



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 34:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Information on educational conditions ( <i>continued</i> );	
(b) Information on other conditions ( <i>continued</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolutions ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	309

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

**AGENDA ITEM 34**

**Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3105 to A/3109, A/3110 and Corr.1, A/3111 and Add.1 and 2, A/3112 and Add.1 and 2, A/3113 and Corr.1, A/3114 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/3115, A/3127) (*continued*):**

- (a) Information on educational conditions (A/3165 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 3; A/C.4/L.458, A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1 and Corr.1) (*continued*);
- (b) Information on other conditions (*continued*)

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/3127, part one, annex II; A/C.4/L.458, A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1 and Corr.1) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) regretted that the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.4/L.461) had been introduced at the present stage, particularly since the Australian delegation had been one of the sponsors of the resolution annexed to the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3127) and would have been happy to support it in the Fourth Committee subject to the reservations he had already made.

2. The Yugoslav amendment altered the nature of the draft resolution by introducing the notion of distinguishing between different authorities responsible for education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In General Assembly resolution 645 (VII), to which the representative of Haiti had referred at the 609th meeting, there was no question of divided authority as implied in the Yugoslav amendment. The Australian delegation would therefore be unable to support that amendment.

3. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that in order to meet the wishes of the Australian representative he was willing to delete the last part of his amendment, consisting of the words "and to communicate to the

Secretary-General any relevant comments or observations made by those authorities".

4. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) thanked the Yugoslav representative for his co-operative attitude and said he would have no objection to the proposal as amended, although in his view it was unnecessary because the action it suggested would naturally be performed in any case. For that reason he would abstain if the amendment was voted on separately, but would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole even if the amendment was adopted.

5. The representative of the Philippines withdrew his amendment to the preamble.

6. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.4/L.461).

*The Yugoslav amendment was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

7. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution (A/3127, part one, annex II), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

8. Mr. SINH (India) presented the joint draft resolution sponsored by his delegation and the delegations of Guatemala, Iraq and Yugoslavia (A/C.4/L.458). The draft resolution was designed to secure the implementation of the suggestion in paragraph 20 of the report on education (A/3127, part two). The sponsors were not thinking in terms of inflexible time-tables, to which the Administering Members had raised serious objections, particularly in the field of political development. In the educational sphere, however, planned development had proved to be practicable. Targets and dates had of course to be continually reviewed in the light of the progress made and of other circumstances, but the principle had been generally accepted in most countries and was being increasingly applied everywhere. The solution of educational problems required more than a scholastic approach, as pointed out in paragraph 17 of the report. In order to perfect the processes referred to in that paragraph it was necessary for suitable systems to be devised and for plans to be introduced with particular regard to priorities and to the time factor. Planning of that kind made it easier to raise the necessary funds. Any progressive programme of education naturally aimed at the achievement of certain immediate objectives which were within reach and were inevitably conditioned by time-tables. There were many instances of that method having proved successful; examples could be found in the Secretariat report on general developments in education (A/AC.35/L.220).

9. He hoped that the members of the Committee would give the draft resolution a wide measure of support.

10. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that his delegation, which, together with the delegations of

India, Iraq, Yugoslavia, sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.458, was particularly interested in the question of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, which it felt to be of crucial importance for their progress and development. The objectives of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories were laid down in General Assembly resolution 743 (VIII) and reaffirmed in the current report of the Committee on Information. Educational plans must be formulated in the light of the particular circumstances of the social group to which they were to be applied. Obviously such plans could not be drawn up in the absence of definite targets and without any idea of the time that would be required to bring them to a successful conclusion. The time that should be allowed would depend on the objectives in view for each particular stage of any plan. A time-table was essential for a number of reasons: firstly, it made it possible to assemble the necessary material and human resources required at each stage; secondly, it enabled educational activity to be co-ordinated with developments in the economic, social and political fields; thirdly, it made it possible to estimate whether or not sufficient funds were available to carry the plan to a conclusion; fourthly, it facilitated the drawing up of a comprehensive plan within which each local region of the Territory in question could be linked to the others; fifthly, it assisted the authorities to accelerate the accomplishment of the plan, to appraise the progress achieved and to foresee the obstacles which would have to be overcome in the following stages. During the meetings of the Committee on Information it had been stressed that there was some kind of planning in almost every Non-Self-Governing Territory. The draft resolution was thus based on the consideration of what had already been achieved in the various Territories.

11. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) criticized the terms of the second paragraph of the preamble, which seemed to assert that there were no systems of primary, secondary or higher education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories which would meet the needs of all and provide adequate preparation for citizenship. The Belgian delegation for one considered that statement to be contrary to the facts.

12. The fourth paragraph of the preamble was accurate, especially with regard to the Belgian Congo, where educational advancement was the subject of plans prepared in advance and periodically reviewed in the light of the progress made.

13. The measures proposed in the operative part of the draft resolution were unrealistic and inadmissible. Paragraph 1 set forth praiseworthy objectives which the Belgian Government was endeavouring gradually to attain. At the same time it was impossible, in the Non-Self-Governing Territories or elsewhere, to draw up concrete plans at the present stage specifying the periods within which those objectives could be attained.

14. In connexion with paragraph 2, he observed that the Belgian delegation, for reasons which had already been stated, had always opposed the use of the statistical or other information furnished by the administering Powers as a basis for discussion. The draft resolution was an attempt to go even further and to invite the administering Powers to communicate plans for the future with the obvious intention of discussing them. The Belgian delegation was unable to agree to any recommendation of the kind, and he reserved his

Government's position in the matter in the event of the resolution's being adopted.

15. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) suggested that the following additions should be made to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution: the words "in co-operation with UNESCO if necessary" should be inserted after the word "Territory"; the words "or extension" should be inserted after the word "establishment"; and the words "free and compulsory" should be inserted after the word "universal". In her delegation's view, those additions would make the recommendation both more specific and more accurate.

16. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution agreed that the Liberian amendments improved the text, and would incorporate them in the draft resolution.

17. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution as a whole, but had three suggestions to make: firstly, that the words "of the population" should be inserted after the word "requirements" in operative paragraph 1; secondly, that the words "consider the formulation of" in the same paragraph should be replaced by the word "formulate"; thirdly, that the word "annual" should be inserted before the word "reports" in operative paragraph 2.

18. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept the first and third additions suggested by the Czechoslovak representative. With regard to the second suggestion, however, they considered the original wording preferable because it gave the Administering Members more latitude; they therefore suggested that that amendment should be put to a vote.

19. The Belgian representative had objected to paragraph 2 of the preamble on the ground that it implied that the systems of education referred to did not at present exist in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That was, however, a very narrow reading of the text. The main objective of the paragraph was to state the principle that systems of education should meet the needs of all, regardless of sex, race, religion or status. That principle was particularly relevant because in some Non-Self-Governing Territories education was not available to all, and in a number of Territories there was discrimination on one or another of the grounds mentioned.

20. The Belgian representative had declared that Belgium was already putting into effect the provisions in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. If that was the case, the Belgian delegation should have no objection to the recommendation. In that connexion he would point out that it was Belgium's absence from the Committee on Information which had prevented the Committee's obtaining an adequate idea of the situation in the Belgian Congo.

21. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) said that he would maintain his second suggestion as a formal proposal.

22. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that paragraph 2 of the preamble was perfectly acceptable as a statement of the principle that education should be equal for all; it had to be borne in mind, however, that in practice such considerations as sex or religion did affect the education made available to the various groups concerned, not only in the Territories under French ad-

ministration but in France itself. For instance, the curriculum offered in schools for girls was necessarily different from that of boys' schools, and in French-administered Territories with Moslem populations the curriculum of the koranic schools included religious instruction although the public schools of metropolitan France did not.

23. His delegation objected to the inclusion of the word "each" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution because it would give the United Nations the right to review each Territory on an individual basis and would thus run counter to General Assembly resolution 447 (V), which was based on the assumption that information would be studied on a regional basis.

24. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that, although plans such as those contemplated in the draft resolution had been in existence for most of the Territories under United Kingdom administration for many years and were reviewed from time to time, any attempt to make a universal principle of such planning was objectionable because planning in any field depended on the certainty that funds would be available—a certainty that did not always exist.

