



**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 36:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):	
(e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community	
General debate and consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .	503
Agenda item 37:	
Question of the renewal of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories . . . . .	509

**Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).**

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

**Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3806, A/3807, A/3808, A/3809/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/3810, A/3811 and Add.1, A/3812 and Add.1, A/3813 and Add.1, A/3814, A/3815 and Add.1, A/3816, A/3837) (continued):**

**(e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/3916/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.575)**

**GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.574/REV.1, A/C.4/L.575) (continued)**

1. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) submitted the revised text (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) of his delegation's draft resolution. His delegation had been unable to accept the amendments proposed by some delegations, for they would have had the effect of altering the meaning of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) submitted the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575), of which his delegation was one of the sponsors. At the eighth session of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories his delegation had already expressed misgivings about the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (see A/3647 and Corr.1, part one, para. 25). It had expressed the same view in the Fourth Committee (672nd meeting) at the twelfth session of the

General Assembly. It considered that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be paramount and that the association of those Territories with the European Economic Community was likely to retard their economic development and their industrialization. It was essential that the Territories should not continue to be mere suppliers of raw materials and markets for manufactured European goods. Furthermore, the immigration of European workers into the Territories associated with the Community would be contrary to the interests of those Territories. Finally, the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories had not been consulted about the association and would not have the opportunity of seceding from it at some future date if they so desired. Those were the reasons why some delegations had thought that the Administering Members should be asked to provide information about the possible effects of the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community. The joint draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the subject, taking into account the information submitted.

3. The Administering Members concerned had referred to the advantages which the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories associated with the Community would gain from the association. If that were so there was no reason why further reassuring information about it should not be communicated to the United Nations. The proposed association should not be at the expense of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In the concluding note of his report (A/3916/Rev.1) the Secretary-General referred to the difficulty of making a general evaluation of the impact of the association.

4. For that reason the sponsors of the joint draft resolution were asking the Secretary-General to prepare a further report to be considered at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. In order not to limit the scope of the study, they had decided to delete the word "economic" before the word "development" in the fourth preambular paragraph and at the end of operative paragraph 3. The administering Powers were certainly in a position to supply the information requested and it was to be hoped that they would not refuse to do so.

5. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) stated that her delegation found the new text of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) satisfactory.

6. With regard to the joint draft resolution, she observed that the United Nations had a number of responsibilities with respect to the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and there was no questioning the Fourth Committee's right to examine the subject of the association of some of those Territories with the European Economic Community. It was therefore essential that information about it should be

communicated as soon as possible. Should the association prove to be detrimental to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, the United Nations could bring its disadvantages to the attention of the administering Powers and propose measures to rectify its harmful effects. It was not premature to ask for such information, for it was always easier to put something right at the very outset. If the administering Powers had the right to establish an association between the Territories which they administered and the Community which they had founded, they were also under an obligation to provide the United Nations with information which would enable it to decide whether such an association was in conformity with the interests of the inhabitants of the Territories. Such information had been requested at the twelfth session of the General Assembly by resolution 1153 (XII) but had not been provided. That was why the joint draft resolution again invited the Administering Members concerned to fulfil that obligation. She hoped that the draft resolution would receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

7. Mr. ABDEL WAHAB (United Arab Republic) pointed out that his delegation had already expressed (821st meeting, para. 24) its misgivings about the possible consequences of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community. The General Assembly, in resolution 1153 (XII), had invited the Administering Members concerned to transmit to the Secretary-General information on the subject to enable him to submit a report on the developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community. In his report (A/3916/Rev.1, para. 57) the Secretary-General had stated that the material it had been possible to use had been very limited and that no information had been available. The Administering Members concerned had not complied with the General Assembly's request. The main purpose of the association in question was to reserve a source of raw materials and markets for their manufactured goods for the States signatories of the Treaty of Rome establishing the Community. While it had been argued that the Treaty would expand the export markets of the associated Territories, it was to be noted on the other hand that some signatories of the Treaty, in the special protocols annexed to it, had reserved the right to a quota of some imports from third countries, duty-free to an extent that was to be equal to their imports for the year 1956. The States members of the Community would be able to fix the price of the raw materials which they obtained from the associated Territories and impose their own prices for the manufactured goods which they exported to them, without any fear of competition from other countries. Moreover, it was impossible for the associated Territories to form a similar association among themselves, as producers of raw materials and consumers of manufactured goods. Thus their economic development and political independence were liable to be endangered and the increasing interests of the colonial Powers would be an obstacle to the realization of the objectives of Chapter XI of the Charter.

