



Thursday, 24 October 1957,
 at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 38: The question of South West Africa (<u>continued</u>)	149
Agenda item 35: 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 (<u>continued</u>):	
(a) Information on economic conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955;	
(e) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General	
General debate (<u>continued</u>)	149
Consideration of draft resolutions	152

- (a) Information on economic conditions;
- (b) Information on other conditions;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/357/Rev.1, A/C.4/359);
- (d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955 (A/3618 and Add.1);
- (e) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: Report of the Secretary-General (A/3619)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

4. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia asked whether the Under-Secretary could give the Committee any information on the attention being given to the European Common Market by various international organs.

5. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the question of the European Common Market and free trade area was under active consideration by various United Nations organs and had attracted considerable attention in the three regional economic commissions.

6. As far as the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) was concerned, the Economic Survey of Europe Survey of Europe in 1956^{1/} had devoted a chapter to "Plans for freer trade in western Europe", in which the position at the beginning of 1957 was analysed and the long-run implications and possible problems of adjustment discussed. The Common Market had been discussed at the twelfth session of ECE,^{2/} mainly in connexion with a statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and with proposals for all-European economic co-operation. The Secretary-General had made a preliminary statement in which he had indicated that the plans for the European Common Market might be considered steps towards greater economic integration and had said that the Commission would be failing in its duty if it did not consider the probable economic consequences of the Common Market for Europe as a whole. He had felt that those questions could be studied in the context of broader all-European co-operation. After a broad discussion the USSR delegation had introduced a draft resolution which, without mentioning the Common Market, made a number of proposals concerning all-European economic co-operation. The draft resolution had subsequently been withdrawn by the USSR delegation on the understanding that it would be reproduced in the Commission's report to the Council and that the proposals it contained would be submitted to the appropriate subsidiary bodies of the Commission.

Chairman: Mr. Thanat KHOMAN (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 38

Question of South West Africa (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with a decision taken by the Committee at its 653rd meeting, the Secretariat had sent letters to Mr. Wilhelm Heyn and Dr. Joachim Seegert with a view to ascertaining whether they wished to be granted hearings by the Committee. He had now received replies to those letters, which he read to the Committee. Mr. Heyn and Dr. Seegert said that they would like to come before the Committee but that financial difficulties would prevent them from undertaking the journey at their own expense.
2. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) pointed out that when the Committee agreed to hear a petitioner, it was for him to take the necessary measures to attend.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that the petitioners would receive a reply along the lines indicated by the Mexican representative.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 35

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/3601 and Corr.1, A/3602, A/3603, A/3606/Rev.1, A/3607, A/3608, A/3609, A/3647 and Corr.1, A/C.4/360, A/C.4/L.497/Rev.1) (continued):

^{1/} United Nations publication, Sales No.:1957.II.E.1.

^{2/} See Economic Commission for Europe: Annual Report (Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6).

7. With regard to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), the subject of the European Common Market and free trade area had been discussed at the ninth session of the Committee on Industry and Trade and at the thirteenth session of ECAFE itself.^{3/} The Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs had suggested that the Commission might consider the relevance of the problem to ECAFE's plans for future action. In the debate on the economic situation of the region the Japanese representative had said that the project need not be opposed provided that it did not entail further economic restrictions against other regions and that the countries of the ECAFE region might benefit from the experience gained in Europe. The Indian representative had said that ECAFE should consider the possibility of organizing interregional trade talks on specific commodities produced and consumed in the region. The French representative had pointed out that the question of whether the Common Market would foster an expansion of world exchanges as well as of intra-European exchanges would be discussed at a special session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The question of the European Common Market was on the provisional agenda of the first session of ECAFE's Committee on Trade to be held in 1958.

8. The Common Market had also been discussed by the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA).^{4/} The Trade Committee of that Commission had, at its first session, considered studies by the ECLA secretariat on Latin-America's payments system, the possible establishment of a regional market, and inter-Latin-American commodity trade. It had finally adopted resolution 3 (I), providing for the establishment of a group of experts to complete the studies on those subjects and to project the possible structure of a regional market. In resolution 1 (I) the Committee had taken steps towards the gradual establishment of a Latin-American multilateral payments system. At its seventh session the Commission had adopted resolutions 115 (VII) and 116 (VII) endorsing those resolutions and requesting the ECLA secretariat to implement them with a view to taking a more decisive step towards their underlying objective. It had also adopted resolution 117 (VII) requesting the ECLA secretariat to transmit to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA-ECOSOC), for the information of the Economic Conference of the Organization of American States, a report on the studies carried out in relation to the problem of payments and the possibility of creating a regional market with a view to co-ordinating the work of ECLA and IA-ECOSOC and preventing the duplication of activities.

