



**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 36: 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) Information on social conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General;	
(e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community;	
(f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General. . . . .	395

**Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).**

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Rodzinski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

**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/3806, A/3807, A/3808, A/3809/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/3810, A/3811 and Add.1, A/3812 and Add.1, A/3813 and Add.1, A/3814, A/3815 and Add.1, A/3816, A/3837):**

- (a) Information on social conditions;
- (b) Information on other conditions;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/374, A/C.4/375, A/C.4/385/Rev.1, A/C.4/390);
- (d) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/3903);
- (e) Report of the Secretary-General on developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/3916/Rev.1);
- (f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General (A/3917/Rev.1 and Add.1)

1. Mr. LALL (India), Chairman of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, presenting the Committee's report (A/3837), said that he would not attempt to summarize it but would rather try to convey something of the atmosphere in which the Committee had conducted its work.

2. During the period covered by the report, the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had focused its main attention on social conditions, following the practice established in 1949 whereby in each year it gave particular attention to one aspect of the subject. It had, of course, taken note also of other developments, and more especially of the establishment of the Economic Commission for Africa, which would be of great importance for many of the Territories. The Committee had discussed a wide range of subjects but what was particularly important was that it had been able to conduct its work in an atmosphere in which information had been freely exchanged. The administering Powers had co-operated in making information available. In particular, Australia, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States had provided additional information. He welcomed the fact that the United States had adopted the practice of including political information although it was not required to do so under Article 73 e of the Charter.

3. A striking feature of the Committee's proceedings had been the presence of experts from the administering Powers; the information which they had provided had enabled the Committee to have a solid basis on which to appraise the real factors and issues involved. The valuable material placed before the Committee would make for more orderly development in the Territories and would enable them to avoid the social difficulties experienced in Europe when it had been in the throes of industrialization and urbanization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The very fact that the Committee considered those developments would in his view cause the administering Powers to be more aware of the need for orderly economic and social progress.

4. He had taken the liberty of suggesting in the Committee on Information that it would be advantageous to its members, including the Administering Members, if the procedure of question and answer were developed; there should be a period for such questions and answers after each expert and representative had spoken. The suggestion had not been put into practice but he was sure that the administering Powers would give it further consideration; such a procedure arose naturally out of the methods adopted by the Committee and was within its terms of reference.

5. There was reference in the report to the development of leadership in various fields. The Territories were essentially rural areas, and the fostering of leadership in the trade unions, in community development and in rural development would in fact create political leaders. The fact that the administering Powers had taken steps to that end showed that they realized the need to develop the political aspect of life in the various communities.

6. Mr. KELLY (Australia), Rapporteur of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Ter-

ritories, said that although that Committee, during its ninth session, had been chiefly concerned with social conditions, some time had been devoted to general questions arising from economic and educational conditions. The Committee had emphasized the importance of technical assistance and had noted with interest the measures of international collaboration in which various intergovernmental bodies participated.

7. He invited attention to the full list of documents in annex I to part one of the report, which would no doubt be of assistance to members of the Committee in studying the problems they might wish to discuss.

8. Annex II to part one of the report contained the text of two draft resolutions which were submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly. The first expressed approval of the report on social conditions, while the second recommended that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories should be continued for a further period of three years, on the same basis as before.

9. Social conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were dealt with in part two of the report, which recorded the views of the Committee on that subject and incorporated the report of the Sub-Committee which it had appointed to study the question. The report very largely reflected the advice given by the distinguished experts on social conditions who had been attached to various delegations. The Committee had also had the advantage of the presence and services of representatives of the specialized agencies.

10. It was his understanding that the suggestion for a question-and-answer period, to which the Chairman of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had referred in his statement, had been completely withdrawn. The work of that Committee was an interesting, if tentative, essay in international co-operation within the United Nations. It would be recalled that the Charter made no provision for the examination by the General Assembly of the information which, for information purposes, certain Administering Member States submitted to the Secretary-General with reference to certain aspects of economic, social and educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Notwithstanding that fact, the Committee on Information had, because of the spirit of forbearance and comprehension shown by so many delegations with respect to certain juridical issues, been able to do useful work. It would be a very great pity if the work of the Committee on Information were to be imperilled by well-meaning attempts to assimilate the Committee to the Trusteeship Council.

11. Mr. DURAISWAMY (Ceylon), Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Social Conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, in the absence of the Chairman introduced the report on social conditions prepared by the Sub-Committee (see A/3837, part two).

12. The Sub-Committee had been composed of the representatives of Ceylon, China, France, Guatemala, India, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. In addition Mr. Kelly of Australia, the Rapporteur of the Committee on Information, had participated in the Sub-Committee's work in an *ex officio* capacity. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 745 (VIII) experts had been included as advisers in the delegations of France,

Guatemala, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Representatives of the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Health Organization had also taken part in the Sub-Committee's work.