8. It was a question of the utmost importance and should be studied by the United Nations as soon as possible. The delegation of the United Arab Republic therefore hoped that the administering Powers concerned would supply the Secretary-General with the necessary information. That was the purpose of the

joint draft resolution, of which the United Arab Republic was one of the sponsors.

9. Mr. HILALY (Pakistan) said that the Secretary-General's report on the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community was not calculated to dispel the fears which the delegation of Pakistan had already expressed (823rd meeting, para. 47) with regard to the impact of that association on the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

10. That association of under-developed Territories with a group of highly industrialized countries was liable to slow down the process of industrialization of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to prevent the establishment of a sound economic basis in those Territories. The Rome Treaty, it was true, stipulated that the associated Territories were entitled to collect customs duties to protect existing industries or to foster the establishment of new ones. Several Territories, however, such as French West Africa and Madagascar, already had a customs union with the metropolitan country. In the case of those Territories, the entry of goods originating from other members of the European Economic Community would receive the same treatment as French products, thus intensifying competition against local producers. Moreover, it was not the local authorities but the administering Powers which, as members of the Community, could decide to introduce new customs duties or to increase those already in effect. The Non-Self-Governing Territories would thus be subjected to exploitation by the States members of the European Economic Community.

11. In addition, the Rome Treaty did not provide any protection against the large-scale immigration of European workers into the associated Territories, a development which could have social and political repercussions apart from the economic competition. Except in the case of the Territories administered by France, all questions relating to immigration were within the competence of the metropolitan Governments. There was reason to wonder whether the signatories of the Treaty of Rome had taken sufficiently into account the principle enshrined in Chapter XI of the Charter that the interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount. It was also regrettable that the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in question had not been suitably consulted and that the Rome Treaty included no provision enabling the associated Territories to terminate their association with the Community.

12. Article 10 and 73 of the Charter left no room for doubt regarding the competence of the General Assembly in the matter. The Fourth Committee was not considering the European Economic Community and its effects on its member States but rather the impact of a supra-national organ on the economic welfare of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. That question was undeniably within the competence of the United Nations and Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter was not applicable to the case. A detailed study of the impact of the European Economic Community on the economy of the Latin American countries had already been made. It was not therefore premature to appraise the situation with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories which would be associated with that Community.

13. It was the duty of the General Assembly to examine in the greatest detail the consequences of the pro-

posed association. One of its most important effects would be on the external trade of the associated Non-Self-Governing Territories, in particular the Territories under French administration. An increase was expected in the exports of those Territories to the States members of the Community, which would grant those exports tariff preferences; on the other hand, increased competition was expected to reduce the price of goods imported by the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It should be borne in mind that that competition would in any case be limited to members of the Community and that its benefits were likely to be offset by the probable establishment of cartels. It was always difficult to prevent the formation of cartels and the provisions of the Rome Treaty on that point would not perhaps be sufficiently effective.

14. One of the more satisfactory results of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community would be the creation of the Development Fund for the purpose of financing the economic and social development of the Territories in question, a Fund which would serve to increase the funds already available. Those resources should, however, be used in such a way as to ensure the balanced development of the Territories benefiting from them. Unfortunately, it was only in the Territories under French administration that the local authorities could take decisions regarding the utilization of those resources. In the Territories administered by Belgium and the Netherlands, the local authorities would have a purely consultative role. The delegation of Pakistan was not trying to obstruct in any way the operation of the European Economic Community but wished to stress the complexity of the problem and the need to keep the operation of the Common Market under constant observation. The Economic Commission for Africa and the other economic commissions and bodies specified in operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution would be well qualified to perform that function.

15. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) recalled that during the twelfth session, at the 675th meeting of the Committee, his delegation had explained its position on the important question of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community and the competence of the United Nations in the matter, a competence which was based on Article 73 of the Charter. The Rome Treaty specified that the Community would foster the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories; to that end it had set up the Development Fund which, over a five-year period, would distribute some \$600 million among the various Non-Self-Governing Territories. In addition, firms and individuals from the European States members of the Community could establish themselves in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The political implications of that association should not be overlooked and the United Nations should see that Chapter XI of the Charter was respected. There was reason to wonder whether the delicate economies of the Non-Self-Governing Territories could stand up to competition from highly-developed countries and whether that competition would not be injurious to existing local industries and prevent the establishment of new industries. It was not known, moreover, whether the increase in the volume of exports of primary commodities would offset the fall in prices.

16. The Committee had already adopted, in connexion with Trust Territories, a draft resolution the text of which was similar to that of the joint draft resolution. The Guatemalan delegation would also support the latter draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories.

17. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the Indian delegation would support the Brazilian draft resolution as now drafted (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1). It would also vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575).

18. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before the Committee. Since, however, Article 73 b of the Charter concerned only the political development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, he thought it would be better if the Brazilian draft resolution referred to Article 73 as a whole and mentioned the political development as well as the economic and social development of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

19. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) supported the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), the purpose of which was to safeguard the interests of the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories which would be associated with the European Economic Community. He considered, however, that the words "some Territories" in the fourth preambular paragraph could be replaced with advantage by the words "those Territories".

20. The Moroccan delegation would also vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575).

21. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation could not accept any further amendment to the revised text of its draft resolution. The idea of political development was embodied in the fourth preambular paragraph because political development would be the normal consequence of economic and social development. His delegation could not accept the suggestion of the Moroccan representative either, because it could not go back on the amendments which had already been made to the paragraph in question.

22. Mr. DURAI SWAMY (Ceylon) said that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) were very glad that Morocco had joined them. They had decided to insert, in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the words "to be" between the word "information" and the word "submitted".

23. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575). However, he could not support the revised text of the Brazilian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), which he did not find as acceptable as the original text. While the original text of the fourth preambular paragraph had referred to the way in which the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community might affect the fulfilment of the objectives set forth in Article 73 b of the Charter, i. e. the political development of those Territories, the new text merely mentioned the influence on economic development. He would therefore ask the Brazilian representative to revert to the original idea of the paragraph by adding the word "political" before the words "economic and social development". Inasmuch as the Brazilian representative had pointed out

(834th meeting, para. 24) that the operative part of the draft resolution was intended to recommend that investments should not be limited to the export sector, but distributed as widely as possible among all the sectors of the Territories' economy, he suggested the insertion of the words "balanced economic development and" after the word "ensure". If the Brazilian representative should accept those changes, his delegation would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution.

24. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) regretted that for reasons he had already explained he was unable to accept those changes.

25. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) thought that the revised text of the fourth preambular paragraph of the Brazilian draft resolution covered the political as well as the economic and social aspects of the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, since it mentioned the objectives set forth in Article 73 b of the Charter, which included political objectives. Nevertheless he approved the change which the Moroccan representative had proposed for that preambular paragraph.

26. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575), but would find it very difficult to vote in favour of the Brazilian draft resolution in its revised form (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1). With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph of that text, he approved the Iraqi representative's suggestion, because he thought that the objectives set forth in Article 73 b of the Charter could be fulfilled only if the Administering Members adopted measures towards the political development of the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, the operative part of the draft resolution was a step backward in relation to the resolutions which had already been adopted in the matter; the Administering Members should be invited to adopt an investment policy and not merely to "examine the advisability" of such a policy.

27. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation was resolutely opposed to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) and would vote against it. As he had already pointed out at the twelfth session (678th meeting, para. 65), the principles underlying the establishment of the European Common Market were completely in accordance with the provisions of the Charter; it was precisely in order to take those provisions into account that the overseas Territories had been associated with the European Economic Community. Steps had been taken to protect the industries that were springing up in those Territories. Moreover, it was at the express request of their representatives, who had participated in the drafting of the Rome Treaty establishing the Community, and who continued to participate in the organization of the Common Market, that France had urged the other members of the European Economic Community to accept the association of the Territories with the Community. That association was thus precisely the opposite of colonialism. As the Secretary-General pointed out in his report (A/3916/Rev.1), an evaluation of the impact of the association on the Territories concerned was not yet possible, and no information on the subject could therefore be supplied for the time being. Some of the criticisms of the Common Market were incon-

sistent: on the one hand, it was said to have created conditions too favourable to the associated Territories and thus the possibility of dangerous competition for other countries, while, on the other hand, it was described as a form of neo-colonialism. The future would show that such criticisms were unfounded and that the European Economic Community was a factor of security and progress, not only for Europe, but also for the Territories associated with the Community and for the world as a whole.

28. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) said that he could not accept the amendment suggested by the Yugoslav representative, because it would completely upset the balance of his text, nor could he accept the proposal of the Moroccan and Mexican representatives.

29. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) moved the closure of the debate.

30. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) asked whether he could submit oral amendments to the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1).

31. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) opposed the closure of the debate because he, too, wished to submit oral amendments to the same draft resolution.

32. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) said that he, too, opposed the closure of the debate, since two representatives wished to submit amendments. Moreover, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) wanted to reply to the French representative's remarks.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom motion for closure of the debate on the two draft resolutions before the Committee.

The motion was rejected by 28 votes to 7, with 28 abstentions.

34. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) recalled that when the Committee had, at the twelfth session, examined the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community, a majority had considered that the Committee was competent to deal with any question which might affect the Territories. The Secretary-General's report did not dispel existing misgivings regarding the unfortunate effects of that association on the economic and political development of the Territories concerned. The Committee should thus give special attention to the matter, particularly since the Rome Treaty had not come into force.

35. One of the chief arguments advanced to demonstrate the General Assembly's competence in the matter had been that, as the Rome Treaty was mainly intended to promote the economic progress of the metropolitan countries, it was necessary to ascertain whether the execution of the provisions of the Treaty was not contrary to the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. The argument was not without foundation, as was borne out by paragraph 43 of the Secretary-General's report (A/3916/Rev.1) which said that, under article 8 of the Implementing Convention relating to the Association with the Community of the Overseas Countries and Territories, the right of establishment in the Territories was to be extended progressively to nationals and companies of the member States of the Community other than those having special relations with the Territory concerned. That meant that



the assistance now furnished to the Territories by international bodies would be progressively replaced by the investments of the States concerned, whose authority would eventually supersede that of the United Nations.

36. Since, in each Territory, investment policy no longer depended on the administering Power alone, it would assume greater importance, so that, in view of the tendency of investments to be concentrated in the less essential branches of the economy, it would be all the more necessary to ensure that that policy was in conformity with the interests of the population. In the light of that tendency, the import policies followed in Non-Self-Governing Territories should be based on the world prices of the products and not on the prices fixed by the metropolitan States alone. Moreover, since exports from metropolitan States to Non-Self-Governing Territories depended on the economic conditions which existed in those States and not on the needs of the Territories, there was a danger that they might delay the development of those Territories. The imbalance of the Territories' economic situation might be all the greater, inasmuch as the interests of the population would be subordinated to the interests of a larger number of Powers. Lastly, since private investments tended to favour the development of a single branch of the economy, the General Assembly should be very careful to see to it that the economy of the Territories could develop in a balanced way as the result of an extension of public investments. In short, the economic policies followed within the European Economic Community should be in conformity with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter, which laid down the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount.

37. For those reasons, the Indonesian delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575), which requested the Secretary-General to prepare for the fourteenth session a report on new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community. The purpose of that draft resolution was merely that the General Assembly should have the necessary information to enable it to judge whether the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the Community would contribute to their political emancipation as provided for in the United Nations Charter.

38. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said, with respect to the observations made by the representative of Mexico concerning the fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), that the adoption of political measures was essential for the political development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In order to avoid a prolonged discussion, he proposed that the preambular paragraph in question be replaced by the following text:

"Considering that the association of some Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community is likely to affect their economic development and their attainment of the objectives set forth in Article 73 b of the Charter."

That text would have the advantage of being clear, as well as of being more in line with the draft resolution as a whole.

39. With respect to the operative part, he proposed that the final phrase should be revised to read as

follows: ". . . an investment policy which will ensure balanced economic development and the progressive increase of the per capita income of the inhabitants of those Territories". That wording would bring out the idea that investment policies in the future should not be concentrated on exports but should be spread out as widely as possible.

40. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) requested that the word "some" in the phrase "the association of some Territories with the European Economic Community" in the fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) should be replaced by the word "these". He considered it improper to make any distinction between the Non-Self-Governing Territories which were dependent on the various member States of the European Economic Community; all those Non-Self-Governing Territories were in the same situation.

41. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that at first his delegation had been inclined to favour the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), but that after making a more careful study of the fourth preambular paragraph of that text it would probably abstain from voting on it. Actually, Article 73 b of the Charter, to which reference was made, dealt only with the political situation; it was illogical, therefore, to go on to mention only economic development. The Greek delegation thought that the fourth preambular paragraph should refer to sub-paragraph a and not to sub-paragraph b of Article 73.

42. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), in reply to the representative of France, who had denied the use of the joint draft resolution, recalled that the French delegation had already, at the twelfth session, refrained from speaking of the political aspect of the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community and that that aspect of the problem was not mentioned in the Rome Treaty either. That was one of the reasons why the Committee was concerned with the question. Moreover, the Yugoslav delegation had no objection to requesting the administering Powers to furnish information concerning the possible effects of the Common Market on the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, since it assumed that before considering the association of those Territories with the Community those Powers had studied the question and had reached the conclusion that such an association would have beneficial effects on the economy of the Territories. If the administering Powers refused to furnish information, it would be proper to ask what might be the real effects of the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the Common Market. The French and Belgian delegations had already described some positive aspects of that association. Why could they not submit a complete study of the matter to the United Nations?

43. The Committee had not discussed the procedure by which the populations of the Territories concerned had agreed to that association. He thought that it would be interesting to know how such agreement had been expressed in each of those Territories.

44. In reply to the representative of Brazil, he observed that the balance of the draft resolution submitted by the Brazilian delegation had been disturbed and that that balance might be restored by adopting the amendment proposed by the Iraqi delegation. He suggested that the words "to examine the advisability of adopting

in the Non-Self-Governing Territories an investment policy which will ensure" in the operative part should be replaced by the words "to re-examine their investment policy in the Non-Self-Governing Territories with a view to". The rest of the operative part would remain unchanged.

45. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon) recalled that at the twelfth session the French delegation had already voted against a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.498/Rev.1) similar to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575). The chief argument which it had advanced at the time had been that the draft resolution dealt with a matter which was not within the competence of the Committee. The representative of France had now added that the purpose of the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community was to ensure the application of the provisions of the Charter. The Committee itself should also see to it that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were protected, and it was that concern which had guided the authors of the joint draft resolution.

46. By supplying information, the administering Powers would help the Secretariat to prepare a report which would give an idea of the effects which the association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community might have on the development of those Territories. They might also furnish information concerning the relations which they proposed to establish with the Non-Self-Governing Territories associated with the Community. The joint draft resolution did not imply any criticism and did not prejudice the situation; it merely invited the administering Powers which belonged to the European Economic Community to furnish to the Secretariat information which would enable it to prepare a complete report on the situation.

47. Mr. Irving SALOMON (United States of America) said that his Government had always been favourable to the economic integration of Western Europe and to the creation of the Common Market, which would help to develop and strengthen Western Europe and could not fail to benefit the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories which would be associated with the Common Market.

