



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.35/SR.83
21 September 1953
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Fourth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 4 September 1953, at 2 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Perez-Cisneros, representative of Cuba,
deceased.

Participation of representatives from Territories in the work of the
Committee (A/AC.35/L.126, 152, 153, 154)

Future work of the Committee (A/AC.35/L.150)

Educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories: Consideration
of the report of the Sub-Committee on Education (A/AC.35/L.149)

Statement of the United States representative on the Commonwealth of
Puerto Rico

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. LOOMES	Australia
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mrs. MENON	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. FRAZAO	Brazil
	Mr. LIU	China
	Miss MANAS	Cuba
	Mr. MOELLER	Denmark
	Mr. BENITES-VINUEZA	Ecuador
	Mr. PIGNON	France
	Mr. CHARTON	
	Miss RUSAD	Indonesia
	Mr. KHALIDY	Iraq
	Mr. KADRY	
	Mr. SPITS	Netherlands
	Mr. GRADLER	
	Mr. PERRY	New Zealand
	Mr. PIRACHEA	Pakistan
	Mr. MATHIESON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. WARD	
	Mr. SEARS	United States of America
	Mr. FERNOS-ISERN	
	Mr. ROBBINS	

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. GAVIN	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. DESTOMBES	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Mrs. MEAGHER	World Health Organization (WHO)
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Assistant Secretary-General
Mr. HOO	Secretary of the Committee
Mr. BENSON	

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. PEREZ-CISNEROS, REPRESENTATIVE OF CUBA, DECEASED

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of the death of Mr. Guy Perez-Cisneros of the Cuban delegation, and recalled the part he had taken in the discussions of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly from 1946 to 1952 and in the work of Sub-Committee 2 of the Fourth Committee which had led to the setting up of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Cuban delegation had been represented on the Committee in 1947, 1948, 1951, 1952 and 1953, and Mr. Perez-Cisneros had acted as Rapporteur in 1947 and had also taken part in the Committee's work in 1951. After praising the personal qualities of Mr. Perez-Cisneros, he said that the United Nations had lost one of its most faithful supporters.

He expressed heartfelt condolences with the Cuban delegation on his own and on the Committee's behalf, and said that he would send a telegram to the Cuban Government.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) thanked the Chairman and the Committee. She recalled the work done by Mr. Perez-Cisneros and assured the Committee that she would transmit the Chairman's condolences to the Cuban Government.

Mr. GAVIN (International Labour Organisation) recalled that Mr. Perez-Cisneros had presided over the International Labour Organisation's Governing Body. He asked the Chairman to associate the ILO with the condolences which he was going to send by telegram.

The representatives of IRAQ, FRANCE, INDIA and the UNITED KINGDOM associated themselves with the tribute paid by the Chairman to Mr. Perez-Cisneros and expressed their sympathy with the Cuban Government and the deceased's family.

PARTICIPATION OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM TERRITORIES IN THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE
(A/AC.35/L.126, 152, 153, 154)

Mr. FIRACHA (Pakistan) recalled that his delegation had been one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 647 (VII) on the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee. It therefore attached great importance to that question. Representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories had already been included in delegations of the Administering Powers. He had felt great satisfaction upon hearing Mr. Fernos-Isern of Puerto Rico give the Committee valuable information on the situation in that territory. Such a practice should be more general. While he appreciated the clarity of the information supplied by Mr. Ward, the United Kingdom Government expert, he believed that a representative of a Non-Self-Governing Territory and not of the metropolitan country would have been able to throw much more light on conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

There was no way to compel Administering Powers to permit indigenous inhabitants to represent the Non-Self-Governing Territories, but he pointed out that resolutions 566 (VI) and 647 (VII) left no room for doubt, and he hoped that the Administering Powers would abide by them in the future. It was for that reason that the delegation of Pakistan, sincerely wishing to reach an understanding, had decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.35/L.152. He wished to remove any misapprehension that the draft resolution had any hidden intention. If it could be accepted unanimously at least one step further could be taken towards the direct association of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee.

