



C O N T E N T S

	Page
Requests for oral hearings (<i>continued</i>).....	29

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

**REQUEST FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE PUERTO RICAN
INDEPENDENCE PARTY (A/C.4/236)**

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that on a point of order raised by the Polish delegation, he had ruled that the Committee would discuss the request for an oral hearing from the President of the Puerto Rico Independence Party (A/C.4/236) after concluding its discussion of the United Kingdom draft resolution.

2. Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the Governments of Puerto Rico and the United States, expressed strong opposition to the granting of an oral hearing to the Puerto Rican Independence Party. The documentation submitted by the United States Government (A/AC.35/L.121) set forth in detail the series of elections, referenda and other democratic steps by which the people of Puerto Rico had achieved a full measure of self-government through a compact entered into by mutual consent between Puerto Rico and the United States.

3. In the numerous democratic elections held in Puerto Rico, the people had repeatedly and decisively rejected the views of the Puerto Rican Independence Party. The United Nations would hardly wish to undermine the principle of the self-determination of peoples by challenging the action of the people of Puerto Rico in determining their own political future. They would strongly and quite properly resent the granting of an oral hearing to the Independence Party.

4. The communication differed from the ordinary petition in one fundamental respect—it challenged, not the action of a governing authority, but the action of the people themselves in a free and democratic election. The Independence Party might contend that it was protesting against the United States' decision to cease transmitting information on Puerto Rico under Article 73 e; in reality it wished to exploit the United Nations by making political capital out of the importance it would acquire if it was granted a hearing.

5. The full details of the democratic process by which the United States had fulfilled its Charter obligation to promote the political advancement of the people of Puerto Rico were given in document A/AC.35/L.121. Moreover, when the Committee considered that item on its agenda, the United States would be represented by a Puerto Rican member of the delegation who would give further explanations and answer questions by members of the Committee.

6. She asked that the vote on the matter should be taken by roll-call.

7. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) would vote in favour of the request for a hearing. The request before the Committee raised a problem of a very special nature, the solution of which could be found in the Charter. The only possible solution in fact was to grant the request.

8. He was referring at present only to the procedural question; he reserved the right on another occasion to state Argentina's position with regard to the substance of the problem, which was of special interest to all Latin-American countries.

9. The request was not a petition in the sense of Article 87 b of the Charter, which was applicable only to Trust Territories. There was no analogous provision in Chapter XI of the Charter, in regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

10. He drew attention to the consequences for the United Nations and the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories that might ensue if the Committee decided that it was not competent to grant hearings to the inhabitants of those territories. Fifteen million people lived under the International Trusteeship System; there were two hundred million inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The States responsible for administering those Territories must carry out the provisions of the Charter, and especially those of Article 73 b.

11. With reference to the question of the Committee's competence to grant hearings to inhabitants of territories other than Trust Territories, he drew attention to the case of Libya. When the question of Libya's future had been submitted to the General Assembly at its third session, the First Committee had given an example of practical democracy by granting hearings to the representatives of several political parties, despite the fact that Libya was not a Trust Territory. The fact that there was no organ expressly created to supervise the implementation of Chapter XI did not mean that the Administering Members were not answerable to the General Assembly for their administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The only important difference between the Trust Territories and the Non-Self-Governing Territories was that supervision was exercised by the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council jointly in the case of the former and by the General Assembly alone in the case of the latter.

12. Whenever a decision must be taken with regard to the political status of a territory, Argentina would support the right of the inhabitants to present their views and wishes to the United Nations.

13. Mrs. MENON (India) said she would vote in favour of the request. Notwithstanding all the arguments and information placed before the Committee by the United States delegation, the Committee should

not hastily take a decision on so momentous a question as the cessation of the transmission of information concerning Puerto Rico. The fact that there were parties in the island which opposed the United States proposal made it desirable that the Committee should have further information from the people themselves. India would continue to regard Puerto Rico as a Non-Self-Governing Territory until the General Assembly had decided that it had attained a full measure of self-government.

14. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said he too would vote in favour of granting the request for an oral hearing. His delegation considered that all such requests should be granted as a matter of principle, except in special circumstances. The petition before the Committee was not a frivolous one, nor did it abuse the right of petition. He would not deal at present with the substance of the question, which would be discussed later. The question before the Committee was simply whether it should hear a group which represented a substantial part of Puerto Rican public opinion on a matter of great importance to that country. To grant a hearing did not mean that the Committee agreed with their contention and should not be construed as prejudging the issue.

15. In reply to the French representative, who had contended that the Fourth Committee was not authorized to receive petitions or grant oral hearings except from Trust Territories, he maintained that the relevant provisions of the Charter did not exclude other territories. At the sixth session of the General Assembly, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had heard the views of representatives from Western and Eastern Germany on the question of holding elections in that country. The Fourth Committee was entitled to follow that precedent. Furthermore the fact that the Puerto Rican Independence Party was a minority party did not affect the merits of the question. The essence of democracy was to give minorities an opportunity to present their views.

16. The objection had also been raised that to grant a hearing to the Puerto Rican Independence Party would increase its influence and would amount to interference in Puerto Rico's domestic affairs. If that argument were accepted, it would lead to the rejection of nearly all oral hearings, since most of the groups that asked for hearings were at least partly political.

17. He had been surprised to hear the French representative refer to the political affiliations of organizations in the African Trust Territories which had submitted petitions. In his view that was contrary to the democratic principle.

18. He appealed to the United States delegation to live up to its country's tradition of fair play and to agree to a minority party's giving its views on a question of great importance to the future of its country.

19. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that the United States representative had clearly analysed the merits of the request before the Committee. The decision which the Fourth Committee was about to take was one of exceptional gravity. Chapter XI of the Charter contained no reference to the reception of petitions from the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That chapter had been the result of a compromise reached after lengthy deliberations; its stipulations were precise and limitative. Its provisions could not be changed except by recourse to the legal procedure for the amendment of the Charter. The Charter drew a fundamental distinc-

tion between Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories which had constituted the basis of the agreement reached at San Francisco, and it was not for the Fourth Committee to discuss that distinction. Some of the resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly considerably exceeded the terms of the Charter, and the French delegation had reserved its position with regard to them.

20. The unfortunate results of that situation were mitigated by the fact that the application of such resolutions depended on the willingness of the Powers concerned; it was thus that France had been able to continue its participation in the work of the Fourth Committee.

21. To grant an oral hearing to the Puerto Rican Independence Party would cause irreparable harm, the more so as it would be carried out immediately. The Fourth Committee should seriously consider the possible consequences of its decision, which would affect not only the eight administering Powers but all the Members of the United Nations.

22. Mr. ABOU KHADRA (Saudi Arabia) said he would vote in favour of the request. He could see no reason for denying any accredited party the right to express its views.

23. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the right to a hearing before the Fourth Committee was the direct outcome of the right of petition laid down for Trust Territories in Article 87 b of the Charter, and the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council were the only text which dealt with the manner in which written and oral petitions should be presented. On the other hand, Chapter XI of the Charter, which dealt with Non-Self-Governing Territories, made no reference to the right of petition even by implication. The Charter thus made a clear distinction between Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories from the point of view of the right of petition, and the Fourth Committee had to bear that in mind in deciding the present case.

24. For that reason, he would be unable to vote in favour of the request for a hearing by the Puerto Rican Independence Party, but that was without prejudice to his views on the merits of the case. His country was always in sympathy with the efforts of peoples to achieve self-government by peaceful means and had always maintained the most friendly relations with its Puerto Rican neighbours.

25. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) would vote against the granting of the request. An attempt had been made to establish a distinction between petitions and requests for oral hearings. In fact, however, they were identical. A request for an oral hearing was merely a request to be allowed to put forward a petition orally. The representative of Argentina had argued that the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories ought to be allowed to submit oral petitions because they were far more numerous than the people of the Trust Territories. The independent sovereign States however contained some eighteen hundred million inhabitants, including groups which were dissatisfied with their governments and would no doubt like to submit their grievances to the United Nations. If, as the representative of Iraq had contended, the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be allowed to submit petitions on the ground that Chapter XI of the Charter did not specifically exclude that right, then there was no reason why the inhabitants of any country

should not present complaints to the General Assembly. The representatives of France and the Dominican Republic had pointed out the serious nature of the precedent which would be created if the request were granted.

26. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the requests for oral hearings received from the Trust Territories, on the grounds that Article 87 of the Charter clearly established the right of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories to address petitions to the United Nations. Their requests should not be rejected merely because it was feared that they had no new information to give to the Committee.

27. The Brazilian delegation would also take the Charter as its guide in making its decision on the request received from the Puerto Rican Independence Party. Since there was no provision in the Charter for the acceptance of petitions from the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would vote against the request. Moreover, on the question of merit, it would be most undesirable for the United Nations to afford minority political parties a platform from which to plead their cause against elected governments.

28. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) began by emphasizing that his decision to vote against the request for an oral hearing from the Puerto Rican Independence Party was in no way inconsistent with the attitude he had adopted in regard to the requests from the Trust Territories.

29. The point at issue in discussing the Puerto Rican request was not whether a political party was entitled to disagree with the elected government, but the purely legal problem of whether the inhabitants of territories covered by Chapter XI of the Charter were entitled to submit petitions to organs of the United Nations.

30. The Charter established two distinct categories of territories whose peoples were not fully self-governing: the so-called Non-Self-Governing Territories governed by Chapter XI of the Charter, and the Trust Territories governed by Chapters XII and XIII. Article 75 of the Charter gave the United Nations powers of administration and supervision over the Trust Territories, the first of which it delegated to the Administering Authorities, while retaining the second. It was in exercise of its power of supervision that it was entitled to accept petitions and examine them, in consultation with the Administering Authorities. The right of petition of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories was thus legally unassailable and had indeed never been questioned.

31. The provisions from which the States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories derived their obligations and powers had given rise to some controversy. Despite the arguments of the French delegation, among others, the Ecuadorian delegation was convinced that the system was based on a multilateral contract and not simply on a voluntary declaration by the administering States, an opinion upheld by Professor Kelsen in his legal exegesis of the Charter of the United Nations.¹ However, Professor Kelsen also maintained that although the administering States had, in signing the Charter, accepted an obligation, the right of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to insist on the fulfilment of that obligation—which would presumably include the right of petition—was not laid

down by any provision in the Charter. It was because the Charter did not grant the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories the right of petition under the system laid down in Chapter XI and because there was no provision to authorize the General Assembly to deal with petitions from those territories that the Ecuadorian delegation had decided to vote against the request from the Independence Party.

32. Chapter XI of the Charter imposed on the Administering Members a number of inseparable and indivisible obligations. Sub-paragraph e of Article 73 laid down only one of many—the obligation to transmit to the Secretary-General statistical and other information, subject only to such limitations as security and constitutional considerations might require. It was clear from that provision that cessation of information could occur for two reasons; the administering Power might consider that its domestic security or constitutional considerations made such a course necessary; on the other hand, the administering Power and the General Assembly might consider that the people of the territory had achieved a full measure of self-government and the territory had ceased to be non-self-governing. In the first case, the only body capable of determining whether the cessation of information was proper was the administering Power itself. However, cessation on such grounds would not release it from all its other obligations under Chapter XI. In the second case, when an administering Power had granted the people of a territory a political status which it regarded as constituting a full measure of self-government, the General Assembly was entitled to decide whether it did in fact do so. The granting of a particular political status to a territory was a matter within the sovereign jurisdiction of the administering Power. The Assembly could not tell that Power that it should or should not grant such status, or that the status was or was not adequate, because in so doing it would trespass upon the authority of the administering Power. However, it lay with the United Nations to determine whether the status which had been granted by the sovereign act of the administering Power had or had not given the territory, from the point of view of the Charter, that full measure of self-government which alone justified the cessation of the obligations contracted by the administering Power when it signed the Charter. The objections of a political party to the status granted to a territory came within the jurisdiction of the administering Power, and the Assembly had no right to consider it, despite the fact that it was entitled to decide whether the status granted was such as to relieve the administering Power of its contractual obligations. Thus, although each delegation was free to take the opinions of political parties into account in forming its own opinion as to the fulfilment of the conditions imposed in the Charter, it was not possible for the General Assembly to accept the petition in question.

