

SEP 21 1954

GENERAL
ASSEMBLYDistr.
GENERALA/AC.35/SR.104
22 September 1954

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Fifth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 9 September 1954, at 10.50 a.m.CONTENTS

General assembly resolutions 222 (III), 448 (V) and 747 (VIII):
communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of
information:

(a) Greenland (A/AC.35/L.155 and Corr.1, A/AC.35/L.183)

International collaboration in respect of economic, social and
educational problems in Non-Self-Governing Territories, including
information on technical assistance (A/AC.35/L.164, L.170, L.178)

General Assembly resolution 789 (VIII): control and limitation
of documentation

Representation on the Committee and participation of indigenous
representatives (A/AC.35/L.165 and Add.1, L.182)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. KHALIDY	(Iraq)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. LOOMES	Australia
	Mr. FRAZAO	Brazil
	Mr. HLA AUNG	Burma
	Mr. YANG	China
	Mr. DONS MOELLER)	
	Mr. BRUN)	Denmark
	Mr. APUNTE	Ecuador
	Mr. PIGNON)	
	Mr. COLLIN)	France
	Mr. ARENALES	Guatemala
	Mr. SINGH	India
	Miss ROESAD	Indonesia
	Mr. AL-JAMALI	Iraq
	Mr. SPITS	Netherlands
	Mr. SCOTT	New Zealand
	Mr. GIDDEN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. GERIG	United States of America

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. MATTHEWS	International Labour Organisation
Miss BANOS	Food and Agriculture Organization
Mr. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Mrs. MEAGHER	World Health Organization

<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. HOO	Assistant Secretary-General
	Mr. BENSON	Secretary of the Committee

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 222 (III), 448 (V) AND 747 (VIII): COMMUNICATIONS
RELATING TO THE CESSATION OF THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION:

(a) GREENLAND (A/AC.35/L.155 and Corr.1, A/AC.35/L.183)

Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) said that his delegation's position on the cessation of the transmission of information was invariably determined by the principles applicable in the particular case and by political realities. The Committee's debate and the action it might take respecting the Danish Government's decision to terminate transmission of information on Greenland would greatly influence the future application of Chapter XI of the Charter.

Before deciding that it could approve of the decision of the Danish Government, the Ecuadorian delegation had had to resolve several doubts. It had satisfied itself that, although the specific case of Greenland was not precisely covered by the third part of the annex of resolution 742 (VIII), the factors enumerated in that part were by extension applicable to Greenland, especially in the light of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the operative part of the resolution. Those key provisions asserted that each concrete case should be decided upon in the light of the particular circumstances, taking into account the right of self-determination of peoples.

Moreover, the statements of the representatives of Denmark and Greenland had satisfied the Ecuadorian delegation that the desire for integration with Denmark and a new constitutional status represented not merely the initiative of the National Council of Greenland, but the freely expressed wishes of the people of the Territory.

Finally, the Ecuadorian delegation had concluded from the documentation submitted by the Danish Government and the supporting statements of its representatives in the Committee that the integration of Greenland with Denmark was the result of a gradual process of cultural, economic and political development in the Territory. A review of the increasing political participation of the people of Greenland throughout the last century, which had culminated in the vote of about 70 per cent of Greenland's voting population in the 1953 elections to the Danish Parliament, indicated the importance attributed by the people of Greenland to their political decisions. Ecuador had been equally impressed by the excellent administrative and judicial systems built up in the Territory.

Ecuador was satisfied that the Danish Government had granted Greenland equal legal status with the rest of Denmark, that the freely expressed will of the Greenland people had sanctioned the resulting constitutional changes and that, consequently, Greenland had in fact ceased to be a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

It commended the Danish Government for the fine example it had given in informing the United Nations, not of a unilateral decision on its part to cease transmission of information respecting Greenland, but of the freely expressed decision of the people of Greenland, in exercise of their right of self-determination to become an integral part of Denmark. The Ecuadorian delegation found the joint draft resolution (A/AC.35/L.183) generally acceptable and would vote in favour of it.

