

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 983rd
 MEETING**

Thursday, 3 December 1959,
 at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda items 13 and 39:</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Report of the Trusteeship Council (concluded)</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Trusteeship Council (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fourth Committee</i>	<i>605</i>
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):</i>	
<i>(d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	<i>605</i>
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>Election to fill vacancies in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories</i>	<i>611</i>

Chairman: Mr. L. N. PALAR (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEMS 13 AND 39

- Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/4100, A/4262; A/C.4/434; A/C.4/L.621; T/PET.3/95, 96 and Add.1, 97, 98, 99) (concluded)**
- Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/4100, part I, chap. VII, sect. D; A/C.4/L.621) (concluded)**

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.621)

1. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report of the Fourth Committee on agenda items 13 and 39 (A/C.4/L.621), recalled that those items had been the subject of lengthy discussions, of several roll-call votes and of numerous draft resolutions, which explained the size of the document. The draft report had been prepared in accordance with the usual practice; the only innovation lay in the arrangement of the part entitled "Recommendations of the Fourth Committee", in which the draft resolutions had been classified not according to the chronological order of their submission, as in the body of the report, but according to their logical order. He thanked the members of the Secretariat who had helped him in the preparation of an accurate and well-balanced report.

2. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she had not had time to examine the draft report as carefully as she would have wished, and that she intended to do so before its submission to the General Assembly; she would not hesitate to vote in its favour, if it were put to the vote.

In the absence of any objection, the draft report (A/C.4/L.621) was approved.

AGENDA ITEM 36

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4081 and Add.1-4, A/4082 and Add.1-5, A/4083 and Add.1-3, A/4084 and Add.1-4, A/4085 and Add.1-4, A/4086 and Add.1-10, A/4087 and Add.1-5, A/4088 and Add.1-14, A/4080 and Add.1-5, A/4111) (continued):

(d) **General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/4096 and Add.1, A/4111, part one, section X, A/4115, A/4226, A/4227, A/C.4/405, A/C.4/406, A/C.4/L.632 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.633)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.632 AND ADD.1, A/C.4/L.633) (continued)

3. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) regretted that the amendment submitted by the Liberian delegation (A/C.4/L.633) had on the previous day given rise to such lengthy discussions at the 982nd meeting. He thought he should say that several of the sponsors of the draft resolution had given the United States delegation to understand that they would be obliged to support such an amendment if it were proposed. His delegation, which had appreciated their frankness and above all their desire to subscribe to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.32) before the Committee even without the provision in question, understood their reasons perfectly. It also understood the position of those delegations which, like itself, would vote against the amendment, and their refusal to support the draft resolution if it were amended. In his opinion, the important point was that, regardless of their final vote, all delegations should be united—as they seemed to be—in their cordial feelings for the populations of Hawaii and Alaska and in the wishes they expressed concerning them.

4. Mr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya) wished, on behalf of his Government and of the Malayan people, to congratulate Alaska and Hawaii on their attainment of the full measure of self-government for which the Charter provided. Congratulations should equally be extended to the Government and people of the United States of America. The Malayan Government, which as a matter of principle supported the aspirations of

peoples that were not yet self-governing, was convinced that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the Union corresponded to the desires of their populations; and for that reason it had wished to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution, feeling that the General Assembly could not let that happy occasion pass without expressing its satisfaction.

5. He would vote for the amendment submitted by Liberia, which merely recalled that the General Assembly was competent to decide whether a Territory had attained a full measure of self-government, in the sense of Chapter XI of the Charter.

6. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) was happy that the purposes of Chapter XI of the Charter had been so successfully achieved by the populations of Hawaii and Alaska; it was an event of particular importance, on which not only the two new States of the Union, but also the Government and people of the United States of America should be congratulated.