Mr. BENITES-VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that, in supporting the draft resolution on the participation of indigenous inhabitants in the work of the Committee, his delegation had been moved by the wish to conciliate divergent opinions. Undeniable progress had been achieved, since colonialism was no more and the inhuman exploitation which had taken place in colonial territories more

than a century ago was now merely a memory. However, there was still room for improvement and it was for that reason that the Ecuadorian delegation supported the draft resolution. The sponsors of the draft had tried to overcome the technical difficulties of dual representation. He hoped that the text would be approved unanimously by the Committee.

Mrs. MENON (India) noted that representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories took part in the work of regional commissions and meetings. She was happy at such co-operation between representatives of the peoples of the territories and the Administering Powers. The Indian delegation would like such co-operation to be extended to include the Committee's discussions, which had a direct bearing on life in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Representatives of the Administering Powers could not really take the place of representatives of the indigenous inhabitants. Moreover, there was nothing new in the suggestion made in the draft resolution. The United Kingdom Government had itself taken the initiative as regards the participation of indigenous inhabitants in certain types of international work. She fully appreciated the fears of the representatives of the Administering Powers. There were obviously territories where the population had not reached such a stage of civilization as to furnish persons capable of participating usefully in the Committee's work. The sponsors of the draft resolution had therefore endeavoured to establish the principle, and it was the principle they wished accepted. It would be advantageous for the Administering Powers to seek to increase the participation of the population of Non-Self-Governing Territories in order to enable the Committee to draw on the sources of the information it needed. She was convinced that the representatives of the Administering Powers would understand the spirit in which the sponsors of the draft had submitted it.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) explained why his delegation believed that it would be useful for the Committee to hear representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories. There might be differences of opinion, for example, regarding the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination or that of democratic representation; but whatever the opinions held, it was nevertheless indispensable for the Committee to be able to obtain information at the source by hearing representatives of the indigenous inhabitants. He was not unaware of the difficulties which the Administering Powers would have to solve, but thought that the wording of the draft resolution was reasonable. For his part he would have preferred it to be a little more categorical. The sponsors of the draft had sought a compromise. He paid a tribute to their spirit of conciliation and wished especially to congratulate the Brazilian representative on the effort he had made to submit a draft acceptable to all. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution as worded, without any amendment.

Mr. PIGNON (France) said that the question under study was of the highest importance, both from the practical and from the theoretical points of view. For that reason he wished he were able to respond favourably to the eloquent appeals of the representatives of Brazil, India, Pakistan and Ecuador. Unhappily, however, after careful examination of the draft resolution, he found himself unable to accept it, at least in that form. He recalled that, as a result of the reservations made by the French delegation at the opening of the session, none of the Committee's resolutions would be binding upon the French Government; nevertheless, a favourable vote on his part would oblige him to justify the resolution to his Government and that he felt unable to do. Naturally he was not unaware that success of the work of the United Nations depended largely on acceptance of compromises making it possible to move forward towards a common ideal. But compromises based on an ambiguity deliberately maintained by both sides offered serious dangers for the future. In the present case, it would be better not to settle the question immediately than to reach a sham solution.

He then examined in detail the draft resolution before the Committee. It was clearly stated in its preamble that the principle of unity of representation must be maintained; that statement he thought in itself excellent, for it satisfied both legality and reality. But paragraph 1 of the operative part specified that the indigenous members of delegations should be duly qualified to act as spokesmen of their local governments, and paragraph 2 developed that idea in requiring credentials. The Committee could therefore, if it wished, insist upon checking the credentials of those appointed. There was a contradiction between the provisions of those two paragraphs and the principle of unity of representation affirmed earlier in the same text. It would in fact serve no useful purpose to inaugurate a special kind of representation if the persons concerned were not free to speak before the Committee on their own behalf or on behalf of the local governments which they represented. He himself had had occasion to work with indigenous advisers from the French territories, and he had been entirely satisfied with their co-operation. He had indeed urged the French Government to repeat that happy experiment. But there were certain conditions under which alone such collaboration could be both fruitful and acceptable. There must be no possibility of questioning the authority and rights of the head of a delegation.