Mr. PIGNON (France), in explanation of the vote he would cast on the joint draft resolution, said that, despite France's position of principle in the Committee, he felt morally bound to express his delegation's appreciation of Denmark's policy and its interest in the people of Greenland.

It would be recalled that France had not accepted resolution 742 (VIII). It took issue with many debatable assertions in the resolution. One of the few principles it did endorse, however, was that stated in operative paragraph 4 to the effect that each concrete case should be decided upon in the light of the particular circumstances. That standard alone might well have been applied to Denmark's decision, with the Committee merely taking note of Denmark's statement that it would cease to transmit information in respect of Greenland. Even the members of the Fourth Committee would have been satisfied by that procedure.

The French delegation would have preferred a simpler text than the joint draft resolution, retaining only the first two paragraphs of the preamble, which made no reference to resolution 742 (VIII). On the other hand, it appreciated the tact shown by the sponsors and would vote in favour of the draft resolution in token of its interest in the people of Greenland and of its appreciation of Denmark's action.

Mr. DONS MOELLER (Denmark) thanked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution for the initiative they had taken. His delegation found the text acceptable on the whole and would vote for it.

Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 6. Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.
The resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) explained that she had abstained on operative paragraph 6, although voting in favour of the text as a whole, because she wished to reserve her Government's position in the General Assembly.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) had voted in favour of the resolution as a whole, although a number of phrases were not wholly acceptable to his delegation. His vote did not imply acceptance of the General Assembly's competence, under Article 73 e of the Charter, to discuss political questions or to decide whether or not Denmark should continue to transmit information in respect of Greenland.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) had also voted in favour of the text as a whole, despite reservations on several points. Like the French representative, he would have preferred a simpler text taking note of the documentation submitted by Denmark and of its decision to cease transmission of information in respect of Greenland.

His delegation had reservations regarding the third paragraph of the preamble. Australia had voted against resolution 742 (VII) and had earlier abstained on resolution 222 (III) because it imposed obligations beyond those stated in Article 73 e. It had not supported resolution 448 (V) because it doubted the extent to which the Committee could examine information - mainly of a political nature - under resolution 222 (III). Moreover, the word "examined" in the last preambular paragraph could be interpreted as extending the Committee's terms of reference to

examination of political information, just as the word "political" in operative paragraph 4 appeared to imply that the Committee was empowered to draw conclusions regarding political advancement, while the word "opinion" in operative paragraph 5 seemed to indicate some doubt regarding the Danish Government's right to make the final decision regarding the status of Greenland. Australia took exception to all those implications. The question of cessation of transmission of information was for the Administering State alone to decide.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) had voted for the resolution as a whole despite some reservations with respect to resolution 742 (VIII), invoked in the third paragraph of the preamble. Like Australia, it considered that the Administering State alone was competent to decide to terminate transmission of information in respect of a dependent territory.

Reverting to the point raised by the Indonesian representative, he pointed out that no member of the Committee could bind his Government's delegation to the General Assembly. Every delegation, including his own, must therefore reserve its position.

Mr. HLA AUNG (Burma) had abstained on operative paragraph 6 but had voted for the resolution as a whole, for the same reason as that given by the Indonesian representative.

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) associated his delegation with the remarks of the United States representative.

Mr. DONS MOELLER (Denmark), associating himself with the remarks of the Australian representative, explained that although his delegation would have preferred different wording in several parts of the draft resolution, as also the omission of a number of phrases, it appreciated the efforts of the sponsors to avoid questions of principle on which there was wide divergence of views and had been glad to vote for the text as a whole. Its action might appear inconsistent when it was recalled that Denmark had voted against resolutions 742 (VIII) and 448 (V) and was therefore opposed to referring to those decisions

in the present resolutions; furthermore, it took exception to implications that the Committee was competent to examine information of a political nature. Nevertheless, the Danish delegation felt that disagreement with certain points in the text should not block acceptance of the whole, if the main object of the resolution was acceptable and desirable. Accordingly, it had cast an affirmative vote.