33. With regard to the point made by the Belgian representative, the Ecuadorean delegation could not agree that the General Assembly's powers of examination and recommendation extended to sovereign States.

34. Mr. DJERDJA (Yugoslavia) said that the request for an oral hearing from the Puerto Rican Independence Party was closely connected with the question of the cessation of information on Puerto Rico and an oral hearing might be useful to the Committee in making its decision. He would therefore support the request.

¹ See Hans Kelsen, *The Law of the United Nations*, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., New York, 1950.

35. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was opposed to granting an oral hearing to the Puerto Rican Independence Party. The analogies drawn by the delegations of Iraq and Argentina were hardly exact or applicable. Libya and Germany had been territories whose fates had been made uncertain by the disturbances of war. The status of Puerto Rico had been clearly defined by the United States, and it no longer fell within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. The delegations of Brazil and Belgium had drawn attention to the dangerous precedent that would be created by allowing minority political parties an opportunity for a hearing in the United Nations.

36. The representative of India had argued that Puerto Rico still fell within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. Even if that were so, Chapter XI constituted a maximum statement of the Powers of the United Nations in regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and it was incorrect to say that since the right of petition was not specifically excluded, the General Assembly was entitled to hear petitions from the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The representative of the Dominican Republic had made it clear that there was no difference between an oral hearing and a petition, and any appearance before the Committee must derive from the right of petition. As the representative of Ecuador had shown, no such right could be inferred from Chapter XI. That was not to say that the rights and interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories were not amply protected by the governing country. The United Kingdom delegation could not agree to the extension of the scope of the Charter by Committee resolutions, and if the request for an oral hearing was granted it would be obliged to reserve its position on the whole matter.

37. Mr. DOMINGUEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation would vote against a request for an oral hearing on the grounds that Puerto Rico was not a Trust Territory and that the right of petition extended only to those Territories covered by Chapter XIII of the Charter.

38. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that his delegation doubted whether the appearance before the Committee of a representative of the Puerto Rican Independence Party would be particularly useful. He would therefore abstain from voting.

39. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) fully supported the statements of the representatives of Argentina, India and Iraq.

40. He saw no reason to question the accuracy of the information submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.35/L.121), but, for that very reason, he had been extremely surprised at that delegation's vehement objections to the granting of the Independence Party's request for an oral hearing. It was going too far to contend that to grant the oral hearing would be tantamount to attempting to destroy the structure accepted by the Puerto Rican people in free elections. The Committee did not have to ascertain whether or not the new status of Puerto Rico should be maintained, or whether or not the Puerto Rican people really wanted that status, but whether Puerto Rico had attained a full measure of self-government in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter and the provisional list of factors. The distinguished Puerto Rican who would represent the United States delega-

tion during the discussion of item 3 (b) of the Committee's agenda would undoubtedly be able to give the Committee useful information, but he too would be speaking on behalf of his political party, which was the party that had voted in favour of the existing status. It therefore seemed only logical that the Committee should also hear the other side of the question. Consequently, it should not reject the request out of hand on the basis of debatable interpretations of the Charter.