It was for each government to settle conflicts between local interests. Divergencies of local interest necessarily existed not only within the group of territories administered by a single Power, but also within a federation. All private interests were to be respected but when they were in conflict it was for national and not international authorities to deal with them.

There was a further contradiction, which arose from the Committee's very character. His Government had agreed to the tacit renewal of the Committee on condition that it remained a purely technical body. But the draft resolution repeated the wording of paragraph 3 of resolution 647 (VII) in speaking of representatives of territories whose inhabitants had attained a large measure of responsibility for economic, social and educational policies; that was an ambiguous wording which might lead to interminable discussions.

He further drew attention to the practical difficulty of defining certain terms, particularly the word "government". In the French territories there were representatives of the executive branch (Governor, Governor-General, High Commissioner) and territorial assemblies exercising broad powers which covered budgetary and fiscal matters; there were in addition parliamentary representatives who sat in the metropolitan assemblies and were essentially the elected representatives of the population. He wondered which of them was to appoint the indigenous representatives to the Committee. The difficulties were great, for it was quite clear that such appointments would soon give rise to struggles between the political parties in each territory.

Finally, he considered that paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution would restrict unduly the possibilities of choice. For his part, he thought that the best course was to find those experts who were best able and qualified to bring a positive contribution to the Committee's academic debates, to whichever territories they might belong politically or administratively.

For all those reasons he could not give his support to the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, India and Pakistan. Nevertheless, the French delegation wished to make some constructive contribution to the study of the question. With that intention it was submitting a draft amendment (A/AC.35/L.153) which proposed the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution and the replacement of paragraph 1 by the following text:

"Invites the Member States which administer Non-Self-Governing Territories to attach to their delegations to the Committee on Information as members of the delegations, indigenous experts duly possessing suitable qualifications in economics, social affairs and education."

In addition, he said that he would ask for a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble, which raised problems not within the Committee's province. He would ask for a separate vote on the last four words of the seventh paragraph of the preamble, "in a regular manner". The objection to those words was that either they meant nothing or on the contrary they introduced an obligation so strict as to be unacceptable to the French

delegation. In conclusion he said that the amendments he had proposed to the draft resolution had been put forward in the sincere desire of constructive collaboration with its sponsors.

Miss MANAS (Cuba) said that the position of her delegation was very similar to that of the Iraqi delegation. She had associated herself however with the draft resolution's sponsors, who had wished to draft a moderate text which the Administering Powers would be able to adopt. The text had been drafted in the spirit of General Assembly resolution 647 (VII) which had been adopted by a large majority.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) congratulated the authors of the draft resolution on the spirit of conciliation which they had revealed. The United States delegation had always supported any measure designed to increase the participation of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It had, however, felt it necessary to submit certain amendments to the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.35/L.152. They were to be found in document A/AC.35/L.154, and he read them out to the Committee.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) was happy to note the spirit of collaboration shown by the authors of the draft resolution. He supported the statements of the French representative who had convincingly argued the case for the Administering Powers. His Government recognized the value there would be in the participation in the Committee's discussions of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such participation, however, would raise practical difficulties in view of the diversity of the territories concerned. An indigenous representative of a given territory would undoubtedly be familiar with economic, social or educational matters affecting his own territory but it was unlikely that his competence would extend further.

The participation of such representatives raised another problem. Those indigenous inhabitants who could make the most valuable contribution were not politicians but experts who had in general a heavy task on their hands in the territory itself. They might be unable to lay aside that task in order to take part in the Committee's work.

Turning to a detailed examination of the draft resolution, he said that the wording of the first two paragraphs of the preamble did not appear to him to be particularly happy. A reference to the resolution adopted at the General Assembly's seventh session would be sufficient. Furthermore, the use of the word "indigenous" in the third paragraph of the preamble raised the problem of its definition. In his opinion, the word should be understood only in the purely ethnic sense.