Mr. BRUN (Denmark) announced with regret that Denmark was withdrawing from the Committee upon the completion of the present session.

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN RESPECT OF ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES, INCLUDING INFORMATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (A/AC.35/L.164, L.170, L.178)

Mr. BENSON (Secretary of the Committee), introducing the documents, drew particular attention to document A/AC.35/L.164, section IV, which recorded a number of resolutions relevant to conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its eighteenth session. In resolution 547 H (XVIII) the Council requested the General Assembly to take appropriate measures, in collaboration with States including those administering Non-Self-Governing Territories, to abolish discriminatory laws and practices against women where such customs and ancient practices still existed and to recommend that special efforts should be made through fundamental education in private and public schools and various media of communication to inform public opinion in all areas, including Non-Self-Governing Territories, concerning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and existing decrees and legislation which affected the status of women.

Other matters of interest in the same document were the tables showing UNICEF aid to Non-Self-Governing Territories, the special section on technical assistance

in the field of education and the appendix describing technical assistance services rendered by the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS (International Labour Organisation) said that the account in document A/AC.35/L.164 of technical assistance to the Non-Self-Governing Territories did not include technical assistance projects within the regular budget of the ILO, but those under the Expanded Programme only. Although the regular budget could finance a few projects only, it was interesting to note that two of them were in Non-Self-Governing Territories, namely assistance to Barbados in preparing a comprehensive labour code and assistance to Jamaica and Trinidad in extending their social security arrangements.

The latter project partially replied to the Guatemalan representative's question concerning the extent to which the specialized agencies were active in social security matters in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations was generally concerned to ensure that ratifications of conventions were extended to non-metropolitan territories; in 1949 it had pointed out that some progress could be made in the social security field in the Non-Self-Governing Territories even though conditions there were widely different from those in countries where social security arrangements were normally applied. The Committee held a five-yearly review of progress made in applying conventions to Non-Self-Governing Territories, covering such matters as social security and the problems of migrant workers. The Committee of Experts on Social Policy in Non-Metropolitan Territories had arranged to place workmen's compensation and other social security matters on the agenda for its next session.

Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) drew the Committee's attention to the last section of document A/AC.35/L.178 referring to associate membership, and to article 2 (3) of the recently amended UNESCO constitution. The rights and obligations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were dealt with in general conference resolution 41.2

of 1951. An application for associate membership had been received from the United Kingdom Government on behalf of the Gold Coast and Sierra Leone: Sarawak, North Borneo, Brunei, Singapore and the Federation of Malaya; and Jamaica, Trinidad, Grenada, Dominica and Barbados. The application would be considered at the eighth session, to be held at Montevideo in November and December 1954. In the meantime, the Executive Board had decided to invite observers from those territories to attend the session. That step, it was hoped, would lead to more effective participation of their inhabitants in programmes designed for their advancement.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that the principle of international collaboration on the problems of Non-Self-Governing Territories was enshrined in Article 73 d of the Charter. The Secretariat's documentation showed that international and inter-regional co-operation was growing steadily. Australia's contribution included membership of the Economic and Social Council, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the Commission on the Status of Women, and assistance to UNICEF and to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. Australia's great interest in the Colombo Plan had already been noted.

The South Pacific Commission, to which the New Zealand representative had referred, was a good example of international collaboration and many of its projects were directly related to the problems discussed by the Committee. The Commission's purpose was to promote by co-operation the welfare and advancement of the people of the South Pacific Non-Self-Governing Territories. A remarkable amount of fruitful co-operation had been achieved among six Governments responsible for eighteen Territories with a total population of three millions. The Commission had held twelve sessions, and an auxiliary body, the South Pacific Conference, in which indigenous inhabitants participated, had held meetings in 1950 and 1953.

