

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**ELEVENTH SESSION**

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 611th  
MEETING**

Friday, 25 January 1957,  
at 10.50 a.m.

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

Page

Agenda item 34:

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*):

(a) Information on educational conditions (*continued*);

(b) Information on other conditions (*continued*)  
Consideration of draft resolutions (*continued*) 313

(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information ..... 314

Requests for hearings (*continued*) ..... 315

**Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA**  
(Dominican Republic).

**AGENDA ITEM 34**

**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/3105 to A/3109, A/3110 and Corr.1, A/3111 and Add.1 and 2, A/3112 and Add.1 and 2, A/3113 and Corr.1, A/3114 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/3115, A/3127) (*continued*):**

(a) **Information on educational conditions (A/3165 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 3; A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1 and Corr.1) (*continued*);**

(b) **Information on other conditions (*continued*)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.459/REV.1 AND CORR.1) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) pointed out that to bring the French text of operative paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1) into line with the Spanish text as amended at the 610th meeting, the words "*les gouvernements des Etats Membres*" should be amended to read "*les gouvernements d'Etats Membres*".

2. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that the sole purpose of his amendment (A/C.4/463) was to bring into the draft resolution the essential provision of the resolution adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which had met at New Delhi in 1956.

3. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) pointed out that the draft resolution, sponsored by his own and sixteen other delegations, dealt with practical matters such as the granting of scholarships, the organization of regional conferences and other machinery, while the amendment submitted by Greece referred to a question of principle and hence could not be included in the draft resolution

without upsetting the balance. He would therefore vote against the amendment, not because he disapproved of the idea embodied in it but simply because he considered it inappropriate.

4. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that operative paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution and paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 743 (VIII), which was reproduced in it, had been translated into Russian in such a way as to distort the meaning. The text of the draft resolution as it stood made it seem that the attainment of full self-government by populations was conditional upon a certain standard of education, which was completely unfounded. He would therefore be in favour either of deleting the last part of paragraph 1, beginning with the words "with a view to . . ." or of paraphrasing it in line with paragraph 17 of part one of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3127).

5. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that General Assembly resolutions were important texts which would go down in history. They should accordingly be prepared with the greatest care in order that they might faithfully reflect the views of the Members of the United Nations. The English version of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1) was not satisfactory. The style was careless in some parts and the text was not always an accurate rendering of the Spanish original. For example, in the first paragraph of the preamble it would be better to use the present tense, that being the tense used in the second paragraph; furthermore the auxiliary verb "should", which implied an obligation, was out of place in a mere recommendation. The wording of the English text should accordingly be amended to read: "Recalling its resolution 743 (VIII) which sets forth, *inter alia*, the objectives . . . Territories and recommends that the Administering Members make the . . .".

6. He did not see the difference between the "local services" mentioned in the second paragraph of the preamble and the "local bodies" in paragraph 2 of the operative part. In any case, he did not think that such services or bodies could form education policy; that was the task of the administering Powers. In the third paragraph of the preamble, the pronoun "it" should be replaced by "they". The words "appropriately" and "suitably" were superfluous and had no equivalent in the Spanish original. In paragraph 2 of the operative part, the word "formation" was not clear and was a poor translation of the Spanish "*determinación*". Furthermore, he did not think that it was very realistic to make recommendations to which the administering Powers could not subscribe; it was they who, from the legal point of view, wielded the supreme authority in establishing education policy. Finally, in paragraph 3, the sponsors of the draft resolution seemed to be trying to confer very extensive powers on the local education services, since in addition to

their functions with regard to education, they were required to concern themselves with technical assistance programmes, which would entail economic and financial questions, and labour and personnel problems.

7. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) explained that the sponsors of the draft resolution had based operative paragraph 1 on paragraph 17 of part two of the report of the Committee on Information, and had then quoted paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 743 (VIII) verbatim.

8. With regard to the comments of the Philippine representative, he agreed that the word "*determinación*" in operative paragraph 2 had been badly translated in the English text. In that paragraph the eighteen Powers were simply taking up a suggestion by the Committee on Information which appeared in paragraph 67 of part two of its report. Paragraph 3 confined itself to "suggesting" to the Administering Members the desirability of studying the methods best calculated to enable local education bodies to participate in the formulation and implementation of technical assistance programmes. Education problems were linked to economic and social problems. It would therefore be quite natural for the education services to co-operate in the economic and social fields.

9. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) noted that the resolution of the UNESCO General Conference, the essential provision of which was embodied in his amendment, was so radical as to have daunted the sponsors of the draft resolution. Accordingly, he could not accept the arguments which had been brought forward against his proposal: on many points the joint draft resolution touched on the substance of the question.

