

The second resolution dealt with the question of the continuance of the Special Committee, and, as a result of a compromise, suggested that "without prejudice to the future," the Special Committee should be reconstituted in 1949. Two amendments were proposed, one of which would have made the Special Committee a permanent organ and the other giving it a three years' mandate.

The first of these amendments was rejected by a tie vote of 17 to 17 with 18 abstentions, and the second by 19 votes to 11 with 21 abstentions. *New Zealand* voted against both on the grounds that, quite apart from the merits of the case, it seemed premature to adopt a final decision when the Special Committee was still in an experimental stage. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 38 votes (N.Z.) to 7.

Two resolutions relating respectively to liaison between the Economic and Social Council and the Special Committee and to co-operation with the specialized agencies, were adopted without opposition.

During the course of the general debate on the Special Committee's report, the representative of *India* drew attention to the fact that information was no longer being transmitted in connection with certain non-self-governing territories named in the list established in 1946. In his opinion, when a particular territory became self-governing, the Fourth Committee had a right to receive information on the change in its constitutional position which, in the opinion of the metropolitan Power, rendered it unnecessary to transmit further information. The draft resolution which he submitted, however, contained a request for extremely detailed information on the constitutional position and status of territories on which information was no longer sent.

The *United Kingdom* representative stated that his Government would, as a normal act of courtesy, inform the Secretary-General of changes in the status of a territory, but felt that the United Nations had no right to examine political information of this nature. The *New Zealand* representative agreed in principle with the resolution, but felt that the transmission of such specific information would inevitably cause the Assembly to discuss whether the administering Power concerned was justified in ceasing to transmit information, and to attempt the difficult task of defining a non-self-governing territory. The relevant paragraph of the *Indian* resolution was adopted by the Committee by 30 to 3 (Australia, Belgium, and the United Kingdom) with 13 abstentions (N.Z.). The resolution as a whole was then adopted by 29 votes with 17 abstentions (N.Z.).

These five resolutions were all adopted in the Assembly, the first by 41 votes (N.Z.) to 6 with 2 abstentions, the second by 44 votes (N.Z.) to 7 with 2 abstentions, the third and fourth by 44 votes (N.Z.) with 7 abstentions, and the fifth unanimously.