In the matter of agricultural development, the Commission had initiated surveys on the production of cocoa, coffee and tea, on methods of increasing food and cash crops and on subsistence economies, with a view to carrying on more detailed research projects later. In the case of the coconut industry, there had

been general surveys of production and specific research into pests such as the rhinoceros beetle. A fisheries officer had been appointed with the task of developing fishing as a method of food production for the indigenous population. General research on nutrition had included laboratory surveys of the value of island food and field studies of family diets. The Commission had done much to encourage co-operatives and had set up a library on the subject.

In addition to those economic aspects of its activity, which were of special interest to the Committee at the moment, the Commission had been engaged on educational and health projects and community development schemes.

Thus the Commission had usefully co-ordinated the activities of the region. It was also authorized to collaborate with the specialized agencies and had entered into certain technical assistance agreements.

The Australian Government's interest in the Commission, like its interest in the Colombo plan, was prompted by a feeling of responsibility for and common interests with the peoples of the neighbouring territories.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that the importance his Government attached to the post-war forms of international collaboration was illustrated by its use of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, which had yielded great benefits in United Kingdom Territories. The value of assistance accepted had been \$254,000 in 1952, \$325,000 in 1953 and \$520,000 in 1954, with \$565,000, or possibly more, planned for 1955. In 1953, forty-one experts had been provided by four agencies to assist with twenty-three projects in ten Territories. Eighty-five fellowships had been awarded to candidates from twenty-two Territories. In addition, some Territories had benefited from regional projects like the WHO insect control project in the West Indies and the FAO locust control scheme in East Africa. The arrangements for 1954 showed an all-round increase over those figures.

The type of benefit received was illustrated by the re-organization and extension of the statistical departments of Jamaica and North Borneo and by a general water resources project initiated in Jamaica.

United Kingdom Territories had also contributed to mutual assistance by providing training facilities under the technical assistance programme. In 1952, fifty-seven nationals of other countries had received such training and sixty-four more had been accepted in 1953.

Other arrangements deserving particular emphasis included the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara. During 1953, the Commission had set up expert bodies on housing and statistics; it had also arranged expert conferences on such subjects as the treatment of offenders, rural welfare and the protection of fauna and flora.

That form of international collaboration was expanding in Africa and the policy of expert collaboration and the pooling of experience was worthy of encouragement in all parts of the world.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 789 (VIII): CONTROL AND LIMITATION OF DOCUMENTATION

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) proposed that the Secretariat should keep under review the question of economy in documentation and should communicate to the Committee at future meetings any suggestions it might formulate on the subject.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General) pointed out that by its recent decision to reduce documentation by producing a detailed report on each Trust Territory only once every three years the Trusteeship Council had instituted a system the Committee had already adopted much earlier with regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore the Committee's reports were not comparable in length with those of the Trusteeship Council, since they did not describe conditions in each Territory individually. The only method by which a reduction in documentation could be achieved appeared to be that of limiting the number and extent of the studies prepared by the Secretariat; the prevailing trend, however, was for the Secretariat to be asked for more rather than fewer studies.

The Secretariat, like the delegations, kept constantly in mind the desirability of reducing documentation. It had no specific proposals to make on the subject at the present session but would be grateful for any suggestions which representatives might put forward.

Mr. SIMH (India) endorsed Mr. Hoo's observations. The only effective method of reducing the Committee's documentation would be to change the status of Territories from non-self-governing to self-governing. Nevertheless, he supported the Australian proposal that the Secretariat should keep the question under review and submit any suggestions to the Committee at later meetings.

It was so decided.