9. After taking note of a preliminary study by the ECLA secretariat on the possible repercussions of the European Common Market on Latin-America's export trade (E/CN.12/449 and Add.1), the Commission had, in resolution 121 (VII), requested the secretariat to continue to observe the economic integration of Europe and other areas and to keep member Governments supplied with information thereon. It had also recom-

^{3/} See Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; Annual Report (Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 2).

^{4/} See Economic Commission for Latin America: Annual Report (Official Records of the Economic and Social Council Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 8.

mended that the secretariat should carry out studies on world market prospects for Latin-American primary commodities, taking into consideration the possible impact of the European Common Market, and that such studies should be co-ordinated with others undertaken by GATT, ECE, ECAFE and other United Nations agencies. In accordance with resolution 117 (VII), the ECLA secretariat had submitted the appropriate report (E/CN.12/483), of which the Economic Conference of the Organization of American States had taken note, adopting resolution 14, in which it commended the work carried out by ECLA in relation to the proposed Latin-American regional market and requested the IA-ECOSOC secretariat to co-operate in further work on the subject.

10. ECA's Central American Economic Co-operation Committee was planning a programme for the economic integration of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, in particular by means of the development of trade in the region and the creation of a Central American regional market or free trade area. At its fourth session, the Committee had recommended that the participating Governments should sign a draft multilateral free trade and economic integration treaty and a draft agreement on Central American integration industries which had been endorsed by the Committee.

11. Following a draft resolution introduced by the USSR delegation (E/AC.6/L.187) in the Economic Committee of the Economic and Social Council, the Council had debated the subject of the European Common Market at its twenty-fourth session. A summary of the debate was to be found in paragraphs 159 and 160 of the Council's report to the General Assembly^{5/} and the introduction to the report, by the Council's President, included a statement on the subject. That statement had been the object of some discussion and criticism in the Second Committee at the present session of the General Assembly, the Mexican representative in particular having pointed out, at that Committee's 455th meeting, that the Council should not direct the regional economic commissions on what they should or should not include in their surveys.

12. No draft resolution had so far been tabled on the Common Market item.

13. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked that the Under-Secretary's statement should be circulated as an official document.

It was so decided.^{6/}

14. In reply to a further question from Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia), Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the question of the European Common Market would be considered by the Contracting Parties to GATT at their next session.

15. Mr. JAIPAL (India) pointed out that, although the question of the Common Market had been considered by various bodies, none of them had given special attention to the effects of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community.

^{5/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Supplement No. 3.

^{6/} The complete text of the statement made by the Under-Secretary was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/362.

That question was the Committee's main concern and had not yet been studied, as was fitting that it should be, in the light of Chapter XI of the Charter and the principles set forth there.

16. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether, to the best of Mr. Cohen's knowledge, such international bodies as the regional economic commissions were concerning themselves with the system known as "imperial preference", to which some States members of the Committee had belonged when they had still been British dependent territories.

17. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said he had not looked into that point.

18. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) paid a tribute to the Committee on Information for the quality of its report (A/3647). Enumerating the evils engendered by colonialism, he recalled the conditions under which the Administering Members had been entrusted with responsibilities that were in the nature of a sacred trust. That trust could not be regarded merely as the renewal of a lease; the administering Powers were in duty bound to bring their vast task to a successful conclusion by helping the Non-Self-Governing Territories to overcome their backwardness. It was from that point of view that the economic conditions in the Territories should be appraised.

19. The situation was alarming with regard to the important question of national income. Not only was the proportion between the national incomes of metropolitan States and those of the Territories catastrophic, but there was no indication that that state of affairs would improve in the near future.

20. The reason for that was the social structure of the Territories. The predominance of small holdings and small enterprises, the desire for immediate gain and speculation were all anti-economic factors. The difficulty of accumulating capital was aggravated by the poverty of the Territories, rudimentary social organization and population pressure, as could be seen from the Secretariat's report in document A/AC.35/L.248. In addition, the domestic market was small as the result of the low level of living and low productivity. In view of the cheapness of manpower, private interests made only limited investments instead of tying up a large amount of capital in technical improvements. All those obstacles were made even more serious by the fact that the economic structure of the Territories was in its infancy and that the Territories were ill-equipped to take counter-measures. In addition, indigenous production must be able to compete with metropolitan products, which often enjoyed customs exemption.