10. In his view the amendment he had submitted referred to a question of principle and he would only withdraw it on condition that the sponsors of the draft resolution would agree to replace the word "establish" in operative paragraph 2 by the phrase "to allow to be established through elections or other democratic means".

11. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) was afraid that the sponsors of the draft resolution would be unable to accept the conditions put forward by the representative of Greece. They had drafted their recommendations in a spirit of mutual confidence. If too many conditions were laid down for the administering Powers, that would be a sign of mistrust and might bring all progress to a halt. Furthermore, there was no certainty that the indigenous inhabitants would in all cases be able to participate in elections for the establishment of local services. There was no reason to believe that the services proposed in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would include people who were not qualified to do their work. He was accordingly unable to accept the Greek representative's suggestion.

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone further consideration of the joint draft resolution until the 612th meeting, in order to allow the sponsors time to study the suggestions which had just been made.

13. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that in order to save time the Committee could take up section (c) of the agenda item under discussion.

*It was so decided.*

**(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/331 and Add.1; A/C.4/L.460)**

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Iraq to present his draft resolution (A/C.4/L.460).

15. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that the General Assembly in resolution 850 (IX) had invited the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories to make proposals for improving the methods to be followed in connexion with the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter. In 1955, the Committee's discussions on that question had been inconclusive, and at the tenth session of the General Assembly the Iraqi delegation had brought the matter before the Fourth Committee again by submitting a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.424). Owing to lack of time, the Committee had referred that resolution to the Committee on Information. No decision had, however, been taken, and the General Assembly was called upon once again to consider the Iraqi proposal (A/C.4/L.460).

16. The primary purpose of the proposal was to protect the rights of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories and to preserve the prerogatives of the General Assembly. The transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter was an obligation of the highest importance, and any decision on its cessation must be taken by the only sovereign body qualified to do so, namely, the General Assembly.

17. The procedure at present followed was that laid down in General Assembly resolution 448 (V): the Committee on Information examined any changes in the constitutional position of a Territory as a result of which the responsible Government concerned thought it unnecessary to submit information any longer. In accordance with that resolution, the Committee on Information had examined three cases: Puerto Rico, Greenland and the Netherlands Territories (Netherlands Antilles and Surinam). It had examined each case with great care, and had questioned the administering Powers concerned and the representatives of the Territories in question. It had, however, always seen fit to accompany its recommendations by the following reservation: "within the limits of its terms of reference and without anticipating the final disposal of this question by the General Assembly". There might be indeed a certain degree of hesitation regarding the desirability of entrusting a committee of limited functions with such an important task and requesting it to undertake the preliminary examination of difficult matters of a strictly political nature. The Committee's reluctance had been further justified by the attitude of certain Administering Members, who had unremittingly opposed the consideration by the Committee of anything even remotely political in character.

18. He did not think that a small committee should deal with questions relating to the cessation of the transmission of information until the Fourth Committee itself had studied the matter. He wondered, too, whether the small committee in question should be the Committee on Information, or a special committee appointed by the General Assembly.

19. The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.460) would have the effect of amending the present procedure. Communications would be referred direct to the General

Assembly, which would examine the manner in which the right of self-determination had been attained and freely exercised. The Assembly would adopt such conclusions as it deemed fit, and it could, when appropriate, refer points for study to the Committee on Information or to some special body.

20. The following were three situations which might arise. A Territory might change its status without achieving full independence. It was his delegation's view that as a matter of principle the General Assembly should be the first to examine communications relating to such a change in status, and only if and when the Assembly decided that it was desirable should the matter be referred to the Committee on Information or some other committee. Secondly, a Territory might achieve independence and be at once admitted as a Member of the United Nations, as had happened in the case of Indonesia. In that case, it would be enough for the Fourth Committee to take note of the new status. He thought, however, that the Government concerned should inform the Secretary-General of the change, and he assumed that that had been done by France in the case of Tunisia and Morocco. Thirdly, a Territory might attain independence without being admitted to the United Nations, and its independence might not even be recognized by all Member States. In such a case it would be impossible for the Committee

on Information to consider the status of that country, since it would be a sovereign State. The decision in that case could be taken only by the Fourth Committee.

21. He was anxious to assure the Committee that his proposal was in no way designed to diminish the importance of the Committee on Information. On the contrary, it would enable the Committee to do its work better, by confining its activities to the work it was best equipped to do. He hoped, therefore, that his draft resolution, which contained nothing that was not already familiar, would meet with the approval of the Committee.

22. His delegation reserved the right to revert later to the second aspect of the question under consideration, i.e., the position of new Member States in respect of obligations under Article 73 e of the Charter.

#### ***Requests for hearings (continued)***

23. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had just received a communication from the Union des Populations du Cameroun. He proposed that it should be circulated to delegations in accordance with the usual procedure.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.