13. The report on social conditions reflected the various opinions held, but differences had all been expressed in an atmosphere of goodwill and harmony.

14. The draft resolution submitted for the approval of the Fourth Committee would be found in annex II to part one of the report.

15. While trusting that the Fourth Committee would approve the report, he hoped that there would first be a thorough discussion of the various aspects of social conditions, including constructive criticism that might help to promote the ultimate welfare of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. One comment that had been frequently repeated in the General Assembly had been that the substantive report of the Committee on Information was of too general a character. In that connexion he pointed out that the report on social conditions formed only a part of the actual report, and he drew attention to the annex at the end of part two which gave a list of the studies on social conditions submitted by the United Nations Secretariat and the specialized agencies and examined by the Committee on Information and the Sub-Committee. All those studies were an integral and essential part of the report on social conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and, together with the actual report, formed the documentation to which members would no doubt wish to refer in considering the item.

16. Members would also wish to bear in mind the fact that the views expressed in the Committee on Information and reflected in its report were the continuation of discussions and views expressed during previous sessions at which social conditions had been the primary subject under consideration. Passages of those reports had not been extensively repeated in the present document, but frequent references were made to the views expressed at previous sessions. Their purpose was to retain the continuity of the Committee's views and of members' interest in the well-being and progress of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In one case the Committee had decided to quote verbatim the principal aims of social policy in Non-Self-Governing Territories enumerated in 1955 (see A/3837, part two, para. 9) as a still valid and reliable guide. The text of the report reflected those principal aims and the analysis of conditions based on information transmitted by Administering Members.

17. As the Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Committee on Information had surveyed the major aspects treated in the report, he would merely make a few additional observations which might be of interest to the members of the Fourth Committee. It would be remembered that at the inception of the Committee's business a suggestion had been made that the problem of mass communications should be, at least in part, considered in connexion with social conditions. The present report on social conditions did not directly touch on that subject but members might wish to refer to the question in connexion with social conditions as reflected in section VIII on educational conditions in part one of the report.

18. Similarly, while the report on social conditions did not directly deal with the subject, members might wish to comment on international co-operation and technical assistance affecting social conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories. In that connexion he referred members to section X of part one of the report.

19. Miss FLOURET (Argentina) observed that the information transmitted by the United Kingdom Government (A/3816) referred, *inter alia*, to the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands). The transmission of such information in no way affected Argentine sovereignty over that Territory, which the United Kingdom held by virtue of an act of force which her Government had never recognized.

20. She reaffirmed her Government's inalienable rights over the Islas Malvinas, the South Sandwich Islands, the South Georgia Islands and the land included in the Antarctic Sector of the Argentine Republic, which were not colonies or possessions of any country but formed an integral part of the national territory of Argentina, were part of its domain and subject to its sovereignty.

21. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his Government had no doubts concerning its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Island Dependencies and formally reserved its rights in the matter.

22. Mr. COHEN (Chile) said that his Government reserved its rights over its Antarctic territory, information concerning which had been submitted by the United Kingdom Government as part of the so-called Falkland Island Dependencies.

23. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his statement in reply to the representative of Argentina regarding the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Island Dependencies applied also to the remarks of the Chilean representative.

24. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) reserved his Government's position with regard to the transmission of information relating to Gibraltar. No matter what his political opinions might be, every Spaniard fervently desired that that final example of colonialism in Europe should disappear. His delegation hoped that the problem could be solved in accordance with law, morality and justice through bilateral negotiations carried out in a friendly spirit. The Spanish Government could not believe that the necessary steps would not be taken to bring about a dignified and friendly solution of the problem which would promote peace and redound to the benefit of all.

25. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had no doubts regarding its sovereignty over the Territory of Gibraltar and wished formally to reserve its rights in the matter.

26. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) expressed his Government's explicit reservations with regard to the Territory of Mauritania, now under French control, which was an integral part of Morocco's national territory. Furthermore, he drew attention to document A/C.4/390, dated 24 November 1958, in which Morocco's position with regard to certain African territories now under Spanish control was defined.

27. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that Mauritania possessed an Assembly elected by uni-

versal suffrage and a democratic Government whose position was clearly defined. The claims advanced by Morocco were therefore imperialistic and without foundation.

28. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) expressed the view that the governmental organs of Mauritania had been set up by the French Administration and were not truly representative of the will of the people.

29. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that it would be for the people of Mauritania to judge of the truth of the statements made by the representative of Morocco.

30. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that he entirely agreed with the French representative that the Moroccan people, which included the Mauritanian people, should be allowed freely to express their wishes.

31. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) pointed out that the statement ascribed to him by the Moroccan representative was quite different from what he had actually said.

32. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that every year, at the beginning of the discussion on Non-Self-Governing Territories, his delegation explicitly reserved its position with regard to the southern part of Yemen, which the United Kingdom authorities called "Aden and the Protectorate" and which his country called "occupied Yemen". Once again he expressed reservations with regard to that question and to the presence of British troops and British authorities on his country's soil. Yemen did not recognize that the United Kingdom had any right to occupy the southern provinces of its territory, to treat them as a Crown Colony and Protectorate and to include them in the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. As was well known, that part of Yemen, which unfortunately lay near the famous "Indian life-line" of the British Empire, had been occupied by force and by other means in which certain great Powers were past masters.

33. Yemen had never ceased to fight for its independence and its unity and had never bowed to force, nor was it likely, in the present era of hope and revival, to yield what it had always refused in the past. For years the United Kingdom had been attacking and bombing the southern provinces of Yemen which wished to be reunited with their mother country, often pressing its attacks into the very territory of free Yemen. Those attacks, in which the most modern methods of destruction were used, were intended to crush the people they claimed to be protecting and to bring pressure on the Government of Yemen to delimit the frontier. In view of the great distances which separated the United Kingdom from Yemen there was no need to trace a geographical frontier between them. The United Kingdom wished to separate the people of his country but it was nobler to unite peoples than to divide them.

34. The United Kingdom Government claimed that it was occupying the region because the population had placed themselves under its protection. He would like to know by whom and against whom those people wished to be protected.

35. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the item under discussion was the report of the Committee on Information. While he understood that representatives might wish to make reservations on certain subjects, he felt that lengthy statements were out of place.

36. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the statements in question were not in the nature of a general debate and appealed to members not to prolong their reservations unduly.

37. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that he had felt it his duty to explain his Government's reservations in the Fourth Committee since he was prevented from doing so in the First and other Committees.

38. He would further state that the United Kingdom action to which he was referring had been in application of treaties which had been imposed on local chiefs and were of doubtful validity, some having been signed only by fingerprints. Moreover, the sultans who had signed could be dethroned at will, as had already been the case with three sultans in Lahej alone.

39. For all those reasons Yemen could not recognize the United Kingdom's right to continue to occupy the southern provinces of Yemen and it hoped that a more liberal and enlightened attitude would prevail in the future. He would further suggest that the Territory in question should be referred to as "occupied Yemen" instead of "Aden Colony and Protectorate".

40. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that his delegation reserved the right to intervene on similar points if such discussions came within the purview of the Committee, which he doubted. He felt that, if the debate were permitted to continue along its present lines, the Committee would be discussing in effect items not on its agenda.

41. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had no doubts about its sovereignty over the Aden Protectorate and formally reserved its rights on the question. There was no foundation to the claim of Yemen to authority over Aden: the representative of Yemen had no claim to act on behalf of the Aden Protectorate sultans. The United Kingdom Government had no intention of abandoning the obligations which it had contracted towards the sultans and the other rulers of the territories. He felt that the explanation given by the representative of Yemen went beyond the scope of a reservation.

42. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that his Government, too, had no doubts concerning its sovereignty over the southern regions of Yemen which had existed from time immemorial and was based on geographical, religious and other factors and not on the use of force.

43. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) wished to point out that the information submitted in connexion with the territory of Belize (British Honduras) could at no time and in no wise affect Guatemala's sovereignty over that territory. It was a territory held by the United Kingdom without legal title: on the contrary, it was held in defiance of incontrovertible Guatemalan rights, formally promulgated in that country's Constitution and based on ample historical documentation, on reasoning found in law and justice, on the principles of international law and on popular sentiment. He believed that his reservation was supported by the other Central American States, which by the Declaration of Antigua (Guatemala) of 24 August 1955 had expressed their solidarity with the Guatemalan cause. He recalled also a resolution of the Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, on putting an end to colonialism and to the occupation of American soil by non-American Powers, so that the independence

of America might be made complete and the unity of that continent better safeguarded. The participation of the Guatemalan delegation in the Committee's debates could never therefore be interpreted as prejudicial to that country's rights over Belize. He reaffirmed the reservations Guatemala had made at the San Francisco Conference on 24 May 1945<sup>1/</sup> and the position it had taken on the subject in the Fourth Committee.

44. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) recalled that on 6 October 1958 Mr. Padilla Nervo had stated Mexico's position concerning Belize in the General Assembly (771st plenary meeting). He would reiterate once again that if the status of the Territory were altered, it would be necessary to take into account Mexico's claim to it.

45. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) said that, while he did not wish to enter into the substance of the matter, since it was neither the place nor the occasion for doing so, he would state that Guatemala had never recognized, and did not recognize, any rights which might be claimed by Mexico in the event of a change occurring in the status of Belize. As those rights had been referred to for some twenty years by the Government of Mexico, a neighbouring country for which Guatemala nourished sentiments of admiration, sympathy and solidarity, he would reaffirm Guatemala's claim, which dated back for more than one hundred years, to the whole territory of Belize.

46. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) reaffirmed his country's friendship for Guatemala and recalled the ties of co-operation that existed between them. Mexico had always respected Guatemala's position on the subject and did not believe that there was any basic cause for a dispute. He would merely reiterate the views he had just stated.

47. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had no doubts regarding its sovereignty over British Honduras and formally reserved its rights in the matter.

48. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that any reservations made by the United Kingdom concerning Cyprus would not be acceptable to the Greek delegation. Greece, as a signatory to the Charter, accepted all obligations in respect of Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Cyprus, and believed that sovereignty over those Territories should be vested not in the Powers administering them but in the inhabitants themselves. Considering their sacred trust, and that the interests of the inhabitants were paramount, the administering Powers had no obligations apart from those relating to administration. That consideration had a practical value since administering Powers were no longer in a position to dispose of Non-Self-Governing Territories without consulting the inhabitants concerned nor could they do so in association with other Powers.

49. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia), pointed out that the question of Cyprus was being discussed in the First Committee. He reserved his delegation's position concerning the remarks made by the representative of Greece.

50. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) said that he maintained what he had said concerning the sovereignty of Non-Self-Governing Territories in general.

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations Conference on International Organization, II/4/24.

51. Mr. Usman SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that his Government rejected the Netherlands assumption of sovereignty over West Irian (Netherlands New Guinea), which was part of Indonesia and could not be considered a Non-Self-Governing Territory. Indonesia's position was based on historical, political and legal grounds and it was only because of the intransigent attitude adopted by the Netherlands Government that the people of West Irian were prevented from enjoying the same privileges as other Indonesian citizens. Article 73 e of the Charter was not applicable to West Irian, since it was an integral part of Indonesia and as such was represented in the Indonesian Parliament and Constituent Assembly. Indonesia could not therefore endorse the joint statement of co-operation by the Netherlands and Australian Governments concerning New Guinea. There was no provision for joint administration and that statement only strengthened the belief that the Netherlands sought to win United Nations recognition for its illegal incorporation of the Territory. The Indonesian position was, however, supported by the majority in the United Nations. Indonesia wished to voice a strong protest against the reference to West Irian as a Non-Self-Governing Territory in United Nations documents.

52. U ON SEIN (Burma) said that Burma, in view of its geographical relationship to West Irian, was anxious for a peaceful solution to the question and, having friendly relations with the States concerned, urged that negotiations should be undertaken to that end.

53. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) reiterated the reservations concerning West Irian expressed by his delegation in the Committee on Information (see A/3837, part one, para. 11). As in the past, Iraq supported Indonesia's claim to sovereignty.

54. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that India, as stated in the past, recognized the validity of Indonesia's position and associated itself with the views expressed by the Indonesian representative.

55. Mr. DURAIWAMY (Ceylon) supported the views stated by the representative of Indonesia.

56. Mr. EL HAMID (United Arab Republic) associated his delegation with the reservations expressed by Indonesia and Yemen. It did not agree with the representative of France concerning French sovereignty over Mauritania.

57. Mr. PIETERS (Netherlands) remarked that Indonesian protests against the fact that the Netherlands had complied with its obligations under the Charter to transmit information concerning the Territories it administered had become a regular feature of the Committee's proceedings. The Netherlands delegation reaffirmed that it regarded Netherlands sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea as beyond question and formally reserved its rights in that respect. Article 73 e of the Charter imposed specific obligations concerning the transmission of information and the question whether a country had responsibility for the administration of a territory was a point of fact and not of law. It was an incontestable fact that the Netherlands administered New Guinea.

58. Mr. KELLY (Australia) stated, in connexion with an earlier reference, that no Administrative Union existed between the Territory of Papua-New Guinea under Australian administration, on the one hand, and the Territory of Netherlands New Guinea on the other. What did exist was a long-standing tradition of administrative co-operation, which could not be otherwise than fruitful. Australia recognized the sovereignty of the Netherlands in Netherlands New Guinea; the Netherlands recognized the authority of Australia in the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the sovereignty of Australia in the Territory of Papua. With reference to the observation of the representative of Burma, Australia was, particularly in relation to New Guinea, interested in developing friendly relations among the nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples.

59. Mr. QUTUB (Jordan) said that his delegation held that Mauritania and Aden were an integral part of the Arab world and it had no doubt where sovereignty lay. As stated previously, it supported the views of Indonesia concerning West Irian.

60. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated his Government's well-known position concerning West Irian and other Territories that had been seized by colonialist Powers and were still under colonial domination.

61. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) reserved his delegation's position concerning sovereignty over Mauritania and the Aden Protectorate.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.