With regard to the operative part of the resolution, he agreed with the French representative that paragraph 1 was likely to give rise to endless discussion. The matter of choice should be left to the metropolitan government alone. Paragraph 2 added nothing and might well be deleted, as the French representative had proposed.

In conclusion, he said that his delegation would give careful study to any proposal for a wording which might prove generally acceptable.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) felt sure that a compromise wording could be found. He would consult his colleagues during the recess for that purpose.

The meeting was suspended at 3.40 p.m. and resumed at 4.25 p.m.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) drew attention to the changes which the authors of the draft resolution had made in their text in the hope that it would be adopted unanimously. So far as the preamble was concerned, they had accepted the first two United States amendments (A/AC.35/L.154), namely that the word "participation" should be replaced by the word "association". Bearing in mind the objections raised by the United Kingdom, France and the United States they had deleted the words "in a regular manner" in the seventh paragraph of the preamble. In the operative part of the resolution they had found a more general way of wording the first paragraph. The term "spokesmen", would be

replaced by "qualified ... representatives" and the word "duly" by "specially" which had no legal connotations. The authors of the draft resolution asked the United States delegation not to insist on the adoption of its formula "expresses the hope" which would weaken a text that was already very moderately worded; the word "invite" should be retained.

The text of the operative part would therefore read as follows:

1. "Invites the Member States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories, the inhabitants of which have attained a large measure of responsibility for economic, social and educational policies, to attach to their delegation specially qualified indigenous representatives to speak for the territories on these matters."

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) proposed that the words "without prejudice to the principle of unity of representation" should be inserted in the text of the paragraph in question.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) pointed out that the principle of unity of representation had already been stated in the fifth paragraph of the preamble and it would therefore be illogical to restate it in the operative part of the resolution.

Mr. PIGNON (France) paid tribute to the spirit of co-operation shown by the authors of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, he would be unable to vote for the first paragraph of the preamble even with the amendments that they had accepted. The operative part still raised difficulties. Given the nature of the Committee, it would be better to speak of "experts" than of "representatives". Furthermore, the phrase: "the inhabitants of which have attained a large measure of responsibility..." seemed dangerous because it was so vague. Discussions would inevitably arise on the meaning of the words "a large measure". Lastly, the words "to speak for" were open to various interpretations.

Mr. FPAZAO (Brazil) explained that by using the words "the inhabitants of which have attained a large measure of responsibility ..." the authors of the draft resolution had intended to restrict its scope; they had wished to make it clear that the practice would be followed only in the case of territories the inhabitants of which had attained a certain degree of advancement.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) proposed that paragraph 1 of the operative part should be drafted as follows: "Invites the Member States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories the inhabitants of which have attained a large measure of responsibility for economic, social and educational policies, to attach to their delegations specially qualified indigenous representatives to speak on these matters as they relate to the territories."

Mrs. MENON (India) had no objections to the amendment submitted orally by the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) approved the United Kingdom amendment. He appealed to the French representative to withdraw his amendment which might divide the Committee, whereas the United Kingdom amendment might well make it possible to achieve unanimity.

Mr. PIGNON (France) pointed out that the United Kingdom amendment was purely formal. His objections still held, therefore, and he felt bound to maintain his amendment.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) pointed out that the French amendment would be put to the vote first; he would vote for it, since he felt that it was preferable to his own amendment. If the French text were rejected, he would vote in favour of his own amendment.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said he would vote for the French amendment first and then, if it were not adopted, for the United Kingdom amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote, paragraph by paragraph, the revised draft resolution and the amendments submitted by the representatives of France, the United States and the United Kingdom.

Preamble

The first paragraph of the preamble with the United States amendment to replace the word "participation" by the word "association" was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble with the same United States amendment was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) asked whether the United States representative would agree to replace the words "qualified representative persons" in the third paragraph of the preamble by the words "qualified representative inhabitants".

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that he would.

The third paragraph of the preamble, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted unanimously.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble was adopted unanimously.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) agreed that the end of the sixth paragraph of the preamble should be drafted as follows: "... have from time to time attached qualified representative inhabitants to their delegations".