21. In order to overcome those difficulties, a strict and realistic form of economic planning was called for. The administering Powers had begun to follow that course, but their plans were still inadequate. The investment rate, on which, incidentally, the Administering Members gave only incomplete data, stood at between 5 and 7 per cent of the national income of the Non-Self-Governing Territories as against 12 to 22 per cent in the industrialized countries. Thus, in order to catch up, the Territories needed to develop at an even faster rate than the industrialized countries. It was therefore necessary to promote productive investments, expand the credit system, facilitate savings and establish central banks. It was also necessary to con-

clude local customs unions rather than customs unions between the Territories and the metropolitan States, which had the effect of integrating the market of a Territory with that of the mother country. He was glad to see that some of those steps were being taken by the administering Powers.

22. He then stressed the social aspects of agricultural development. In some cases, as the Committee on Information had pointed out, there must be a change in the basic economic structure through such means as a reorganization of the land-tenure system in order to remedy chronic indebtedness and the parcelling-out of land. Plots of land should not be distributed to each peasant unless there was some kind of comprehensive plan under which co-operatives and agricultural stations would play a useful part. Another important consideration was to ensure that the people accepted and actively co-operated in the schemes for land reform.

23. Although some alarming comments had been made on the over-population of rural areas, every emerging industry needed manpower, and the Non-Self-Governing Territories thus had, as an American economist had put it, "potential savings" that made it possible to initiate general development plans.

24. The utilization of manpower gave rise, of course, to problems of planning, investment priorities and economic equilibrium. Their solution depended upon the situation peculiar to each country and should be planned with flexibility and realism. In order to modernize the economy, priority should be given to basic industries, although care should be taken to avoid jeopardizing the dynamic equilibrium of development and unleashing inflationary trends. Emphasis on consumer industries would mean the continuous import of capital goods from the industrialized countries, and that would sooner or later cause difficulties for the Territories in connexion with the balance of payments.

25. In all those matters, the administering Powers unfortunately paid little heed to the interests of the inhabitants. Industrialization should not, of course, be regarded as an end in itself but as one of the means of increasing the national income. That reservation, however, did not justify the situation reflected, for example, in table 8 of document A/AC.35/L.242, showing the estimates of the ten-year plan in the Belgian Congo. Although nearly half of the funds under that plan were devoted to transport, only 7.09 per cent was assigned to electricity and nothing at all to industry. The situation was little better in the French and British Territories. In view of the small part of the national income that reverted to the indigenous populations, the development plans were far from satisfactory, for they merely accentuated the backwardness of the Territories and compromised their independence.

26. He paid a tribute to the national and international organizations which were providing technical assistance for the Territories. That method of co-operation was a lesson in solidarity.

27. He acknowledged that the administering Powers had a thankless task. They were subjected to the constant and irresponsible pressure of capitalists and were obliged at the same time to face the all but insuperable difficulties inherent in the very nature of their mission.

28. The Iranian delegation reserved its position concerning the European Common Market.

29. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) wished to offer a correction to that part of the Iranian representative's statement which concerned the ten-year plan in the Belgian Congo. The plan provided solely for public investments intended to establish an infrastructure which would encourage private investment. There had been a heavy volume of private investment in recent years which, in particular, had made it possible to increase the output of electric power from 453 million kilowatt-hours in 1949 to 1,292 million in 1954 and to more than 2,000 million kilowatt-hours annually at the present time.

30. As to the national income of the Belgian Congo, recent statistics showed that the population was growing at a rate of 2 per cent annually and the national income at a rate of 7 per cent. In addition, 10 per cent of the annual gross national income was devoted to industrialization.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/3647, draft resolution A, p. 11; A/C.4/L.497/Rev.1)

31. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to turn to consideration of two draft resolutions, firstly, draft resolution A submitted by the Committee on Information (A/3647, p. 11) and secondly, the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica, Greece, Iraq, Mexico, Morocco and Yugoslavia (A/C.4/L.497/Rev.1).

32. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution A.

33. Mr. SULTANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution should not be taken to mean that it subscribed wholly to the conclusions contained in the Committee on Information.

Draft resolution A (A/3647, p. 11) was adopted.

34. Mr. CARREÑO MALLARINO (Colombia) observed with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.497/Rev.1, that the question raised in sub-paragraph (a) of the operative paragraph was resolved by Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Charter, which declared that decisions on the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority should be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

35. In the case of sub-paragraph (b), he was of the opinion that the issue which the General Assembly was called upon to settle was a question of fact and not of law. The International Court of Justice could not tell the General Assembly how to proceed in deciding that matter. If a legal question was at issue, the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly was qualified to examine it.

36. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the questions embodied in the draft resolution did not appear to be particularly well drafted. In sub-paragraph (b), the question "would it be in accordance with the Charter to submit a resolution on Non-Self-Governing Territories to a two-thirds vote if an additional category to that effect has not been established beforehand for the Non-Self-Governing Territories..." might equally well be worded: "...would it be in accordance with the Charter to submit to a simple majority vote all questions on Non-Self-Governing Territories irrespective of the

importance of those questions?" The objective was to determine whether the important questions consisted solely of those enumerated in Article 18, paragraph 2, and whether, in case the General Assembly considered a question to be important, the only procedure available to it was to decide that all similar questions were important.

37. It would be absurd to say that questions concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories were not important questions, or that they were always less important than those which concerned Trust Territories. If the Charter included questions on Trust Territories among the important questions, the reason was that the authors of the Charter had felt, and the Belgian delegation agreed with them, that the General Assembly had a responsibility in the case of those Territories which it did not have where Non-Self-Governing Territories were concerned. That request amounted, in short, to telling the Court that the concern which the members of the Committee felt for the Non-Self-Governing Territories was not so great that questions affecting those Territories were regarded as important questions.

38. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that the authors of the draft resolution had wished to present a text that would be objective while omitting any reference to the arguments of both sides, but he clearly realized that the debate must be reopened.

39. Replying to the representative of Colombia, he did not deny that the General Assembly could determine its own procedure and was continually interpreting the Charter. Nevertheless the General Assembly had for three years been vacillating between two diametrically opposed interpretations. That conflict was the reason why the International Court of Justice must be asked to decide who was right - those who had championed one view in 1953 or those who had championed the other view in 1957.

40. He recalled the arguments advanced by his delegation in the 459th plenary meeting, held on 27 November 1953, at the eighth session of the General Assembly. Article 18, paragraph 2, stated that decisions on important questions should be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. The words "important questions" had given rise to much argument. That was undoubtedly due to a weakness in the Charter's wording, as had been pointed out by Mr. Hans Kelsen in his book The Law of the United Nations.^{7/} If the reference had been to "important questions" without any qualification, there would have been no reason to list the questions to which the two-thirds majority rule applied and still less reason to allow the General Assembly to determine additional categories of questions to be decided by that majority. It should be noted that Article 18, paragraph 3, spoke of "questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority" and omitted any reference to "important questions". It should also be noted that several of the items enumerated in paragraph 2, such as recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the operation of the Trusteeship System and budgetary questions, could not be considered "questions" in the strict sense of the term but were rather "categories" encompassing a multitude of different questions.

41. Although according to paragraph 2, "questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System"

^{7/} London, Stevens and Sons Ltd., 1950.

had to be decided by a two-thirds majority inasmuch as they were "important questions", it could not be said that the fifty-odd resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on Trust Territories were all important. He did not mean to underestimate the importance of any specific decision adopted by the General Assembly, but, by the way of example, he cited resolutions 651 (VII) and 654 (VII) which, although adopted by a two-thirds majority, were unquestionably less important than some resolutions which had been adopted by a simple majority. Thus, the far-reaching decision to call a special session of the General Assembly was taken by a simple majority only, in accordance with Article 20 of the Charter. The determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority was particularly important, and yet that decision, which in the eyes of many was equivalent to a reform of the Charter, was taken by only a simple majority. It was indisputable that so long as the General Assembly did not establish additional categories, there was nothing in the Charter itself which authorized the Assembly to require a two-thirds majority.

42. If a delegation wished to propose that questions concerning Chapter XI should be decided by a two-thirds majority, what it would actually be proposing would be the determination of an additional category. Questions which fell within the purview of Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter were expressly provided for in Article 18, paragraph 2, but those which came under Chapter XI were expressly excluded. That was because at the San Francisco Conference the question of Non-Self-Governing Territories and that of Trust Territories had been handled by the same Committee, which had finally assigned them to different chapters of the Charter. Eventually, however, the matter would have to be cleared up, and that was why the Mexican delegation believed that the International Court of Justice should be asked for an opinion, which would eliminate a cause of profound disagreement in the Fourth Committee.

43. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) stated that he had only wanted to show the authors of the joint draft resolution that they were mistaken if they thought that they had put their questions objectively. As he had already pointed out, the question contained in sub-paragraph (b) could also be put in the opposite way. In addition, if the question contained in sub-paragraph (a) was accepted, the second question would be quite unnecessary.

44. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) explained that the first question was in effect a general statement of the problem as it had stood since 1953, while the second one related specifically to what had taken place at the 656th and 657th plenary meetings, held on 20 February 1957, when the Mexican delegation had asked what legal basis there was for the request for a two-thirds majority vote and had not received any reply.

45. Mrs. DE BARISH (Costa Rica) supported the remarks made by the Mexican representative.

46. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) considered the present form of the draft resolution to be the most satisfactory and said that she might have to abstain if the text was modified.

47. Mr. GRIECO (Brazil) thought that Article 18 of the Charter was clear and complete in the sense that it showed the Organization the course to be followed in determining additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority and that it left no

room for any interpretation. The voting procedure thus established was one of the main prerogatives of the sovereign General Assembly. It was true that the Fourth Committee had taken the initiative of requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court on the procedure to be followed in questions relating to reports and petitions referring to South West Africa; but that had been a special case, for besides the two procedures indicated in the Charter, the Committee had had to consider also as a third possibility the practice of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

48. The Brazilian delegation thought that the draft resolution would, if adopted, establish a serious precedent. In eleven years, the General Assembly had adopted many resolutions related to Non-Self-Governing Territories, some by a simple majority and others by a two-thirds majority, according to the circumstances in each case. An advisory opinion of the Court would narrow the issue down and, whatever it might be, would have the effect of making illegal many of the resolutions already adopted. No general decision could be made beforehand that all draft resolutions concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories should be adopted by a simple majority or by a two-thirds majority. Each delegation must arrive at a decision according to the circumstances and according to the importance of the questions.

49. He recalled that at the 424th meeting of the Committee, held at the ninth session, the Mexican delegation itself had stated that the General Assembly was a sovereign body and could not request an advisory opinion on its voting procedure from the Court without setting a very dangerous precedent. In the course of the same meeting, the Yugoslav representative had stated that as South West Africa came under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, the General Assembly had been fully entitled to apply the two-thirds majority rule. There was equal justification for saying that the Non-Self-Governing Territories came under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and the General Assembly thus was fully entitled to apply to that question either the two-thirds majority or the simple majority rule. That was one of the fundamental rights which the Charter conferred on the Member States, and there could be no question of violating it.

50. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) stated that the Portuguese delegation would not be able to vote for the draft resolution, because it did not conform with the Charter, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice or with the procedure of the General Assembly.

51. Under the terms of Article 65 of its Statute, the Court could give an advisory opinion only on a legal question. Did the draft resolution submit a legal question to the Court? The Portuguese delegation did not think so. A legal question was a technical question, and there did not seem to be anything technical in the draft resolution. In fact, the first paragraph dispelled any doubts by the words, "Considering the terms of Article 18 of the Charter...", for that meant that Article 18 did not need any interpretation. The only legal question that the draft resolution might embody would concern the definition of an important question, but the definition of an important question was a political and not a legal matter. The Court had no authority to give an advisory opinion on political questions and the General Assembly

would be relinquishing its powers if it asked the Court to do so.

52. Article 18 of the Charter spoke of "decisions", and the key words of paragraph 3 of that same article were "the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided...". Thus, whether a question was or was not an important question was a political matter that the General Assembly alone had the power to resolve.

53. For eleven years, it had been maintained that the General Assembly had the power to determine its own procedure, and that had to be so if the Assembly wanted to keep its sovereign power in that matter intact. It was quite natural for the Assembly, at its discretion, to reverse a decision previously taken. The essential point was for it to exercise its judgement in the most prudent manner and to decide each case on its merits. If the Assembly had to ask the Court for an advisory opinion each time it followed a procedure different from the one previously followed, the number of requests for advisory opinions might very likely increase indefinitely.

54. The opinion of the Portuguese delegation in the matter was in no way new. The same opinion had already been expressed at the 424th meeting of the Committee by the Mexican and Yugoslav delegations, both

of which were now among the authors of the draft resolution. Those two delegations had stated in substance both that the General Assembly would be setting a dangerous precedent if it asked the Court for an advisory opinion on a resolution it had adopted and that the General Assembly had a perfect right to decide the question of South West Africa, with which it had then been dealing, by a two-thirds majority vote. Those statements were perfectly applicable to the draft resolution, since the question with which it was concerned undeniably came within the competence of the General Assembly, and since sub-paragraph (b) of the operative part of the draft resolution implied a criticism of previous decisions taken by the General Assembly.

55. Mr. WHITE (Canada) asked that the statements made at the previous meeting by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom should be circulated as official documents.

It was so decided.^{8/}

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

^{8/} The complete texts of the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and of France were subsequently circulated as documents A/C.4/363 and A/C.4/364, respectively.