French delegation's suggestion had removed his delegation's main objection to the draft resolution. It was not quite clear to him why a special programme should be established for territories under Portuguese administration and why the necessary assistance could not be given, once Portugal's co-operation was obtained, under existing schemes. He also had reservations about such a special programme being charged to the regular budget of the United Nations rather than to those programmes which were supported by voluntary contributions. His delegation felt strongly that any charges on the regular budget should come out of existing appropriations.

48. Despite those reservations, and since the sponsors had indicated willingness to accept the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.765), the United Kingdom would have no difficulty in voting in favour of the draft resolution.

49. Mr. BAYONA (Colombia) said that the measures envisaged in draft resolution A/C.4/L.760 constituted an indispensable step towards the solution of the problems related to the territories under Portuguese administration. He welcomed the sponsors' acceptance of the French suggestion for the deletion of expressions which would aggravate relations with Portugal. That was in line with the policies of his country; as the Colombian Foreign Minister had stated in the General Assembly, Colombia was in favour of decolonization but could not join in unfounded attacks on friendly nations.

50. His delegation supported the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.765) and hoped that it was acceptable to the sponsors.

51. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) supported the United States amendment. Although the Portuguese representative had stated that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and reserved its position, he hoped that, when the resolution was adopted with nearly unanimous support, the Portuguese Government would reconsider its attitude and decide to co-operate in putting the resolution into effect.

52. He supported the French suggestion regarding the French text of the final preambular paragraph.

53. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana) said that, although the sponsors had accepted the French delegation's suggestion for the deletion of certain words in the seventh preambular paragraph, he would like to explain why those words had been used. Paragraph 372 of the report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (A/5160 and Corr.1 and Add.1) revealed that Portugal did not appear to recognize the important role of government in accelerating the development of education, and that, in the

case of most of the overseas territories, it allocated less than 10 per cent of total expenditure to health, education and research combined. It was also clear from the report that the lack of indigenous cadres was the result of Portugal's policy of classifying the vast majority of the indigenous population as "não-civilizado". Those findings supported the view that Portugal was both incapable of creating indigenous cadres and unwilling to do so.

54. Mr. PASCUCCHI-RIGHI (Italy) pointed out that if the USSR amendment was adopted in its revised form the meaning of the English text of operative paragraph 2 would be rendered obscure: as it would then read, the words "to make available" would appear to be governed by the words "so as" in the amendment. He therefore suggested that the words which it was proposed to add should be placed in parentheses. The paragraph would then read "Requests the Secretary-General ... to make use as fully as possible of the existing United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (notably the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund, so as to minimize the charge on the regular budget), and particularly to make available to those indigenous inhabitants ...".

55. Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted that suggestion.

56. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, accepted the French oral amendment to the French text of the final preambular paragraph, the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.4/L.763) as amended, and the United States amendment (A/C.4/L.765).

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.765, as revised by the sponsors.

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, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.760, as revised by the sponsors, was adopted by 86 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

58. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that the Rapporteur should be authorized to submit his report

on the present item direct to the General Assembly. That would assist the work of the General Assembly, which was about to resume discussion of the report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI).

59. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) supported the Yugoslav proposal, but in view of the fact that the Committee had decided to hear certain petitioners on the present

item, he wondered in what report the hearing of those petitioners would be dealt with.

60. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the matter could be covered in an addendum to the Committee's report.

The Yugoslav proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.