The sixth paragraph of the preamble, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The seventh paragraph of the preamble was adopted unanimously.

Operative part

Paragraph 1

The French amendment (A/AC.35/L.153) was rejected by 8 votes to 7.

The United States amendment to insert the words "without prejudice to the principle of unity of representation" was adopted.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) explained that he had voted against the United States amendment because he felt it was repetitive and superfluous at that point.

Mr. KADRY (Iraq) said he had abstained for the same reason.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil), supported by the United States representative, formally proposed that the phrase in question should be redrafted as follows: "without prejudice to the principle laid down in the fifth paragraph of the preamble".

The Brazilian amendment was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. KADRY (Iraq) explained that he had been able to vote for the amendment in its modified form.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted against the new phrase as it was longer than the original one.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) had voted in favour of the new phrase which, though long, was not repetitive.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted orally by the United Kingdom representative.

The amendment was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2

The second French amendment to delete paragraph 2 of the operative part was adopted by 8 votes to 7.

The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) stated in explanation of his vote that in his Government's opinion a State's right to determine the composition of its delegations to various conferences or meetings of international organizations could not be limited in any way whatsoever. Because of that fundamental principle he had been unable to vote for the draft resolution. Nevertheless, in view of the admirable intentions underlying the text, he had not wished to oppose it formally and had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

He had abstained from voting on the second paragraph of the preamble; it had not in fact ever been established that the direct participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information could assist in promoting the progress of those territories towards the goals set forth in Chapter XI of the Charter. He had voted against the first paragraph of the preamble; it referred to the direct participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies in general and thus it went still further than the second paragraph in that respect.

He had also abstained from voting on the operative part of the draft resolution because he would have preferred the French amendment. It would also have been better to keep the phrase "expresses the hope" suggested by the United States representative; the word "invites" implied that the Committee was giving directives to Member States on the composition of their delegations, that was to say on a matter which was exclusively within their competence.

Mr. PIGNON (France) reiterated his thanks to the authors of the draft resolution for the goodwill and conciliatory spirit that they had shown and assured them that his attitude during the discussion and the vote had been inspired by the best intentions. He had wished above all - and that was a consideration which he had felt it better not to stress at an earlier stage in the discussion - to prevent the Committee from adopting any text which might make it difficult in future for his country to participate in its work. He was happy to be able to say that, although the draft resolution that had just been adopted seemed open to criticism in many respects, its nature was not such that it would prevent the French Government from participating in the Committee's work in the future; that in itself was very satisfactory.

He had voted in favour of a number of paragraphs in the draft resolutions; he had, in particular, supported paragraph 7 of the preamble to show that he would always be prepared to advise his Government that the participation of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the delegations of the Administering Powers should be encouraged and extended.

Mr. SPITS (Netherlands) likewise wished to pay tribute to the goodwill and spirit of co-operation of the authors of the draft resolution. In the past the Netherlands delegation had always emphasized the need for mutual concessions which made it possible to reconcile opposed viewpoints and thereby achieve a basis of agreement. The attitude of the authors, which had been guided by that essential principle, therefore deserved the highest praise.

Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) said he would have preferred the original text of document A/AC.35/L.152 which he had co-sponsored; it was for that reason that he had voted against the French amendment and had abstained on the United Kingdom amendment, for he thought it undesirable that a text which had already been altered by its authors to meet the objections raised by certain representatives should be so much further weakened. The Committee had finally adopted a curtailed

text and the hopes of delegations which had taken the initiative in the matter had been largely disappointed. At any event he still thought that no opportunity should be missed of achieving some progress, however slight, and he had therefore voted in favour of the amended draft resolution. He thought that it still represented a half-step forward.