7. He thanked the Liberian representative for having taken the initiative of submitting an amendment in keeping with the desire of most of the Committee's members to reaffirm the General Assembly's rights with regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore, there was no question of an innovation: General Assembly resolutions 748 (VIII) and 849 (IX) concerning the cessation of the transmission of information in respect of Puerto Rico and Greenland, respectively contained a similar provision. The Assembly would take a major step backward if it now allowed the prerogatives which it had not hesitated to claim in 1953 and in 1954 to be disputed. Certain members of the Committee had said that they would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution if the amendment submitted by Liberia were incorporated in it. That was a disguised threat which was unworthy of the Committee. There was no conflict between the draft resolution itself and the amendment proposed, which merely reaffirmed the recognized competence of the General Assembly. His delegation would vote for both texts and hoped that they would be supported by the majority of the Committee's members.

8. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) stated that it was with very real satisfaction that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution concerning the cessation of the transmission of information in respect of Alaska and Hawaii.

9. Recalling operative paragraph 6 of resolution 742 (VIII)—of which his delegation had been one of the sponsors in 1953—and the third part of the list of factors annexed to that resolution, he emphasized that the association of any territory with a State or group of States was, internationally, a very delicate matter, since it meant an enlargement of the State concerned. It was therefore necessary to establish, in the most formal way, not only that such a step was taken on the basis of absolute equality, but also, and principally, that it corresponded to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, in whom the national sovereignty resided.

10. In the case of Alaska and Hawaii, it was beyond doubt that, in achieving the status of free and sovereign States within a great federation, they were assured of full and complete equality. But the evidence concerning the exercise of self-determination was even more impressive. There had never existed in either of the two Territories, so far as was known, any movement

for independence or for any other status; on the contrary, their peoples had long been urging their integration with the Union, and the difficulties had arisen solely on the United States side. The fact that the latter had removed all the obstacles to integration bore witness to the sense of human fellowship inspiring the United States, and should be a matter of great satisfaction to all who were working towards the ends specified in Chapter XI of the Charter.

11. He requested the United States representative to transmit Mexico's warmest good wishes to the peoples of Alaska and Hawaii, and to convey its congratulations to the United States of America on its exemplary attitude towards the United Nations in the matter.

12. As for the amendment submitted by Liberia in regard to the competence of the General Assembly, his delegation, which had been co-sponsor of a similar amendment in 1953, would naturally have no hesitation in voting for it.

13. The second case of the cessation of the transmission of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories with which the Assembly had to deal in the present year was certainly no less important, rather the contrary; and it was far more complicated. The fact that no draft resolution had been submitted on that question confirmed the difference between the two cases, and called for some explanation, although it should not give rise to undue concern. In the first place, there was no "statute of limitations" in international law, and the General Assembly would be perfectly entitled to re-examine the matter whenever it thought fit. Secondly, it was reasonable to assume that—like the United States, Denmark and the Netherlands, which had desired formal sanction by the United Nations of their legitimate decision to cease transmitting information in respect of important Territories administered by them whose status had changed—France and the French Community would see fit to solicit the same act from the General Assembly later on.

14. He fully understood the reasons moving the Administering Powers to insist on their own interpretation of Chapter XI of the Charter, but he observed that public opinion was not prepared to accept such an interpretation, which might be regarded as out of date. France's idea of founding a Eurafrikan community was of exceptional importance. If successful, it might constitute one of the greatest achievements yet known in the sphere of inter-racial and inter-continental relations. In that event it could be assumed that, within the free and voluntarily constituted community, there would be an enlightened public opinion which would wish to see the legitimacy of its organization, on the international level, confirmed by a formal act of the United Nations.

15. It was clear, however, that such a move could not and should not be taken in 1959. Much time and effort would inevitably be required to carry out so complex a plan. Further, the African continent was at present in the throes of an evolution so far-reaching, that the public at large could not appreciate all its aspects. In a period of national awakening, when radical changes were occurring in relations between Africa and the rest of the world, European communities were still living a more or less isolated existence in certain parts of the African continent, but in such Territories, African, European and Asiatic communities were living peacefully side by side, and miscegenation was taking place on a much larger scale

than was generally believed. That being so, the idea of establishing a Eurafrican community should give grounds for satisfaction and hope. But it was essential to realize that a great deal would have to be done to obliterate the heritage of the past, to get rid of superiority and inferiority complexes, to restore confidence and put an end to unjust privilege; and a task of that nature could not be completed in a day.