REPRESENTATION ON THE COMMITTEE AND PARTICIPATION OF INDIGENOUS REPRESENTATIVES (A/AC.35/L.165 and Add.1, L.182)

Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) said that his delegation maintained the view it had stated in the Fourth Committee at the eighth session of the General Assembly: namely, that General Assembly resolution 744 (VIII) represented a backward step from the position the Assembly had taken in adopting resolution 647 (VII). At its seventh session the Assembly had taken into account two points of view, one being that the need for participation by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Committee's work could be adequately met by the inclusion of qualified representatives from those Territories in the delegations of the administering members, and the other, that other forms of representation were desirable. Resolution 744 (VIII) gave the former view the ascendancy, but fortunately that effect was counterbalanced by the provision, in its operative paragraph 2, for further study of the question. Should the Committee be unable to adopt at the present session a resolution providing for the attendance of observers from the Non-Self-Governing Territories at its sessions, it would be well advised to resolve that the study should be continued.

Recent changes in the constitutions of international agencies, such as those described in documents A/AC.35/L.165 and Add.1 and those of which the Committee had learned from the representatives of specialized agencies, showed that comparatively rapid progress was being made in associating Non-Self-Governing Territories with the work, for example, of the ILO, FAO and UNESCO. The Executive Board of UNESCO had authorized the Director-General to invite to its meetings as observers representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories who were recommended by administering members of UNESCO. The Economic Commission for Asia and the Far

East included Non-Self-Governing Territories in the area in its membership. Such cases provided useful precedents for the Committee's study of the present item of its agenda and indicated the readiness of administering members to allow, and even to seek, the association of the Territories under their control with the work of international organizations.

His delegation would support the Indian draft resolution (A/AC.35/L.182).

Mr. SINGH (India) observed that operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 744 (VIII), of which his delegation had been one of the sponsors at the Committee's last session, indicated the General Assembly's recognition that the inclusion of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the delegations of administering members need not exclude other forms of participation by those Territories in the Committee's work and that a study of the means of securing a progressive increase in such participation was required. Mr. Rao, his predecessor, had suggested that, from the point of view of participation in the Committee's work, Non-Self-Governing Territories might be divided into two groups according to whether or not they had attained a sufficient measure of self-government to warrant representation at sessions of the Committee. By way of illustration, India, although it had not attained independence until August 1947, had been a Member of the League of Nations and an original Member of the United Nations.

Instances of participation by representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of Regional Commissions and meetings in recent years demonstrated that such representation was needed and justified the contention that it should be increased. The point was well illustrated from both the practical and the constitutional point of view in document A/AC.35/L.164, paragraph 76, and document A/AC.35/L.165, paragraphs 46 to 50, the latter document showing also the steps taken by both international organizations and Administering Powers to ensure the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories at international meetings. Many instances of the practical application by international agencies of the principle of participation by Non-Self-Governing Territories were to be found in the documents before the Committee, which welcomed the UNESCO representative's announcement of the relevant amendment to that agency's constitution. It was interesting to note

that the United Kingdom, Australia and the Netherlands had all deposited instruments of ratification of the Final Protocol to the Universal Postal Convention of 1952 on behalf of the Territories under their administration.

His delegation favoured the participation in the Committee's work of representatives from Non-Self-Governing Territories, with the right to speak but not to vote. That position implied no disregard of General Assembly resolution 745 (VIII), which had been adopted in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority. Such participation, moreover, would constitute for the Non-Self-Governing Territories an intermediate stage on the way to full membership of the United Nations and would give their representatives valuable experience.

He proposed that the Committee should defer consideration of his draft resolution until early in its next session, to allow members time to study it.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) supported the Indian proposal. The question had been the subject of prolonged and detailed study and the various texts concerning it had been drafted with a care which demanded close attention. Brazil had been one of the sponsors of resolution 744 (VIII) and regarded operative paragraph 2 of that resolution as extremely important. It might prove possible for members of the Committee to reach some agreement on the question before the opening date of the next session.

The Committee decided to postpone consideration of the Indian draft resolution until early in its next session.

In reply to a question from Miss ROESAD (Indonesia), the CHAIRMAN, supported by Mr. GERIG (United States of America), stated that, since the Committee had not completed its work on the present item of its agenda, it would be in order for that item to be included in the agenda of its next session. The Committee's decision would be stated in its report to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.