



**C O N T E N T S**

Agenda item 32:

Page

Consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*):

- (a) Communication from the Government of the Netherlands concerning the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam (*continued*) ..... 327
- (c) Procedures concerning the consideration of communications (*continued*) ..... 331

**Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS  
(Mexico).**

**AGENDA ITEM 32**

**Consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*):**

**(a) Communication from the Government of the Netherlands concerning the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam (A/2908/Add.1, A/AC.35/L.206, A/C.4/L.421/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.422, A/C.4/L.423) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. ESKELUND (Denmark) said that the amendments submitted by the Indian delegation (A/C.4/L.423) were unnecessary, but would do no damage to the draft resolution; he would accordingly abstain on them.

2. It was to be hoped that the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.4/L.422) would be withdrawn by its sponsor, for, as some delegations and the representatives of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had stated at previous meetings, it was redundant. The Uruguayan representative had said that the question was whether or not the representatives of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were to be left the opportunity to appear before the United Nations again. In reality the adoption of the amendment would not affect that point in any way. Furthermore, no decision of the General Assembly constituted a binding precedent; the Assembly could always reconsider its decisions. In point of fact the Uruguayan amendment was a statement of principle, the controversial nature of which rendered it unsuitable for inclusion in the draft resolution.

3. The Danish delegation, consistent with the attitude it had maintained concerning Greenland at the previous session, would not support the Uruguayan amendment. It would vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.421/Rev.1.

4. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) pointed out that the French text of his amendment did not correspond exactly with the Spanish text. It should read:

*"Tenant compte de la compétence de l'Assemblée générale pour décider si un territoire non autonome a atteint ou non l'autonomie complète visée au Chapitre XI de la Charte".*

5. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) asked whether, since the amendment which the Pakistani delegation had proposed at the previous meeting had now been embodied in the draft resolution, there was any point in inserting the words proposed in the second Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.423, para. 2).

6. Mr. MENON (India) reminded the Committee of the observations he had made in introducing his amendments (524th meeting); in his view there was no redundancy. According to the Charter reproduced in document A/AC.35/L.206, the expression "Kingdom of the Netherlands" had a special legal meaning and signified an association of three countries; but the Member State of the United Nations which was responsible for the transmission of information was the State of the Netherlands, a European country.

7. Mr. BELL (United States of America) pointed out that the Kingdom of the Netherlands existed, and that representatives of the three parts of that Kingdom were at present sitting in the Fourth Committee, to which they had furnished information. It would be preferable not to alter the text of paragraph 2 as amended by Pakistan.

8. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru), supported by Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), observed that the information of which the General Assembly was to take note under paragraph 1 of the operative part consisted of the communication from the Netherlands Government (A/AC.35/L.206) and the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2908 and Add.1), together with the explanations offered to the Fourth Committee. The information referred to in operative paragraph 2 consisted of the same items. The complication was due to the incorporation of the Pakistani amendment. If that amendment was withdrawn the text of operative paragraph 2 would be perfectly clear.

9. Mr. BARGUES (France), speaking in support of the United States representative, pointed out that the information supplied to the Fourth Committee had been furnished by the Government of the Netherlands and also by the representatives of the new Governments of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The three delegations together represented the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

10. To solve the difficulty he proposed that both the word "Kingdom" and the words "Government of the Netherlands" should be deleted. There would then be

no mention whether the information had been presented by the Government of the Netherlands or by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

11. Mr. MENON (India) felt that the French representative's proposal would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter. He regarded the representatives of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles as special advisers of the Netherlands delegation; only the Government of the Netherlands, the administering Power, was known to the Charter.

12. Mr. BENITEZ VINUEZA (Ecuador) commented that in relation to the Netherlands the word "Kingdom" had two meanings; it could mean either the monarchical form of the Government or the new internal organization established by agreement between the Netherlands proper, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. However, the State which was a Member of the United Nations was not that new entity but the Netherlands State. He therefore felt that the word "Kingdom", which might cause confusion, should be deleted.

13. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) noted that the draft resolution was entitled "Communication from the Government of the Netherlands...". In the circumstances she felt that the word "Kingdom" could be deleted.

14. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) thought that the sponsors should withdraw the word in question, as it did not appear in the title of the draft resolution.

15. In reply to Mr. SAAB (Lebanon), Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) pointed out that from the very beginning of the discussion his delegation had made it clear that it represented the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Accordingly, the reference in the draft resolution should be to the Kingdom of the Netherlands. However, the Netherlands representatives had no objection to the Indian delegation's proposal.

16. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) appealed to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to accept the Indian proposal, since those mainly concerned had no objection to it.

17. Mr. BELL (United States of America) agreed on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution to the deletion of the word "Kingdom", leaving the phrase to read "Government of the Netherlands".

18. Mr. WALKE (Pakistan) reminded the Committee that at the previous meeting he had made a suggestion, not a formal proposal. He agreed to the deletion of the word "Kingdom".

*At the request of the representative of Argentina, a vote on the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.4/L.422) was taken by roll-call.*

*New Zealand, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico.

*Against:* New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

*Abstaining:* Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Afghanistan, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Israel, Liberia.

*The Uruguayan amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.*

19. At the request of Miss ROESAD (Indonesia), the CHAIRMAN put the Indian amendments (A/C.4/L.423) to the vote separately.

*The first Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.423, para. 1) was adopted by 27 votes to 7, with 18 abstentions.*

*The second Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.423, para. 2) was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.*

20. At the request of Mr. PYMAN (Australia) and Mr. BARGUES (France), the CHAIRMAN put the first two paragraphs of the preamble to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.421/Rev.1) to the vote separately.

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 35 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.*

*The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 27 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.*

*The third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble were adopted by 28 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 1 of the operative part, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to 7, with 22 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Argentina, a vote on paragraph 2 of the operative part, as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

*Against:* Liberia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

*Paragraph 2 of the operative part, as amended, was adopted by 18 votes to 10, with 27 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Ecuador a vote on the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.421/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Denmark, Dominican Republic, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba.

*Against:* Czechoslovakia, France, Liberia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, Afghanistan, Belgium, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 18 votes to 10, with 27 abstentions.*

21. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) pointed out that at the eighth session the Mexican delegation had been one of the sponsors of an amendment (A/C.4/L.302, para.1), the text of which was identical with that submitted by the Uruguayan delegation as an amendment to the draft resolution just adopted. He had therefore voted for the Uruguayan amendment.

22. He regretted that he had been unable to vote for the Indian amendments, but the position his delegation had taken on the matter had precluded that course. The sponsors of the draft resolution had fortunately left it to each representative to define his position on the scope of their text in the light of paragraphs a, b, c and d of Article 73.

23. The Mexican delegation did not consider that the guarantee of the self-government of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would now reside in the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. It was obvious that self-government was not a privilege to be received and retained without effort. Peoples were constantly defending their right to economic independence, at international conferences and in the instruments to which they subscribed. The Mexican delegation had been among the first to point out the weaknesses in the association between Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles and the Netherlands proper. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that long negotiations had resulted in the establishment of a system firmly based on the principle of equality, a principle which had been formally proclaimed, it had not hesitated to agree that the Netherlands Government should cease to transmit information under Article 73 e.

24. The Mexican delegation would have felt greater misgivings had the Charter been perhaps more satisfactory but the peoples to which it was granted less vigorous or less advanced than those of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The self-government of those two countries was guaranteed by the fine qualities of their peoples, their connexions with so advanced a nation as the Netherlands, and their inevitable association with the rest of the American continent, an association in which Mexico might have an important part to play. It might justly be said that the friendly and fruitful relations which were now being established between the Netherlands and the countries of America were such that the attitude of every American State would inevitably play a part in the future of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. Mexico, for its part, opened its doors to the peoples of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles and offered them, together with its friendship, access to its universities and its traditions.

25. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) explained that he had not voted against the draft resolution, but had abstained, because there were a number of arguments in favour of the Netherlands Government and because those

arguments had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft. The objections raised against the competence of the United Nations should not overshadow those arguments, for that point would be taken up again later. The Lebanese delegation regretted that the Netherlands decision had not taken a form which would have enabled it to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Lebanon had the most friendly feelings for the peoples of the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, and it hoped that the establishment of a new link between the three countries would be followed by more radical measures taken voluntarily and in full agreement by the three partners. The Lebanese delegation had been greatly impressed by the dignity and ability of the Netherlands delegation, which had answered questions with great courtesy, and by the manner in which the sponsors of the draft resolutions had defended their case.

26. Another reason for his delegation's abstention had been the lack of unanimity among the American States with regard to the future relations between Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and the rest of the continent. As a member of the Arab League, Lebanon was very well aware of the beneficial role played by regional organizations in promoting peace, co-operation and progress on both the regional and the international level.

27. Finally, the Lebanese delegation had abstained because it did not agree with the Netherlands delegation on certain legal aspects of the Charter for the Kingdom. It respected the philosophies and the legal systems of all Member States, and it had already paid a tribute to the Netherlands contribution to modern law. The Lebanese legal system was no less complex than that of the Netherlands. In that connexion, he recalled the history of Mesopotamian law, of the Roman school of Beirut and of that universal Koranic law which had extended for centuries over half the world. Modern Lebanese law was based on those systems and on various European systems. The conclusion he drew was that it was the judiciary, and not the executive power, that should be the final judge of the constitutionality of the law. Lebanon and Syria had courts which could annul any law promulgated by another State authority; that was the best guarantee of justice. The same applied to many other countries, such as the United States, where Supreme Court played an important part. Nevertheless, out of respect for the ideas of others, the Lebanese delegation had preferred to abstain, rather than to raise objections to legal provisions differing from its own, for it regarded variety as a source of moral wealth for mankind.

28. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that a distinction should be made between the right of peoples to self-determination, and self-government. The former concept might result in different political combinations, whereas the latter simply meant independence. Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were not completely independent, but they had a status which, in their view, satisfied their aspirations. Nevertheless, he felt that the populations of those Territories had had only limited opportunities for expressing their opinion. The Prime Minister of the Netherlands Antilles had said that his country would perhaps one day decide on complete independence. But it might have chosen that status now, had it been given the opportunity to do so.

29. As the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam were not completely independent and had not exercised to

the full their right to self-determination, his delegation ought to have voted against the draft resolution. It had not done so because the new status allowed the two Territories a considerable degree of self-government in those matters on which information was normally supplied under Article 73 of the Charter. While the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam had not exercised to the full their right to self-determination, nobody could challenge the statements of their representatives that the new status had been approved by the population as a whole. Finally, as the Queen of the Netherlands had declared, there could be no durable political association without the support of the majority of the people concerned. The Netherlands representative had confirmed that opinion when he had informed the Committee on Information that a member of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would be able to withdraw from the Kingdom if it so desired. Those various factors had enabled his delegation to abstain on the draft resolution proper.

30. The Syrian delegation had supported the Indian and Uruguayan amendments because they safeguarded the principles at issue. His vote had in no way been intended to hamper the development of dependent peoples, and he wished the Surinam and Netherlands Antilles representatives every success.

31. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she had decided to vote against the draft resolution when the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam had rejected the Uruguayan amendment, thus denying the competence of the General Assembly. She wished nevertheless to congratulate the two countries on their new status.

32. Mr. GILBERT (Canada) said that he had abstained from voting on the amended draft. He had, however, accepted without reservation the declarations of the Netherlands delegation on the new Charter for the Kingdom. He thanked the Netherlands delegation for the information it had given the Committee. That information clearly indicated that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, already vested since 1951 with autonomy in the management of their domestic affairs, were now full and equal partners with the Netherlands in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. It was not subject to question by the Assembly, its committees or ancillary organs. His delegation did not recognize the competence of the United Nations to intervene in political matters affecting Non-Self-Governing Territories, or to decide on the question of the cessation of the transmission of information.