16. There would be no point in denying that many difficulties were involved in considering the question, which had not come up in the United Nations before. One difficulty was the uneasy relationship between France and Guinea; he hoped that relations would have improved by 1960. Again, the situation was still very fluid. The Mali Federation, for example, hoped to achieve complete independence while maintaining certain ties, the exact nature of which had not yet been decided with France. In those circumstances, it was natural for the General Assembly—whose rights were after all not subject to any limitation in time—to wait until the situation had been stabilized and clarified before reaching a decision.

17. He recalled that, when the French Government announced the establishment of the autonomous Republic of Togoland under the "loi-cadre" in 1956, many delegations had expressed their concern about shortcomings in that country's status. However, for some reason which it was difficult to define, they had not opposed the French move, and his own delegation had expressed the high hopes it placed in the "creative evolution" to use a Bergsonian term, of French action in Africa. At the time Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, an eminent African who had since become Prime Minister of the Republic of Togoland, had advised accepting the new status at its face value and making the best of it until such times as an autonomous Togoland could freely decide its own future. The wisdom of that attitude was confirmed by the fact that the Republic of Togoland was very soon to attain its independence. The Committee should take that example to heart and should merely note the important changes taking place in Africa and express the hope that rapid developments would soon make it possible for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution of genuine value for the peoples concerned.

18. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) expressed his sincere congratulations to the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska, and to the Government and people of the United States of America.

19. His delegation would vote in favour of the Liberian amendment, which was in keeping with the normal practice followed by the Committee for resolutions of that nature.

20. His delegation fully approved the text of the draft resolution, subject to a slight drafting change in operative paragraph 3—the words "of these two Territories" should be replaced by "of Alaska and Hawaii".

21. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) expressed her appreciation of the Haitian representative's action in defending her delegation against the attacks which the Australian representative had made on it. She also thanked the representative of Ghana. Anyone reading the Committee's summary records in the future would see that the Liberian delegation had been attacked for defending the principles of the Charter and the competence of the General Assembly.

22. She had been glad to hear the United Kingdom representative making common cause with the African peoples, which his country had been trying to help for so long. The peoples of Africa were not perhaps so advanced as other peoples of the world, but the degree of development should not be measured by the capacity to produce nuclear weapons.

23. Mr. REMOLADOR (Philippines) supported the draft resolution whole-heartedly. His delegation congratulated the United States people and the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska, which had been admitted to the United States on the basis of absolute equality. He wished the two new States a prosperous future. Philippine nationals resident in Alaska and Hawaii would do all they could to assist in the attainment of the aims of the peoples among whom they lived.

24. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia) said that he wished first to make some general comments concerning the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter. The various recommendations which, in its resolutions 222 (III), 742 (VIII), 850 (IX) and 1051 (XI), the General Assembly had made with regard to the basic rules to be applied in that connexion were binding on the Fourth Committee. The General Assembly had considered that the cessation of the transmission of information would be justified by the attainment of a full measure of self-government by the Territories concerned. It had stated in resolution 742 (VIII) that it considered that the manner in which Territories could become fully self-governing was primarily through the attainment of independence, but that self-government could also be achieved by association with another State or group of States if that was done freely and on the basis of absolute equality. On the other hand, the General Assembly had always affirmed its own competence to decide whether or not a Non-Self-Governing Territory had attained the full measure of self-government that would justify the cessation of the transmission of information.

25. The Indonesian delegation was happy to note that the draft resolution was consonant with the General Assembly's recommendation. There was no doubt that the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska had exercised their right of self-determination on a basis of absolute equality and that they had attained a full measure of self-government through the admission of their respective Territories into the United States of America as States of the Union.

26. The General Assembly's competence to take a decision on the question appeared to have been recognized in the official communications from the United States delegation with regard to the cessation of the transmission of information on Alaska and Hawaii (A/4115, A/4226). The Indonesian delegation therefore found it difficult to understand why the United States delegation did not seem prepared to accept the Liberian amendment, which took note of the General Assembly's competence. If there was a separate vote on the Liberian amendment, the Indonesian delegation would vote for it.

27. In conclusion, he extended the congratulations of the Indonesian people to the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska on the occasion of their attainment of self-government through the admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the United States of America as new States.

28. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had never entertained the slightest doubt about the General Assembly's competence to take a decision with respect to the cessation of the transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories. The General Assembly's competence was sufficiently established by the fact that a resolution on the subject had to be adopted by the Committee. The United Arab Republic would therefore have no hesitation in voting for the Liberian amendment. His delegation was happy to note that the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska had freely exercised their right of self-determination; it congratulated the two new States and paid a tribute to the United States of America for the manner in which it had fulfilled its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter.

29. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) extended his delegation's congratulations to the people of Hawaii and Alaska, and also to the former Administering Power, the United States of America.

30. Although there was no need to define the word "independence", which appeared in Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter, the same did not apply to the idea of a full measure of self-government, referred to in Article 73. The Venezuelan delegation believed that for the attainment of full self-government, a people must have complete sovereignty with respect to both its internal affairs and its foreign relations. That did not, however, preclude a people from associating itself with another State, even though such an association implied a certain limitation of sovereignty. In that connexion it should be noted that a certain limitation of sovereignty was involved when a State became a Member of the United Nations. A Territory could also cease to be non-self-governing by freely agreeing to become an integral part of another State, always provided that any such union should take place on a basis of absolute equality. That was in fact what had happened in the case of Alaska and Hawaii.

31. His delegation would therefore be glad to support the draft resolution. It would also support the Liberian amendment, which recalled the General Assembly's competence to decide whether a Non-Self-Governing Territory had or had not attained a full measure of self-government. The small States had a special stake in defending the General Assembly's powers. Although the General Assembly's decisions could be no more than recommendations, the moral weight of those recommendations was continually increasing.

32. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that his delegation would always be the first to welcome every occasion on which the Fourth Committee approved the attainment of a full measure of self-government by a Non-Self-Governing Territory. That was one of the noblest tasks that fell to the Committee or to the United Nations. Guinea longed for the fast-approaching day when there would be no more Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United Nations must continue to play a decisive part in the achievement of that goal in order to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security.

33. The Guinean delegation had been surprised by the reaction to the Liberian amendment of delegations which were prepared to vote for the draft resolution, and it wondered how that draft resolution could be of any use unless the General Assembly was competent to decide on the question. The Guinean delegation's

attitude towards the draft resolution would be determined by the result of the vote on the Liberian amendment.

34. While the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination was the guiding principle of Guinea's foreign policy, its practical application had to be made subject to certain conditions. The Guinean Constitution stated that Guinea was prepared to give up some degree of sovereignty in the interests of bringing about African unity, but before that unity could become a reality, all African peoples still under foreign rule must become independent and be able to decide their own future status in full freedom.

35. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) invoked his right of reply in order to clarify several points regarding the cessation of the transmission of information by France on a number of Territories which had now become self-governing. If circumstances had permitted, it might have been helpful to have an exchange of views on the subject of colonization in relation both to colonialism and to under-development, because all too frequently those expressions had been used interchangeably. Some gratifying comparisons might have been made on the basis of the information that France, in fulfilment of its commitments, had given to the United Nations. That information had not, however, aroused much interest on the part of some delegations, whose main concern appeared to be to find facts that would confirm their own views, since every year the Committee had to listen to the same confident expression of beliefs that were fifty years behind the times. A faithful picture of the Africa of 1900 was drawn, and Non-Self-Governing Territories were compared, not with countries that had long been independent but were still under-developed, but rather with the countries that had reached a high stage of development. Yet it was clear that France's achievements in the field of economics, medicine, education and social activities, especially since the establishment of the Investment Fund for Economic and Social Development (FIDES), could stand comparison with corresponding achievements in any of the independent under-developed countries. The figures in the United Nations Statistical Yearbook 1957 showed that France was doing far more for the under-developed areas with regard to investments than any other of the large and advanced countries; furthermore, 10 per cent of the taxes paid by every French citizen were spent on overseas development.