25. Moreover, the use of the word "reports" in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was inaccurate, since Administering Members did not undertake to submit reports to the Secretary-General.

26. Those were, however, minor difficulties. His delegation's main objection to the draft resolution was one of principle. It had consistently maintained that the General Assembly had no right to intervene in the administration of any of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and it could not accept the principle, which was embodied in the four-Power draft resolution, that the General Assembly could undertake to advise Administering Members on how they should conduct their administration of any particular field.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Czechoslovak amendment to replace the words "consider the formulation of" by the word "formulate" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

*The amendment was rejected by 18 votes to 11, with 30 abstentions.*

28. The CHAIRMAN put the amended four-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.458) to the vote.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.*

29. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) pointed out that in calling on the Administering Members to draw up time-tables with regard to various aspects of educational development the resolution went beyond the scope of the suggestion in paragraph 20 of the report on education (A/3127, part two), which applied only to universal primary education and general literacy. For the first time an attempt was being made to apply the concept of targets and dates in Non-Self-Governing Territories. He shared the view of the United Kingdom delegation that the United Nations could not properly request an Administering Member to adopt specific administrative procedures in such Territories. Furthermore, in the case of Territories under Australian administration the requirement would be not only out of order but also impracticable, since the physical environment in Papua made the establishment of time-tables valueless and the unequal stages of development attained precluded the possibility of an over-all pro-

gramme. His delegation's position was based entirely on principle, for the Australian Government had every intention of continuing to carry out in good faith its obligations to the indigenous inhabitants. It could not, however, commit itself to time-limits. He would therefore be obliged to make a reservation with regard to the implementation of the resolution in Papua.

30. Mr. THORP (New Zealand), observing that universal primary education was already a reality in the Territories administered by his Government, objected to the resolution on two grounds. Firstly, it was superfluous in that it called for the adoption of administrative measures which were already in practice. Secondly, under the terms of the draft resolution the Fourth Committee would, in effect, assume an administrative role in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The matter of time-tables had become something of a fetish in the Committee's discussions regarding Trust Territories. He hoped that the same thing would not happen in the case of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

31. Mr. D. A. DE SILVA (Ceylon) thought it would have been logical to adopt the second Czechoslovak amendment, since the wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution implied that plans would be formulated.

32. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.459/Rev.1).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Miss Brooks (Liberia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

33. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) suggested the addition of a paragraph to the preamble, reading "Considering that education must be closely linked to the local indigenous life and culture", as recommended in paragraph 15 of the report on education. He further suggested the following additional operative paragraph:

*"Recommends to the administering Powers that they ensure the free functioning of education and adopt the necessary measures so that education should be closely linked to the national, religious and cultural traditions of the inhabitants and so that its character should not be altered for political reasons".*

That amendment would be in the spirit of a similarly worded resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO held at New Delhi in 1956.

34. He thought the draft resolution should also include a provision specifically barring discrimination in education. An example of such discrimination was the recent offer by the Government of Cyprus of scholarships for technical and secondary school teacher training in educational institutions in the United Kingdom and Turkey.

35. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation's co-sponsorship of the draft resolution did not affect the reservation on the question of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories which he had expressed at the beginning of the discussion. Since certain delegations had expressed some criticism of the drafting of operative paragraph 5, he thought that the invitation might perhaps be more broadly interpreted if the definite article before the word "Governments" was deleted.

36. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) objected that the proposed change would substantially alter the meaning of the paragraph in the French text, since the words

*“des gouvernements”* would imply that some Governments would be invited while others would be excluded. 37. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that his delegation found the draft resolution acceptable, with the exception of operative paragraphs 5 and 6. If paragraph 5 were applied to the area which included Papua it would affect the South Pacific Commission, an inter-governmental body of a consultative nature whose activities were regulated by an agreement drawn up between the six participating States. If that Commis-

sion desired to invite other Governments to attend its meetings it could do so, but there was no requirement that such invitations should be preceded by a request from the General Assembly. His delegation did not feel that the United Nations should make recommendations applying to organizations completely independent of it. He hoped that a separate vote would be taken on the last two paragraphs of the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.