48. The United States delegation thought that the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) was premature. The phrase "Noting with concern" in the third preambular paragraph was not justified, because the European Economic Community was still in the process of formation, its status had not yet been completely defined, and a certain number of problems would not be solved for a long time. In view of the fact that the Community had not yet begun to function, it would be impossible to apply operative paragraphs 2 and 3 and the adoption of that resolution could only embarrass the Committee and the Secretary-General. The situation might be clearer at the fourteenth session and the Committee would then be able to determine what should be done. Moreover, it would be better for the question to be considered by the Economic and Social Council and GATT, which specialized in problems of that kind and which were able to solve them in a more satisfactory way from the technical point of view. He recalled the leading part which had been played by GATT, in particular in connexion with international trade in such products as tea, tobacco, sugar, bananas and cocoa.

49. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), supporting the United States representative's comments regarding the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575), said that it was impossible to note "with concern" something which had not yet taken place. With reference to the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), he pointed out to the Moroccan representative that if the word "some", in the fourth preambular paragraph, were changed to "these", the resolution would apply to all the Non-Self-Governing Territories, although the Territories under United Kingdom, United States, Australian and New Zealand administration were in no way associated with the European Economic Community.

50. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana), referring to the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1), said that he did not consider that the political development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories "largely" depended on economic and social development. His delegation endorsed the Iraqi representative's amendments and would support the wording that representative had proposed if it was acceptable to the Brazilian delegation.

51. His delegation unreservedly supported the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575). That text merely requested more information for the General Assembly's fourteenth session; it was not at all premature and did not prejudice the question in any way. The French representative had said that events would soon show that the criticisms made by certain delegations were unjustified. He hoped that that statement would be borne out at the Assembly's fourteenth session.

52. His delegation had noted the United States representative's statement that the policy of the United States Government was to support every measure designed to promote European economic integration and the prosperity of the African countries. Europe must certainly continue to prosper at the same time as the countries of Africa.

53. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that the amendments which the Iraqi representative had proposed to the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) eliminated all difficulties and his delegation would vote in favour of that text. It would also accept the amendment submitted by the Moroccan representative. The objection to that amendment voiced by the United Kingdom representative could perhaps be overcome by replacing the word "these", which had been proposed by the Moroccan representative, by "such".

54. Replying to the French representative, he stated that the revised draft resolution in no way prejudged the questions; he hoped that all doubts would be dispelled at the General Assembly's fourteenth session.

55. Mr. SIBI BABA (Morocco), replying to the United Kingdom representative, said that his only wish was that all the Non-Self-Governing Territories administered by countries belonging to the European Economic Community should enjoy exactly the same treatment. He accepted the amendment proposed by the Mexican representative.

56. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation supported the change requested by the Moroccan delegation and the amendments submitted by the Iraqi delegation.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment proposed orally by Iraq (see para. 38 above) to the

fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) submitted by Brazil.

The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 18, with 13 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the adoption of that amendment disposed of the amendment submitted by Morocco.

59. He put to the vote the amendment submitted orally by Iraq (see para. 39 above) to the operative part of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) submitted by Brazil.

The amendment was adopted by 43 votes to 8, with 17 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.574/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of India, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ceylon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

Against: France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Belgium.

Abstaining: Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

61. At the request of Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) and Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal), the CHAIRMAN put to the vote separately the words "with concern" in the third preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575).

At the request of the representative of Czechoslovakia, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria.

Abstaining: Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Spain, Thailand, Argentina.

It was decided, by 34 votes to 18, with 17 abstentions, to retain the words "with concern" in the joint draft resolution.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.575) as a whole, as orally amended.

At the request of the representative of France, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco.

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

Abstaining: Portugal, Spain, China, Ireland, Israel.

The draft resolution was adopted by 48 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

#### AGENDA ITEM 37

**Question of the renewal of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3837)**

63. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that since draft resolution B submitted by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in its report (A/3837, part one, annex II) had been supported by many members of the Committee, he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

64. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) asked for a vote on draft resolution B. His delegation intended to vote against the renewal of the Committee on Information because it believed that that Committee was illegal and that it contributed nothing to the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

65. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution B submitted by the Committee on Information (A/3837, part one, annex II).

The draft resolution was adopted by 61 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.