



**C O N T E N T S**

Agenda item 31:

- Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*):
- (a) Information on social conditions;
  - (b) Information on other conditions;
  - (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
  - (d) Offers of study and training facilities under General Assembly resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 ..... 99

**Chairman:** Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS  
(Mexico).

**AGENDA ITEM 31**

**Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2892 to 2894, A/2895 and Add.1 and 2, A/2896, A/2898, A/2908 and Add.1) (*continued*):**

- (a) **Information on social conditions;**
- (b) **Information on other conditions;**
- (c) **General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;**
- (d) **Offers of study and training facilities under General Assembly resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 (A/2937 and Add.1, 2 and 3/Rev.1)**

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

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Ecuador to introduce the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.397) on the progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories.
2. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) recalled that during the general debate on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories he had expressed the view that the progress of the Territories in the past ten years should be assessed. The general debate had strengthened that view. Accordingly, together with the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Syria and Yugoslavia, he was presenting a specific proposal, the purpose of which was clear: that the United Nations should know how far the Territories had advanced.
3. There did not seem to be anything controversial in the three paragraphs of the preamble. The first

operative paragraph expressed an opinion without making a judgement. It would be difficult, however, to carry out the proposed examination without some previous idea of what questions were of special interest to the General Assembly. For that reason, the draft resolution suggested that the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the specialized agencies, should submit a preliminary report for consideration at the eleventh session of the Assembly. The Fourth Committee would then be in a better position to decide what questions should be dealt with in the final report. The plan did not require any additional information from the Administering Members, and they would therefore not be assuming any new obligation. He was presenting the draft resolution in a constructive spirit and hoped it would be favourably received.

4. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that he would like some explanation of the procedure suggested in the draft resolution: it was not clear whether paragraph 3 actually instructed the Secretary-General to prepare a summary for consideration at the Assembly's eleventh session, listing the questions which he thought should be considered in working out the final report. He assumed that the final report would then be discussed at the Assembly's twelfth session.

5. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) read paragraph 3. The Secretary-General would not be expected to prepare a report on the progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories for consideration at the eleventh session. The draft resolution merely asked him to outline the questions which might be dealt with later. At the eleventh session, the Assembly could decide what questions should be included.

6. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) said that he had read the draft resolution with interest and had listened carefully to the Ecuadorian representative's statement. Nevertheless, some very important points were still not clear.

7. First, he asked, with reference to the second paragraph of the preamble, why the sponsors had felt it necessary to mention that, in certain cases, Administering Members had voluntarily transmitted political information. That was a fact, but it was not clear how it was relevant to the operative part.

8. Secondly, he wanted to know what meaning should be given to the third paragraph of the preamble, which spoke of information "indicating how and to what extent the principle that the interests of the inhabitants . . . are paramount" had been implemented. The concept of paramountcy was not susceptible of the limitation implied in the phrase "to what extent".

9. Thirdly, the sponsors of the draft resolution should state clearly whether they had any intention that the examination which they thought would be highly desirable (operative paragraph 1) should in

any way take into account political information transmitted by some Administering Members.

10. Fourthly, he would like the sponsors of the draft resolution to state which of the goals set forth in Chapter XI should be taken into consideration in the proposed examination. In that connexion, it should be borne in mind that sub-paragraph a of Article 73 mentioned political advancement and that sub-paragraph b dealt with the political development of the Territories. It was not clear whether the examination was also to measure the extent of advancement towards those goals.

11. Fifthly, if the extent of progress towards those goals, in other words, of political advancement, was not to be taken into account under the provisions of operative paragraph 1, he would like to know whether the sponsors intended to say so explicitly in their draft.

12. Sixthly, the meaning of the word "extent" in that paragraph should be explained. The manner in which the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were advancing might conceivably be a subject for objective study, but the words "the extent to which" suggested some kind of mathematical assessment, which could have no objective value whatsoever.

13. Seventhly, he inquired on what basis the examination was to be made: whether the Territories would be taken separately or collectively.

14. Eighthly, he asked whether the final report, as envisaged by the sponsors of the draft resolution, would constitute a sort of consolidation of the ten volumes of the *Summaries and analyses of information transmitted to the Secretary-General*, or would take some other form, and whether it would be purely factual or would also contain conclusions and recommendations.

15. Finally, he wanted to know who, in the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution, was to draw up the final report.

16. In view of the remarkable obscurity of the language of the draft resolution his delegation could not but regard it with profound misgivings. Pending clarification of the text by the sponsors, he would be quite unable to offer it any support.

17. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) was sorry to say that he had not heard all the questions put by the Australian representative owing to a mechanical break in the interpretation. He would, however, answer some of them.

18. The second paragraph of the preamble, which recalled that Administering Members had voluntarily transmitted political information, was merely a statement of fact. In the third paragraph of the preamble, the word "extent" did not mean a mathematical computation, but a kind of evaluation. There was no contradiction between the words "to what extent" and the word "paramount". It was simply an interpretation of Chapter XI of the Charter. In operative paragraph 1, the General Assembly would merely express an opinion and affirm the need for the proposed examination. It would not yet decide when and how the study

should be carried out. It would ask for an outline of the main points to be covered if it should undertake a more detailed survey. In requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report it would not be prejudicing any decision it might take at its eleventh session.

19. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) read again the questions he had put to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution.

20. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador), replying to the question regarding the third paragraph of the preamble, recalled that Article 73 stated the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount. It was possible, in his opinion, to ascertain to what extent that principle had been implemented in the Territories in the past ten years.

21. With regard to operative paragraph 1, Chapter XI stated a number of principles and imposed various obligations on the Administering Members. It seemed that the General Assembly should assess the progress achieved, taking all those points into account.

22. In reply to the Australian representative's eighth question, he said that the report referred to in operative paragraph 3 would be a straightforward account, without conclusions or recommendations. Its purpose was to lay down criteria which would help the General Assembly to carry out the examination and make its decision. The report would be provisional, and it would be for the Assembly to decide who was to draw up the final report and in what form.

23. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) said that the replies to his questions were not complete, despite the fact that the questions were very important and should have clear answers. The vague passages of the draft resolution to which he had referred had not been sufficiently clarified. For example, the representative of Ecuador had given no reply to the question about political information and political advancement.

24. In the circumstances, he felt that consideration of the present text was a waste of time. The draft resolution was so vague that the Australian delegation would be unable to vote for it.

25. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, in view of the Australian representative's many questions, it would be advisable either to suspend the meeting for ten or fifteen minutes so that the sponsors of the draft resolution could consult, or to defer consideration of it until a later meeting and go on to another draft resolution.

26. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) supported the Yugoslav proposal, but thought that the sponsors of the draft resolution would need more than fifteen minutes to study the Australian representative's questions. Accordingly, it would be better to defer consideration of the text until a later meeting.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, as there were no objections, consideration of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.397) would be resumed at a subsequent meeting.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.