41. Countless references had been made to Article 87 of the Charter, but there were none of them pertinent, since Puerto Rico was not a Trust Territory. It would have been more opposite to cite the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the right of self-determination and the universal right of petition. He felt it necessary to make express reservations with regard to some of the arguments advanced by the representative of Ecuador.

42. His delegation would vote in favour of granting the Puerto Rican Independence Party a hearing on the grounds that such a procedure would facilitate the Committee's work. He appealed to the delegation of the United States and other delegations to consider the case from the human rather than the purely legal point of view.

43. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that the request for an oral hearing should be rejected for two reasons. First, approval of that request would clearly imply the right of petition from Non-Self-Governing Territories, for which there was no warrant, explicit or implied, in the Charter. He agreed with the representatives of Belgium and the Dominican Republic that it was impossible to distinguish between petitions and oral hearings, since oral hearings necessarily derived from the right of petition. To admit the right of petition from Non-Self-Governing Territories would assimilate those territories to the Trusteeship System, a procedure for which there was absolutely no justification. Secondly, the people of Puerto Rico had declared their will by a great majority, in a democratically conducted referendum. The United Nations could not become a forum for defeated minorities whether in self-governing or Non-Self-Governing Territories. To transform it into such a forum would be to contradict the very principle of the democratic process.

44. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) said that over and above any positive rules of law there were certain universally accepted principles which the Committee could not overlook. One such principle was the right of petitioners to be heard by international organizations, whether those organizations represented many or few States. He fully agreed with the Argentine representative's legal interpretation of Chapter XI and Article 87 b of the Charter. The principle of petitions could not be restricted. While Chapter XI made no provision for petitions or the hearing of representatives from Non-Self-Governing Territories, neither did the Charter prohibit such a step. Furthermore, under Article 10 and Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Charter, the General Assembly had very broad powers of action to promote the principles and purposes of the United Nations. Those articles gave the Committee every right to decide the issue before it, regardless of the restrictions deriving from Article 87 b. The Committee was not being called upon to examine the implementation of General Assembly resolution 222 (III) on the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e. or the communication from

the United States Government concerning Puerto Rico (A/AC.35/L.121), but merely to decide on a principle which was fully within its competence.

45. Because of his belief in the general principles of the United Nations Charter and in order to avoid any suspicion that the Committee was being unfair, his delegation would vote in favour of granting the oral hearing.

46. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) understood from the request that the petitioner considered that the General Assembly was the only body competent to decide whether or not Puerto Rico had ceased to be a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. On that basis, he asked to be heard by the Fourth Committee. In that connexion, the Yugoslav representative had correctly understood the request of the Puerto Rican Independence Party.

47. The discussion of the request had led the Committee into a substantive discussion on the scope of Chapter XI, a question which should properly be discussed in connexion with items 1 and 3 of the Committee's agenda. The legal situation with regard to factors and the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e was not at all clear, and the Committee might avoid much discussion if it decided the case at issue solely on the basis of the facts.

48. Article 73 of the Charter consisted not only of the much-quoted paragraph regarding the transmission of information relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories but other paragraphs concerning, *inter alia*, the development of self-government and the progressive development of free political institutions. Since Article 10 of the Charter gave the Assembly the right to discuss any questions or matters within the scope of the Charter, it was difficult to accept the argument that the debate should be limited solely to the questions dealt with in any one paragraph of Article 73. The Committee had often discussed whether, under Article 10, it was entitled to intervene in the relations between an administering Power and a Non-Self-Governing Territory and, more particularly, to decide whether a territory was or was not a Non-Self-Governing Territory or had ceased to be a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The administering Powers considered that the Committee was not so entitled. They invoked the differences between Chapter XI on the one hand and Chapters XII and XIII on the other. They contended that there was no organic link between the Assembly and the Non-Self-Governing Territories, that Chapter XI provided for nothing comparable to the Trusteeship Council and that it did not provide for visiting missions or petitions. They argued that the transmission of information under Article 73 depended on security and constitutional considerations of which the administering Power alone could be the judge and they invoked the limitations of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. His delegation did not think that the Committee need discuss any of those weighty matters in connexion with the Puerto Rican Independence Party's request. At the previous session, during the discussion that had led to the adoption of resolution 648 (VII), on factors, his delegation had stressed in the Committee (275th meeting) that the real solution of the Committee's difficulties on the matter did not lie in the adoption of doctrinal resolutions but in deciding each case on its own merits. It still maintained that position.