Mrs. MENON (India) said that the draft resolution adopted was certainly far from fulfilling the hopes of the delegations which had drawn up the original text but, if a principle was recognized, the words used were of small importance. The modifications made in the original text had not altered its spirit and the Committee had therefore undoubtedly taken a further step towards the ultimate goal.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) recalled that his Government had always upheld the right, for each State, to determine as it thought fit the composition of its delegations to the various international organizations; in that respect he fully supported the comments made by the Australian representative. Considering, however, that the text adopted did not in any way prejudice that right the United Kingdom delegation had been glad to support it.

He had had no difficulty in accepting the inclusion of the word "representatives" in the text of the draft resolution since any person who took part in the work of an organ of the United Nations as a member of a delegation was in effect a representative. Similarly he had seen no need to oppose the use of the word "invites" since it did not properly speaking imply an obligation for the Administering Powers but rather a recommendation which they would follow as far as possible.

His affirmative vote should be interpreted in the light of his previous comments. In voting for the draft resolution he had gone somewhat beyond the instructions of his Government, for he had wished to help to frame a text which, he sincerely hoped, would mark a step forward and really reflect the general agreement reached during the proceedings.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand) while associating himself with the previous speakers in congratulating the authors of the draft resolution on their conciliatory spirit, regretted that he had not been in a position to support their text. He had abstained from voting on the first two paragraphs of the preamble because he thought it preferable, in the general interests, not to recall the past.

With regard to the operative part he had voted in favour of the French amendment which had the advantage of setting out in a clear and precise fashion the reasons for which the Administering Powers might, if the need arose, include in their delegations to the Committee on Information representatives from the Territories which they administered. The text adopted was perhaps open to different interpretations and he had not felt free on such an important matter to vote for it at the present time. He expressed the opinion, however, that the text represented a considerable step forward on a problem which had defied solution at previous sessions.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) pointed out that in accordance with the instructions received from his Government he had endeavoured to find a basis of agreement in order to put an end to the long discussions which had been held on that question both within the Committee on Information and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. It was the duty of the Member States of the United Nations, both within the main organs and the subsidiary committees or commissions, to do their utmost to settle disputes in a manner satisfactory to all concerned and thus contribute to implementing the fundamental principle on which the organization was based.

His country had always realized the difficulties which faced the Administering Powers and it had never refused them its co-operation. He understood the difficulties of the French representative when the latter had to reconcile his personal inclinations with the instructions he had to follow; he was convinced that, in the near future, the French delegation to the Committee on Information would include among its members representatives from the Territories administered by France. The text adopted constituted only a relative progress but at least it eliminated the immediate obstacles.

FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.35/L.150)

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to resume the examination of the provisional programme of work (A/AC.35/L.150) drawn up by the Secretariat.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) thought that the questions listed under heading I (General Problems) might be improved and that the list could be made more complete. In the first place it would be advisable to include after point 1 (development plans) a point entitled "Transport and Communications" since that question constituted one of the essential aspects of the economic problem. Moreover, the question of indigenous participation in the various phases of the economy which at present constituted point 3 of heading I should logically be placed at the end of the list of questions under that heading. In addition, it would be useful to include under heading I a point relating to technical assistance and international co-operation which might be entitled: "Function of technical assistance research and technical co-operation in economic development".

Lastly, as regards point 5, he could see very clearly what meaning should be attached to the word "commercialization" but he thought, in any case, that point 5 might well be omitted since it could be assumed that the questions relating to it were covered by point 4.

With regard to problems concerning agriculture (heading II) he agreed with the Indian representative that the question of forest conservation should be included, say under point 4. He did not see very clearly what was meant by the words "allied industries" in point 5 and observed that, in the English text, the expression "fishing industries" appearing under point 6, should be replaced by the word "fisheries".

Finally with regard to the industrial problems included under heading III, he thought that the handicrafts to which the Indian representative had alluded might be included in that category. He suggested further that points 1 and 2 should be merged into a single point entitled "Mining, including its effects on economic and social development". Lastly there would be no harm in deleting, under point 3, the words "and measures to promote it" which seemed superfluous.

Mr. PIGNON (France) proposed that the Secretariat be asked to take into account the comments and suggestions submitted when it prepared the basic documentary material required for the work of the next session of the Committee.