36. For a number of years the Committee had concerned itself not with the information transmitted, or with making practical use of it for the common good, but with the principle of the transmission of information in conjunction with certain interpretation of Chapter XI of the Charter. France's position was well known; it had always supported international co-operation so far as such co-operation, impartial and divorced from any kind of ideological propaganda, could make a real contribution to the advancement of the under-developed countries. He noted in that connexion that France participated in the work of the Committee on Information in a spirit of co-operation, although not accepting the underlying principle of that Committee. Chapter XI of the Charter consisted of a voluntary declaration of intentions by Member States which recognized that they had assumed responsibility for administering Territories whose peoples had not yet taken over the conduct of their own affairs. When the Charter had been signed and the French Govern-

ment had agreed to furnish information on those Territories, the French Government had made it clear that the situation was still in the course of development. France had met its obligations, and, as the Territories had developed, it had gradually ceased to transmit information—in 1947 for Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guiana, Réunion, New Caledonia, the French Settlements in Oceania, and St. Pierre and Miquelon; in 1948 for the States of Indo-China and the French Settlements in India; and in 1956 for Tunisia and Morocco.

37. In 1959, the French Government had informed the United Nations—while at the same time furnishing all the relevant official documents—of the change that had taken place in the former Non-Self-Governing Territories of French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, the Comoro Archipelago and French Somaliland (A/4096 and Add.1). The Secretary-General had been duly notified, as in the preceding cases, that information would no longer be transmitted on any Territories still administered by France except for the New Hebrides Condominium.

38. Some delegations would like to interpret Chapter XI of the Charter differently than did the French delegation. While they were perfectly entitled to consider that Chapter outdated, the best course in that case was to seek a revision of the Charter, and not to try to make the Charter mean what it did not say or to amend it indirectly by a procedural device. In the view of his delegation, the General Assembly was not in the present instance called upon to take any decision except, at the most, to note the French Government's decision. In any case, the Assembly could do nothing more than confirm the cessation of the transmission of information.

39. His delegation was very happy at the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the United States as States of the Union, and it warmly congratulated the United States on such a magnificent example of freely consented integration into a democratic federation of States. While the change taking place in the former Non-Self-Governing Territories of France was somewhat different, it was nevertheless based on the same principles of free determination.

40. Certain delegations had recalled that the adoption of the "loi-cadre" in 1956 had not released France from the obligation of transmitting information. He pointed out that the purpose of that instrument had merely been to establish a transitional arrangement under which universal suffrage would be instituted in Africa and certain additional powers would be granted to the territorial assemblies. By bringing forth, however, from the African masses the leaders who now headed the republics of the Community, it had also made possible the first steps towards establishing the Community.

41. The decisive phase had been the referendum of 28 September 1958, in which more than 47 million men and women of voting age of all races and creeds, spread over the five continents of the world, had been asked if they wished, on a basis of equality and solidarity among peoples, to establish a "Community". Shortly before, General De Gaulle, then President of the Council of Ministers of the French Republic, had explained the meaning of the referendum by saying that what was proposed was that the metropolitan country and the overseas Territories should join together in a Community in which each would have a free and full Govern-

ment of its own and in which there would be a common domain that, in the interest of all, would include defence, foreign affairs, economic policy, the administration of justice and education, and long-distance communications. He had added that any Territory that might wish independence could have it at once, without opposition from the metropolitan country. If the territorial electorate were to vote "Yes" in the referendum, that would mean that the citizens had, by free determination, chosen to form the Community. If at a later date some Territory were to feel itself capable of assuming all the duties and responsibilities of independence, it could take that decision without, in that case either, facing the opposition of the metropolitan country. No metropolitan country had ever spoken in such terms to the peoples it had colonized.