49. No one challenged the fact that Puerto Rico's new status as a free, associated State had been approved by a series of elections between 1948 and 1952 and that the Independence Party had been in a minority in those elections. That minority party now wished to appear before the Committee to contest the elections and explain why the Puerto Rican Government was wrong to say that Puerto Rico was no longer a Non-Self-Governing Territory. In the eyes of the Israel delegation it would be wrong for the Committee to associate itself with such accusations by stating its willingness to hear them before it had even considered item 3 (b) of its agenda. Furthermore, it would set a strange precedent to admit, previous to any serious study of the case, the multiple representation of an organized political community, that was to say, its representation simultaneously by the majority in power and by minority elements. He doubted whether the governments of Member States would be prepared to sanction such a principle.

50. The Argentine representative had invoked the precedent of Libya. In the case of Libya, however, there had been no elections such as had been held in Puerto Rico and no constitutional assembly. Hence, the comparison was not valid.

51. The Committee should first hear the United States delegation on the changes that had taken place in Puerto Rico's status. It should then hear the official representatives of the free, associated State of Puerto Rico and study the official documents relating to the constitutional development of the territory. Only if grave doubts still persisted should the Committee consider whether it was legally possible or practically desirable to obtain additional information. His delegation would therefore vote against granting the request for an oral hearing.

52. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote against granting the request for an oral hearing because it was not convinced that there was any need for it. He wished to make it clear that his delegation's negative vote applied only to the case under consideration. It reserved its full freedom of action in regard to any other similar requests that might be submitted in the future.

53. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that there was no provision of the Charter which would authorize the Committee to accept any petitions other than those concerning Trust Territories. It was not the Assembly's practice to recognize requests for hearings from dissident parties in individual Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Independence Party's request for an oral hearing was in quite a different category from the right of petition in Trust Territories. His delegation had never acquiesced in attempts to amend the Charter by General Assembly resolutions. The decision to cease transmitting information under Article 73 e rested solely with the administering Powers. Logically, therefore, a complaint by a minority party against a decision of an administering Power which had majority support could not properly be received by the United Nations. The question of admitting complaints and granting hearings to minority parties in Non-Self-Governing Territories would have to be very carefully considered by the General Assembly to ensure that there was no infringement of Article 2, paragraph 7. His delegation would therefore vote against the request for an oral hearing.

54. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) could not support the Independence Party's request for an oral hearing

in view of the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. He pointed out, however, that his delegation had always supported requests for oral hearings concerning Trust Territories, since such requests were covered by Article 87 b. To grant the oral hearing requested might encourage the Puerto Rican Independence Party to fight against the established government. It was an opposition party enjoying full guarantees under the Constitution of Puerto Rico and it could press its case at the next election.

55. He wished to make it clear that his Government sympathized with the ultimate objectives of the Independence Party and hoped that if Puerto Rico decided that it wanted complete independence, it would obtain it. He would abstain from voting on the request for an oral hearing.

56. Mr. ESPINOSA y PRIETO (Mexico) announced that his delegation would vote in favour of granting the oral hearing on grounds of principle. He wished to make it clear that it was always in favour of the broadest interpretation of the right of petition and oral hearings and that its vote in no way prejudiced its views on the substance of the Puerto Rican question.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the request for an oral hearing from the President of the Puerto Rican Independence Party (A/C. 4/236).

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

In favour: Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Israel.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, China, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Liberia.

The request was rejected by 25 votes to 19, with 11 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.