33. The decision to cease transmitting information fell within the competence of the administering Power, which alone was entitled to decide when was the proper moment to do so. His delegation had abstained from voting on the amended draft resolution in order not to detract from the importance of the decision taken by the Netherlands in 1951 on the transmission of information relating to Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. It would have voted for the draft, if the Uruguayan amendment had not been adopted. It had voted against the Indian amendments in view of the interpretation placed upon them by the sponsor and because it had already declared its opposition to resolution 742 (VIII), which was mentioned in these amendments.

34. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) explained that he had abstained from voting on the Uruguayan amendment because he feared that it might jeopardize the adoption of the draft resolution itself. However, his abstention

did not mean that China had changed its position on the principle involved.

35. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that while he recognized the General Assembly's competence he had found it necessary to abstain from voting on the Uruguayan amendment, for the constant reiteration of that principle was unnecessary. Moreover, the draft resolution itself did not raise the issue of competence.

36. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he had unfortunately been obliged to vote against the draft resolution because of the adoption of the Uruguayan amendment. Nobody, however, could welcome the new status of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles more warmly than he did, and he wished the two countries every success.

37. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) said that his country was opposed to the colonial system, which was an obstacle to the progress of humanity. Moreover, he recognized the General Assembly's competence, and had therefore voted for the Uruguayan amendment.

38. His delegation was not certain that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had achieved complete independence; it had therefore abstained on the draft resolution itself. On the other hand, the two countries would develop towards complete independence, since they enjoyed universal suffrage. He welcomed them among the free countries of America.

39. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece) said that he had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole for the reasons which he had explained at the 525th meeting. However, he had voted for the Uruguayan and Indian amendments.

40. He wanted to repeat that his abstention should not be taken as implying criticism either of the Administering Power, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, with which Greece maintained close, friendly ties, or of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, to which Greece wished the best and happiest future.

41. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had explained his position during the general debate (524th meeting). The new status of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam was a step forward, but it did not enable them to achieve complete independence. The Surinam representative had visualized such independence for the future; but Mr. Tazhibaev did not understand why neither the administering Power nor the Kingdom Charter had mentioned that point. He did not know how long it would be before the two countries achieved independence. Finally, he did not see why a United Nations mission should not be assigned the task of ascertaining the views of the populations concerned.

42. He had voted against the draft resolution, because it attempted to legalize the arbitrary decision to cease the transmission of information required under the Charter. Despite its adoption, the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam ought to remain under United Nations supervision until they had attained complete independence.

43. Mr. PIMENTEL BRANDAO (Brazil) congratulated the Netherlands delegation. Although the draft resolution had not obtained a large majority, its adoption nevertheless represented a real triumph.

44. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution had raised many delicate questions for

his delegation. The Uruguayan amendment declared a principle which the United Kingdom had never accepted, and the Indian amendments mentioned a resolution which his delegation had opposed. However, the main intention of the draft resolution was to support the Netherlands decision, and that had made it possible for him to abstain. His abstention did not mean that his Government recognized the Assembly's competence to discuss constitutional problems relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories, or had any doubt whatever about the correctness of the Netherlands' position.

45. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it explicitly declared the General Assembly's competence to decide whether the transmission of information should cease. However, France welcomed the new constitutional status of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

46. Mr. BELL (United States of America) said that he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, despite his delegation's disagreement with the Uruguayan amendment, since the latter did not alter the basic purpose of the draft resolution. While the Indian amendment had rendered the resolution less clear-cut, it had not, in his view, prejudiced the position of any delegation. He hoped that, despite the reservations of some delegations, the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would accept the adoption of the draft resolution as a clear recognition by the General Assembly of their new status, in which the Caribbean partners, without losing the advantages of their association with the Netherlands, had attained the full dignity of self-government.

47. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he had been unable to compromise on principles which his country had always upheld. Nevertheless, he wished to pay a tribute to the Netherlands delegation for its contribution to the debate.

48. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that although the principles on which the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands was based were not the same as those of his delegation, his delegation nevertheless had every confidence in the three members of the Kingdom.

**(c) Procedures concerning the consideration of communications (A/2908, A/C.4/L.424, A/C.4/L.425) (continued)**

49. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), submitting draft resolution A/C.4/L.424, said that his delegation had always held the view that questions concerning the cessation of the transmission of information, which involved the termination of obligations of the highest importance under the Charter, should be examined by the only body that was entitled and qualified to take decisions on such important matters, namely the General Assembly. That was the principle on which the Iraqi draft resolution was based.

50. Paragraphs 83 and 84 of part one of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2908) gave little indication of any new procedure that the General Assembly could adopt in implementation of its resolution 850 (IX). He felt that it would be most useful for the Fourth Committee to decide whether the Committee on Information should continue to examine cases involving the cessation of the transmission of information. In accordance with the instructions it had received, the Committee on

Information had so far examined three cases: Puerto Rico, Greenland and Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. In each case it had heard the representatives of the administering Power, had asked questions which had been answered by the representatives of the Territories concerned and had adopted a resolution.<sup>1</sup> It had done valuable work, but its resolutions, particularly the reservations contained in their last paragraphs, implied a certain degree of hesitation as to the desirability of entrusting the preliminary examination of political matters to a committee with limited functions and membership. Some members of the Fourth Committee had also expressed doubts on that point; he drew attention in that connexion to the statements of the Australian and Canadian representatives during the discussion in the Committee at the fourth session (125th meeting) of the draft resolution which had subsequently been adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 334 (IV).

51. He also drew attention to the insistence of the administering Powers that the Committee on Information should confine itself to the examination of technical questions concerning economic, social and educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Experience had shown that while the Committee on Information had prepared valuable reports on those subjects and had been most helpful to the Fourth Committee in examining questions of procedure, including the preparation and amendment of the Standard Form, it had been unable to deal adequately with questions of a more political character, particularly questions involving the transmission of information. The Committee on Information referred such questions automatically to the Fourth Committee, which was in a far better position to take decisions of a political character.

52. His delegation had therefore reached the conclusion that while the examination of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information by a small committee might be useful, it was advisable that that small committee should not consider specific cases before they had been examined by the Fourth Committee from a more general point of view. It also wondered whether the task should be carried out by the Committee on Information or by a special committee appointed by the General Assembly for that purpose. It considered that the first question could be answered by the Fourth Committee at the present session, while the second question could be left open for further consideration. Accordingly, it had submitted a draft resolution which would have the effect of amending previous General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 448 (V) relating to the work of the Committee on Information on the cessation of the transmission of information.

53. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece), submitting his draft resolution (A/C.4/L.425), said that his delegation considered the question of perfecting the methods and procedures to be followed in connexion with the cessation of the transmission of information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories as a most important and a very serious matter. It was indeed a very important goal to be achieved by and for any and all the Territories in question. He regretted therefore that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Gov-

<sup>1</sup> See A/2465, part one, para. 67; A/2729, part one, para. 61; and A/2908/Add.1, para. 21.

erning Territories had been unable to study the question, although the General Assembly had requested it to do so in its resolution 850 (IX).

54. He had originally intended to propose the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to devise means of implementing General Assembly resolution 850 (IX); unfortunately, the item under consideration had come belatedly before the Fourth Committee and consequently it was too late to think of setting up such a committee at the present session. The General Assembly must be given sufficient time to examine that important question; accordingly his draft resolution proposed that the item should be included in the agenda of the next session. If it was adopted, he hoped that the consideration of

communications would be one of the first items on the agenda of the next session.

55. The CHAIRMAN, pointing out that the Togoland question had been on the Committee's agenda for several meetings, appealed to the Iraqi and Greek representatives to agree to postponement of the consideration of their draft resolutions until the completion of the debate on Togoland.

56. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) and Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) agreed to the Chairman's request.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.