42. By an overwhelming majority, and with the sole exception of Guinea, the French African Territories and Madagascar had replied "Yes". Five Territories had expressed the desire to retain the status of self-government granted under the "loi-cadre", and twelve had chosen to become republics within the Community with their own constitution, government and flag. The question of who was right—Guinea with 2.5 million inhabitants or the twelve new republics with their 27 million Africans and Madagascans—concerned only the Africans. No doubt could be cast on the fact that there had been a choice, that the choice had been freely exercised and that, consequently, the spirit and letter of the Charter had been amply and abundantly respected. The Community rested on a basis of liberty, equality and fraternity. No further proof of that was needed than the statement by Mr. Léopold Senghor, President of the Mali Federation—who had told the Committee (937th meeting), in connexion with the independence of the Cameroons, that his country, in agreement with France and by constitutional means, proposed to follow a similar course in the near future—and the statement by Mr. Félix Houphouët-Boigny, who had said in a Press conference at the United Nations that the thirteen republics comprising the French Community might very well come to the United Nations one day as independent States and that that would in no way weaken the bonds of fraternal amity which linked the French Republic with the other twelve members of the Community. The President of the French Republic had stated, on 10 November, that France's policy towards the members of the Community was one which respected and recognized their free right to self-determination. That, he had added, was the basis for the agreement concluded for one year between the French Republic, the eleven new African States and the Malagasy Republic. That "contract" could be modified, provided that the modifications were made in accordance with constitutional methods of procedure. All the States in the Community belonged to it because they wanted to, and any of them could leave it whenever they saw fit.

43. That was why the African leaders would no longer have France transmit information on matters which henceforward fell within their own jurisdiction, and why the French Republic, being no longer able or morally and legally entitled to transmit information it no longer kept, had notified the United Nations to that effect. That was a development which all Member States could not but welcome. France, for its part, would continue to follow the course it had charted, and it was proud of having led so many millions of people

to independence in circumstances of freedom, equality and friendship.

44. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) said that he was very happy that the peoples of Alaska and Hawaii had exercised their right of free determination and had freely chosen their new status. He regretted that some administering Powers had decided to stop sending information on the Territories under their administration, whereas others claimed that they had no colonies and that their overseas Territories formed an integral part of the metropolitan country and enjoyed full rights. He suggested that those Powers should follow the example of the United States and arrange to hold plebiscites in their Territories. His delegation wished to commend the United States Government for the democratic procedures it had followed in Alaska and Hawaii, and it was convinced that the two new States would enjoy the same prosperity and freedom as the other States of the Union.

45. His delegation, which had requested that its name be included among the sponsors, would vote in favour of the draft resolution. It would also vote for the Liberian amendment, in which the competence of the General Assembly in matters concerning the future of Non-Self-Governing Territories was reaffirmed.

46. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), considering that operative paragraph 2 of the English text of the draft resolution was poorly drafted, proposed the following new wording: "Expresses the opinion, based on its examination of the documentation and the explanations provided, that the people ...".

47. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) accepted, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, the Ethiopian representative's proposal relating to operative paragraph 3, the Nepalese representative's proposal to add the name of his country to the list of sponsors and the Indian representative's proposal relating to operative paragraph 2.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.433).

At the request of the Nepalese representative, supported by the Liberian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya.

Against: Honduras, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France.

Abstaining: Ireland, Israel, Japan, Peru, Thailand, Uruguay, Argentina, Austria, Costa Rica.

49. Mr. DZIRASA (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, said that he would have voted in favour of the Liberian amendment, if he had been present when the name of his country had been called.

The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to 20, with 9 abstentions.

50. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) observed that the representative of Ghana had resumed his seat before the end of the roll-call.

51. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), in support of that view, protested against the fact that the vote of the delegation of Ghana had not been counted.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that he had applied rule 128 of the rules of procedure.

53. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that nothing in that rule permitted the exclusion of the vote of a delegation which had not replied when its name had been called but had indicated, before the result of the vote had been announced, the manner in which it would have voted.

54. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) said that he would have voted against the Liberian amendment if he had been present at the time of vote.

55. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the result of the vote, it mattered little whether one vote had been included or not. He requested that the voting should proceed.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.632 and Add.1. Since separate votes had been requested on operative paragraphs 1 and 3, the Committee would vote first on those paragraphs.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

At the request of the Indian representative, a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan.

Against: None.

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

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 37

**Election to fill vacancies in the Committee on Information
from Non-Self-Governing Territories**

57. The CHAIRMAN said that two vacancies were arising in the Committee on Information from Non-

Self-Governing Territories, and recalled the manner in which elections to fill those two vacancies must be held. The elections would take place at the afternoon meeting on Tuesday, 8 December 1959.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.