



C O N T E N T S

	Page
Agenda item 31:	
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 (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Information on social 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 General Assembly resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954	105
Agenda item 33:	
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 (<i>continued</i>)	107

Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 31

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/2892 to 2894, A/2895 and Add.1 and 2, A/2896, A/2898, A/2908 and Add.1) (*continued*):

- (a) Information on social 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 General Assembly resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 (A/2937 and Add.1, 2, 3/Rev.1 and 4)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO (A/C.4/L.397) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked whether one of the co-sponsors the joint draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.397 was ready to answer the questions put by the Australian representative at the 485th meeting.

2. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) said that the co-sponsors did not consider that the draft resolution could give rise to controversy since its intention was clear and simple. They merely wished to have gathered in one document the data concerning conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted since 1946, up to and including the data contained in the latest reports received, so as to show what progress had

been achieved in the past ten years. There was no intention to disparage the work done by the Administering Members. Owing either to the fact that information on cultural, social and economic advancement reached the Fourth Committee through the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, or else because of the short periods covered by the annual reports, it was difficult to evaluate the progress made over a period of years. Hence the sponsors had thought well to extend the period covered by the summary to ten years. The summary would obviously have to be based on the information received by the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 73 e, as stated in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

3. Some of the Administering Members had voluntarily submitted information concerning the political development of the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was not proposed to analyse that information or to ascertain the political situation in the Territories; all that was proposed was to summarize the data concerning such progress.

4. Most of the questions put by the Australian representative were irrelevant to the scope and purpose of the draft resolution, and they could be answered at the eleventh session of the General Assembly; it would be premature to answer them at the current session. It was impossible to foresee how the General Assembly would deal with the question at the eleventh session. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not ask the Secretary-General to make evaluations or reach conclusions. The General Assembly would deal with the report as it thought appropriate. All the sponsors asked was that the Secretary-General should draw up a preliminary summary, which might be by Territories, since that was the form in which the information was received; they could not anticipate whether the General Assembly would ask for the final report to be drawn up by Territories or in some other manner.

5. In drawing up the preliminary report, the Secretary-General should consult the specialized agencies concerned; the sponsors' original idea had been that the proposed summary should be prepared in consultation with the Administering Members, but they had abandoned the idea in case the objection might be raised that they were attempting to impose tasks upon those Powers without having the authority to do so. If, however, the Administering Members were willing to help, a gap in the draft resolution would be filled.

6. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) said that his delegation would take into account the measure of information which had been provided when casting its vote on the draft resolution.

7. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) said that, if he had correctly understood the sponsors' intentions, the draft resolution would request the Secretary-General to draw up for the eleventh session a report comparing the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories

in 1947 with that prevailing at the present time in the same Territories in the three technical fields about which the Administering Members supplied information in conformity with Article 73 e.

8. Commenting on the obscure nature of the draft, he pointed out that in operative paragraph 3, the Fourth Committee itself, or at any rate the sponsors of the draft resolution, should make it clear what were the main points that should be studied by the Secretary-General. In operative paragraph 1, too, there was a basic contradiction. It was obvious that the goals of Chapter XI of the Charter related not only to economic, social and educational advancement in the Territories but also to political advancement. It would then be difficult to carry out the intention expressed in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution using only information concerning economic, social and educational conditions.

9. Even if those obscurities were eliminated and the Belgian Government agreed that the data transmitted solely for information purposes could be examined, it would still have grave doubts about the usefulness of the draft resolution. The basis of the report that the Secretary-General was asked to submit, and of the examination that would be carried out by the General Assembly, would be the information furnished at present in conformity with Article 73 e of the Charter. The information at present available to the Secretary-General concerned only a part of the indigenous peoples who had not yet attained a full measure of self-government. The Secretary-General's report and its examination by the General Assembly would therefore be subject to narrow and arbitrary limitations and could not lead to any useful conclusions. The Belgian delegation felt that the technical information it continued to supply would be of use in such a study only when considered in relation to adequate statistical data.

10. He would therefore be unable to support the draft resolution.

11. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) said that he would vote for the joint draft resolution because of its spirit, its usefulness, its timeliness and the intercontinental character of its sponsors. It would be useful to have a comprehensive view of developments in the guidance of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and peoples towards self-government so as to make possible an evaluation of the progress achieved and, in particular, of the work of the Fourth Committee.

12. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) proposed the insertion of the following clause in paragraph 1, after the words "Article 73 e of the Charter": "and also any other information gathered by the Secretary-General from official publications of the Members responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories or inter-governmental and scientific bodies on matters relating to these affairs".

13. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) saw no objection to that amendment.

14. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), while ready to support the amendment, feared that it might give rise to objections in the Committee; he therefore urged that it should be voted on separately rather than incorporated in the draft resolution.

15. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) felt that, in the light of the explanations furnished by the representative of Ecuador, the draft resolution was an interest-

ing one to which the New Zealand delegation would have no serious objections at the present stage. The draft resolution contained a number of obscurities which caused the New Zealand delegation some doubts as to the final results of the proposed operation. Nevertheless there had been considerable progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories over the past ten years and any report designed to demonstrate that fact would in itself be valuable.

16. With reference to paragraph 2 of the operative part, he would agree with the statement it contained and, since the initial step would be taken by the Secretary-General, he would like to know what the Secretary-General himself considered would be the difficulties involved in implementing that paragraph.

17. The representative of Pakistan had raised a point which was, of course, not new in the consideration by the Fourth Committee of information about conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. As the Committee was aware, the New Zealand delegation would oppose any suggestion that the General Assembly should consider information about the Non-Self-Governing Territories other than that contemplated in the Charter. That would of course rule out the consideration of information from unofficial sources such as scientific organizations or voluntary bodies. In that connexion he recalled that General Assembly resolution 143 (II) authorized the Secretary-General to include in his summaries and analyses all relevant and comparable official statistical information which was available in the statistical services of the Secretariat and which might be agreed upon between the Secretary-General and the Member concerned, giving appropriate citation of sources. The New Zealand delegation had for many years felt that such information would add realism to the summaries and analyses prepared by the Secretary-General, but the members of the Committee were well aware of the difficulties involved and the attitude of certain delegations with regard to that point.

18. He was glad that the representative of Yugoslavia had asked for a separate vote to be taken on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Pakistan, since its incorporation would undoubtedly reduce the number of votes in favour of the draft resolution.

19. He asked the Under-Secretary to give the Committee his views on paragraph 3.

20. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that from the very beginning of its work in the field of Non-Self-Governing Territories his Department had been in the habit of conferring at operating level with all the specialized agencies. There was a constant exchange of information between the officers of those agencies and the officers of the Department with regard to the information submitted by the Administering Members. There did not seem to be any need for the Secretary-General to receive an instruction to establish any form of consultation beyond that which had existed up to the present and which had worked very well. The directive would however, be useful in eliciting much fuller co-operation on the part of the specialized agencies in the preparation of those points which, under the draft resolution now before the Committee, would have to be brought to the attention of the eleventh session of the General Assembly as constituting the main points that might be useful

in an examination of the progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories over a period of years.

21. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) felt that it might expedite the Committee's work if the sponsors of the draft resolution and the Pakistan representative could reach agreement on a text to be submitted to the Committee. He therefore proposed that the meeting should be suspended for a short time.

22. The CHAIRMAN put the Venezuelan proposal to the vote.

The proposal was not adopted, 2 votes being cast in favour and 2 against, with 48 abstentions.

23. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) understood that the New Zealand representative's objection to his amendment applied only to information from non-official bodies. He therefore agreed to delete the reference to scientific bodies from his amendment.

24. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) thought it inconceivable that the Secretary-General should need anything but the information transmitted under Article 73 e to produce the kind of report described by the Ecuadorian representative. If, during the coming year, the Secretary-General found the information at his official disposal inadequate, he would surely say so at the eleventh session of the General Assembly. The implication that the information submitted by the Administering Members was inadequate was *prima facie* unacceptable to his delegation. The amendment was complex and he could not see that it was necessary.

25. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked that the Pakistan amendment should be circulated in writing.

26. The CHAIRMAN suspended the meeting in order to allow the document to be circulated.

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.40 p.m.

27. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the Pakistan amendment (A/C.4/L.402) should be put to the vote separately. His delegation did not agree to its incorporation in the draft resolution of which it was a co-sponsor.

28. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece) said that he would vote in favour of the Pakistan amendment.

29. Mr. GHANEM (Egypt) had no objection to the Pakistan amendment but agreed that it should be put to the vote separately, since that was the wish of some of the other sponsors of the draft resolution.

30. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) noted that some delegations felt that if his amendment were adopted, the draft resolution would not gain as much support as it might without it. The purpose of his amendment was to ensure that the ultimate report on progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be based on the information submitted under Article 73 e and all other official information provided for in the relevant General Assembly resolutions. Since the draft resolution merely called for a preparatory report by the Secretary-General, his amendment was not essential at that juncture. He was therefore prepared to withdraw it, provided that it was reproduced in full in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

It was so agreed.

31. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) thanked the Pakistan representative for his co-operation. Had the Pakistan amendment been adopted, the New Zealand delegation would have been obliged to vote against the draft resolution. It would not vote against it in its present form.

32. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He would vote against that paragraph and would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

The preamble to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.397) was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 39 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 were adopted by 39 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

33. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because the interpretation given by the sponsors to certain points in it seemed to raise questions of principle on which it was necessary for him to reserve his Government's position.

34. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) reminded the Committee that at the 485th meeting he had said that the obscure language of the draft resolution led his delegation to regard it with grave misgivings. The Ecuadorian representative had supplied some information at the beginning of the current meeting, but the situation had not changed sufficiently to offer his delegation any alternative but to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole. He reserved his Government's position fully.

AGENDA ITEM 33

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/2908) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION B SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (A/2908, PART ONE, ANNEX II; A/C.4/L.393)

35. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to discuss draft resolution B, on the renewal of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, reproduced in annex II of part one of the report of the Committee on Information (A/2908), and the amendment to it. He invited the representative of Thailand to introduce the joint amendment to draft resolution B sponsored by the delegations of Burma, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Thailand (A/C.4/L.393).

36. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that the five-Power amendment to draft resolution B was largely self-explanatory. It was intended to give effect to the opinion expressed at the previous session of the General Assembly and in the general debate which had just concluded, that the terms of reference of the Committee on Information should not be so restricted as to reduce its usefulness, and that the Committee could,

without upsetting the basis on which it had been established, be made to perform the task entrusted to it better. The need to give the Committee on Information greater latitude had been recognized in the statements made by several delegations in the general debate. He emphasized that in submitting the amendment, the sponsors had not neglected the views of the administering Powers. On the contrary, their objections and apprehensions had been taken into account and efforts had been made to meet them. That was the reason for the explicit reference to the provisions of paragraph 6 concerning substantive recommendations with respect to individual Territories. The purpose of the amendment was modest, simple and practical; it was intended to create a basis on which the Committee on Information could do useful work and achieve concrete results.

37. It had been argued that the Committee on Information had already been doing what the amendment would authorize it to do. True, the Committee had, on some occasions, timidly attempted to treat some of the problems which arose in a number of Territories on a comparative basis, but, as the report of the Committee on Information showed, it had not proceeded very far in that direction because of the lack of specific instructions. The five-Power amendment was intended to fill that gap and to enable the Committee to produce more comprehensive conclusions in regard to certain problems, from which both the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the Members of the United Nations would benefit. He hoped that it would receive general support.

38. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) asked for an explanation of the phrase "subject to the provisions concerning substantive recommendations with respect to individual Territories contained in the preceding paragraph".

39. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that the reference to the provisions of paragraph 6 of draft resolution B was intended to make it quite clear that the Committee on Information was to be authorized to carry out studies in relation to a number of Territories in connexion with problems occurring there in similar forms, but not to make substantive recommendations.

40. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that his delegation had no objection to the five-Power amendment. He recalled, however, that his delegation had objected in the general debate to the limitation in the last part of paragraph 6 of draft resolution B: "but not with respect to individual Territories". He asked for a separate vote on that phrase.

41. Mr. MANI (India) said that in the discussions in the Committee on Information, the Indian delegation had brought up the question of the consideration of problems on a regional basis and the making of substantive recommendations. Its suggestions had met with opposition, and had not been adopted. He was glad that the five-Power amendment had succeeded in effecting a compromise. He reserved the right to raise the important question of substantive recommendations at the next session. In the meantime, he would support draft resolution B and the five-Power amendment.

42. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) asked the representative of Thailand to give a concrete example of the way in which it was envisaged studies would be carried out under the terms of the amendment. He felt

that as the amendment stood, it would be possible for the Committee to make a comparative study of, say, educational problems in British and French Territories in West Africa and to make substantive recommendations on regional problems in that area, provided that those recommendations were not directed at individual Territories, but had only a regional application. The limitation imposed in the phrase "subject to the provisions concerning substantive recommendations with respect to individual Territories contained in the preceding paragraph" seemed to apply only to individual Territories and not to groups of Territories or regions. He would like to know what the sponsors of the amendment intended on that point.

43. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that several representatives had referred to problems which could be treated on a comparative basis, including community development, wages, labour, education, nomadism and so on. There were a number of problems which arose in a number of Territories and could well be studied on a comparative basis. In regard to the second point, he noted that the sponsors had taken their proviso from the actual instructions of the Committee on Information. The purpose of the amendment was merely to allow the Committee on Information to carry out studies on a comparative basis. The question of substantive recommendations did not fall within the scope of the amendment.

44. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that, as the Committee was considering the renewal of the Committee on Information, it was appropriate that his delegation should restate its views on the matter.

45. He would deal first with the constitutional basis of the Committee on Information. According to Article 73 e of the Charter those Members of the United Nations which had responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose peoples had not yet attained a full measure of self-government transmitted information on those Territories to the Secretary-General "for information purposes". The Charter conferred no right on the General Assembly to consider and discuss the information so transmitted. It was for that reason that the United Kingdom Government had consistently questioned the Committee's constitutional basis. It found it very difficult to accept the view that the Article in question would have been so drafted had it been the intention of the authors of the Charter that information submitted under Article 73 e should be considered and discussed by the General Assembly. There was therefore no obligation whatever on the part of the Powers who transmitted information under Article 73 e to submit to cross-examination on the basis of the information presented.

46. With regard to the practical aspects of the work of the Committee on Information, he noted that in spite of its objections of principle to the Committee's very existence, the United Kingdom had participated fully in its work since its inauguration, because it was the wish of the majority of the Members of the United Nations that it should do so. As far as assistance in the actual administration of the Territories under its control was concerned, the United Kingdom Government's experiences had not been particularly profitable. The disappearance of the Committee would not cause alarm and despondency to his Government.

47. The Committee on Information had been set up on the basis of parity of membership between administering and non-administering Powers. It would seem

probable that if the Committee was renewed at the current session, not all the administering Powers would be present at its next meeting. The United Kingdom Government felt that the work of such a committee would be of even less practical value to it than the work of earlier Committees on Information. A rational assessment of the situation would lead to the conclusion that whether or not the General Assembly saw fit to re-establish the Committee on Information, the United Kingdom Government would not consider it worth-while to attend. Nevertheless, if the Committee was re-established for a further three years, on exactly the same basis as hitherto, and provided that in practice it kept strictly within the terms of reference laid down for it, it was the present intention of the United Kingdom Government to continue to take part in its deliberations. However, his Government would keep the position under constant review, in the light of the course of the deliberations in the Committee on Information and in the Fourth Committee itself. In that connexion, he trusted that the Greek representative's remarks at the 481st meeting of the Fourth Committee were not an augury for the future.

48. In view of his Government's decision, there would be no need for him to speak at length on the five-Power amendment to draft resolution B (A/C.4/L.393). The United Kingdom Government regarded that amendment as an extension of the existing terms of reference of the Committee on Information, and if it was adopted, it would not take part in the work of the new committee.

49. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) wished to explain his delegation's position on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B, which contained the decision to continue the Committee on Information on the same basis for a further three-year period. As most of the previous speakers had recognized, the Committee on Information had done remarkable work and achieved

constructive results. Its existence was vital for the continuation of the United Nations' efforts to assist the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to achieve the capacity for self-government and attain their ultimate freedom. It was regrettable that certain delegations should wish to abolish the Committee on Information. The effects which such a decision would have on the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be most unfortunate. The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories had no way of voicing their grievances save through the Committee on Information; without the Committee on Information, the United Nations would know nothing of their condition. Information about those Territories could not, therefore, be discontinued. Moreover, there was clear provision in the Charter for the communication of information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and the cessation of such information would be in contradiction to the spirit of the Charter.

50. The delegation of Yemen was strongly opposed to the abolition of the Committee on Information and was in favour of its establishment on a permanent basis in the near future. It was also in favour of extending the scope of the activities of the Committee on Information to include information on political conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and on the way in which their peoples were progressing towards self-government. Article 73 a of the Charter referred to the political advancement of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories as well as to their economic, social and educational advancement. Without political information, the Fourth Committee would remain ignorant of the political progress of the non-self-governing peoples.

51. The delegation of Yemen would vote in favour of draft resolution B, and of all appropriate amendments to it.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.