It was so decided.

EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION (A/AC.35/L.149)

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) introducing the report of the Sub-Committee on Education (A/AC.35/L.149) of which he was Chairman, said it had been adopted unanimously without a single vote being necessary. That showed the spirit of compromise and conciliation which had inspired its members and their desire to express general opinions rather than those of the various delegations.

In the first part of the report, the Sub-Committee had stated the objectives which education should seek to attain in Non-Self-Governing Territories (paragraphs 3 to 12).

Next, the Sub-Committee had dealt with two questions which had been raised in the 1950 report and to which the Committee attached particular importance: equality of opportunity and the language of instruction (paragraphs 13 to 20). The report then dealt with other developments since 1950 (paragraphs 21 and 22).

The next section was concerned with a subject which had not been mentioned in 1950, namely the extension of primary education. It described the difficulties to be overcome in extending free and compulsory primary education and the part played by teacher training in that connexion (paragraphs 23 to 34).

The section dealing with women's education embodied the opinions expressed during the Committee's discussions and described the progress accomplished and the methods to be followed in future work (paragraphs 35 to 40).

The Sub-Committee had next dealt with a subject which had not been included in the 1950 report, that of vocational training (paragraphs 41 to 46) and then with the financing of education (paragraphs 47 and 48).

The passage dealing with community education (paragraphs 49 to 53) gave their due place within the general framework of cultural progress to those movements which under the name of community education, development of the community or education of the masses, contributed to the extension of education to all groups of the population.

The concluding paragraphs of the report recalled that only Non-Self-Governing Territories came within the Committee's purview, even though there were other areas where educational conditions were backward while in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories conditions were comparatively advanced. The report gave only a general picture of Non-Self-Governing Territories as a whole, for the Committee was not competent to make recommendations on any particular territory. The Sub-Committee stated in conclusion that its report completed that of 1950, which explained its brevity and the reports on economic and social conditions. He hoped that it would meet with the General Assembly's approval as a contribution towards educational progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and towards international collaboration for the welfare of peoples.

At a later stage he would formally submit to the Committee a draft resolution (A/AC.35/L.151) sponsored by all delegations represented on the Sub-Committee.

Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) paid a tribute to the harmony and spirit of conciliation which had characterized the Sub-Committee's work. In spite of the minor objections which delegations might raise against the report, it constituted a valuable appraisal of the state of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories. On behalf of his delegation he congratulated the Brazilian representative in particular for the admirable way in which he had presided over the Sub-Committee's labours.

Mr. CHARTON (France) associated himself with the United Kingdom representative's remarks and also thanked the Secretariat which, by providing the Sub-Committee with full, scientific and impartial documentation had greatly helped it in its work.

Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) said his delegation wished to suggest several minor amendments to the text of the report, but in view of the late hour he proposed that the study of the report should be adjourned until the meeting fixed for the adoption of the Committee's report.

It was so decided.

STATEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The CHAIRMAN called upon the United States representative to make a short statement on Puerto Rico.

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN (United States of America) said that at the conclusion of the session, he wished on his own behalf and on that of the Puerto Rican people to thank the Committee for the interest it had shown in Puerto Rico and for the decision it had taken concerning it. He particularly thanked the representatives of New Zealand, Brazil, Ecuador and India for their very useful proposals. Nor could he fail to mention the wise diplomacy of the Ecuadorian representative, the spirit of conciliation shown by the Indian representative and the valuable contributions made by other representatives, including those of the United Kingdom, China, France and the Netherlands. The Committee's decision reaffirmed the principle of the self-determination of peoples, which was not the right to imitate others blindly but to choose a governmental structure which corresponded with their particular aspirations and needs.

The Constitution of Puerto Rico recognized the co-existence in the country of the two great cultures of the American hemisphere. Dignity and respect for the human person were fully safeguarded in Puerto Rico. That was a proof that men of all races, cultures and languages could, if they wished, practise tolerance and thus contribute to the progress of the world towards peace and the achievement of the noble ideal of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.