



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Requests for hearings (<i>continued</i>)	257
Organization of work	257
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) Information on educational conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions	257

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

Requests for hearings (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received a communication from the Union des populations du Cameroun with regard to the hearing it had been granted by the Committee (566th meeting). He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, it should be circulated as a Committee document.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should divide agenda item 34 into two parts, dealing first with sub-items (a) and (b) and then with sub-item (c).

It was so decided.

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):

(a) Information on educational conditions (A/3165 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2);

(b) Information on other conditions

GENERAL DEBATE

3. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala), Chairman of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, introduced that Committee's report (A/3127). In accordance with the three-year cycle of work adopted by the Committee, the report devoted special attention to the problem of educational advancement. That did not mean, however, that the Committee had neglected other aspects of the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, for it was convinced that there could be no real progress in education without a simultaneous advance in the economic field and that general progress could only

be achieved when education was made available to all levels of the indigenous populations, without whose active participation the efforts of the Governments alone could not be genuinely effective.

4. That conclusion had been summed up in part two, paragraph 17, of the report, where it was stated that the solution of the problems was a social-economic process which required more than a scholastic approach, since the battle was directed not only against ignorance but also against ill-health and every form of poverty.

5. Members of the Committee had also stressed that there should be educational opportunities for all, regardless of race, colour or economic condition.

6. The Committee had reached its conclusions in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and had unanimously adopted the draft resolution annexed to part one of the report; that there had been two abstentions in the vote on part two was due not to any disagreement on the technical content of the report on education but to the fears of some members that the report might imply that the Committee was exercising a political function. It was his opinion, however, that during the last session of the Committee there had been a genuine effort on the part of all its members to concentrate their technical contributions on the questions directly relating to educational, economic and social conditions rather than on those which might lead to a political discussion.

7. He hoped that no member of the Fourth Committee would have difficulty in approving the report and the draft resolution, but that the Fourth Committee would be able, through them, to make a greater contribution to the improvement of conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to the progress of their 125 million inhabitants.

8. Mr. VIXSEBOXSE (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, drew attention to some features of the report which might be of general interest. In general, the report was an attempt to place before the General Assembly a faithful record of the Committee's discussions during its seventh session. Following the practice of previous years, the report was divided into two main parts, the first dealing primarily with matters of a procedural and general character and the second with those of a more technical nature.

9. The Committee had devoted particular attention to the question of procedures for the consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter. A summary of the views expressed was to be found in section XI of part one.

10. The 1956 session of the Committee had been primarily devoted to the examination of educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The importance attached to that item of the Committee's

agenda was fully reflected in the fact that a separate portion of the report was entirely devoted to it.

11. Annex I of part one and the annex to part two formed an integral part of the report as a whole, and would serve as a guide to those who wished to make a closer study of the matters dealt with by the Committee on Information at its seventh session. Together with the summary records of the Committee's proceedings and the report, they constituted the basic source material for the Fourth Committee in dealing with the items relating to information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

12. Mr. CUTTS (Australia), Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Education, introduced the report on education in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3127, part two). It might be objected that the information in the report was insufficient. He would therefore point out that the studies on educational conditions submitted to the Committee by the Secretariat and the specialized agencies were regarded as integral parts of the report, and a list of them appeared in the annex; furthermore, the various relevant documents were noted in the body of the report. Another point that might be criticized was the omission of the general statements which had been set forth in the past. It should be borne in mind, however, that the current report was the third such report on education and should be treated as a supplement to the other two. Hence an effort had been made to avoid unnecessary repetitions. The Sub-Committee had, however, included certain statements of principle which it held to be of a permanent and fundamental nature, and had entered into certain questions of detail not touched upon, or only briefly touched upon, in previous years. For example, it placed greater emphasis than hitherto on certain points connected with secondary education, the status of teachers, and local participation in the development of education.

13. The report as a whole sought to survey the ways and means whereby the aims of education, as laid down by the General Assembly, might more surely be promoted, the educational needs of the people met, and fresh progress planned and effected. It gave him great pleasure, as Chairman of the Sub-Committee, to note the progress it had been possible to achieve through the exchange of information and experience among the various members in the course of the discussions.

14. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece), recalling that the Fourth Committee was responsible for examining not only the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories but also the summaries of information on particular Territories transmitted to the Secretary-General, pointed out that those summaries related largely to the year 1954. He wondered whether the Secretariat had received later information, and, if so, whether summaries would be available for consideration by the Fourth Committee.

15. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) replied that, since the summaries in question had been prepared, information for 1955 had been received from the United Kingdom, New Zealand and the Netherlands and had already been summarized for the use of the Committee on Information at its 1957 session. If the Fourth Committee so desired, an effort would be made to distribute those summaries to the members as soon as possible. He pointed out, however, that under the existing system the summaries were brought out in

fascicles for each regional group, and the absence of information from any one Territory within a group delayed the completion of the document as a whole.

16. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) reaffirmed his country's claim to Belize (British Honduras) and wished to make it clear that Guatemala's participation in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories and the Fourth Committee was not to be construed as evidence that it had renounced that claim in any degree. The situation prevailing in the Territory profoundly affected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guatemala, and was a matter of concern to the entire American continent. His Government protested against the continued illegal occupation of Belize by the United Kingdom, and hoped that with the latter's co-operation a solution favourable to his country might be reached.

17. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) restated the position of his Government: namely, that should the status of Belize be altered, the interests of Mexico in relation to a part of that Territory would have to be taken into account.

18. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) stated that the United Kingdom Government had no doubt regarding United Kingdom sovereignty over the Territory of British Honduras and formally reserved its rights in the matter.

19. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) protested against the illegal inclusion of information on what the United Kingdom called the Aden Colony and Protectorate in its report on Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3114). Aden and the surrounding territory were an integral part of the Kingdom of Yemen which had been alienated from the mother country in accordance with a dubious treaty concluded many years earlier as the result of diplomatic machinations, and by virtue of vague agreements imposed by threats, intimidation and force. That treaty and those agreements, which could not be regarded as internationally valid, had never been recognized by the Government of Yemen.

20. He likewise protested against the continued occupation of Aden and the surrounding territory by United Kingdom forces, the acts of aggression repeatedly committed by those forces against the Government and people of Yemen, and the United Kingdom Government's disregard of the legal rights of the Yemeni people in retaining that area under its control. It was a well-known historical fact that Aden and the surrounding territory had been illegally and forcibly occupied and ruled by the British. The Government of Yemen had always regarded the presence of a foreign authority on its territory as a violation of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. The United Kingdom Government's intentions had been clearly demonstrated in Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's statement on 21 May 1956 to the effect that it was committed to a firm policy with regard to the Territories of Cyprus, Aden and Singapore, including, if necessary, the use of force. That Government was carrying out its firm policy to the letter by using force in Aden, and was persistently violating the terms of the Treaty of San'a concluded in 1934 between the Governments of Yemen and the United Kingdom, which had provided for the settlement of all disputes by friendly and peaceful means. Furthermore, the United Kingdom Government was at present seeking to extend its

domination over other parts of Southern Yemen through the establishment of a new system which it called the Federation of the Protectorates.

21. The Yemeni Government had often suggested that an international fact-finding commission should be sent to the area to investigate the situation with a view to arriving at a just and peaceful settlement, but, because of the intransigence of the United Kingdom authorities, that suggestion had never been carried out. The Yemeni Government would like to settle the dispute by direct peaceful negotiation with the United Kingdom and avoid placing an additional burden on the United Nations. Should it be unable to do so, however, it would have no alternative but to place the matter before the world Organization.

22. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had the gravest doubts about the propriety of the action of the Yemeni delegation in treating the Fourth Committee to what he could only describe as misleading propaganda about a Territory under United Kingdom protection. The Committee was fortunately familiar with the technique employed by the Yemeni delegation in such matters. The Yemeni authorities had increasingly instigated dissident activity within the Aden Protectorate, and had armed and supported dissident tribesmen there. He categorically rejected the tendentious remarks made by the Yemeni representative in regard to certain recent events in that area.

23. With regard to the formal claims made by the Yemeni delegation to the Territory of Aden, the United Kingdom Government had no doubts concerning United Kingdom sovereignty over the Territory and wished formally to reserve its right on the question.

24. Furthermore, there was no foundation for the Yemeni claim to the States of the Aden Protectorate. Those States were under the protection of the United Kingdom Government, which was responsible for their external relations. Yemen had therefore no claim to act on their behalf, and the United Kingdom Government had no intention of abandoning the obligations it had contracted towards the Sultans and other rulers of those Territories.

25. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) strongly denied the allegation made by the United Kingdom representative that the Government of Yemen was equipping tribes to attack the Aden Protectorate. The contrary was the truth. Furthermore, no one who had an elementary knowledge of geographical and historical facts could doubt that Aden and the surrounding territory were an integral part of Yemen which had been forcibly occupied by the United Kingdom many years previously. The Government of Yemen merely asked the United Kingdom authorities to cease their acts of aggression, and to carry out the provisions of the Charter and restore that part of Aden to its legitimate owners through peaceful negotiations in which the rights of all concerned would be protected.

26. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Argentina) said that the information transmitted by the United Kingdom Government in document A/3114 referred, *inter alia*, to the Islas Malvinas which were described as the Falkland Islands. He wished to make a formal reservation to the effect that the transmission of such information in no way affected Argentina's sovereignty over that Territory, which was occupied by the United Kingdom pursuant to an act of force which had never been accepted by the Argentine Government. Argentina re-

affirmed its inalienable rights over the Islas Malvinas, the Sandwich Islands, the South Georgias, and lands included in the Argentine sector of the Antarctic, which were not a colony or possession of any country but an integral part of Argentine territory and included in its dominion and sovereignty.

27. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had no doubt regarding its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, and formally reserved its rights on the question. With regard to the Dependencies, the United Kingdom reserved its freedom of action as a result of the refusal of the Governments of Argentina and Chile to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

28. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia) protested strongly against the submission by the Netherlands Government, under Article 73 e of the Charter, of reports on West Irian (Netherlands New Guinea). Historically, politically, and legally, West Irian had always been a part of Indonesia, and it was only because of the unwillingness of the Netherlands Government to cease its unlawful occupation of the Territory that that Territory was prevented from enjoying the same independent status as other parts of Indonesia. He realized that the Secretariat had merely summarized the information submitted by the Netherlands Government and was in no way to blame for West Irian's being described as a Non-Self-Governing Territory. West Irian did not come within the provisions of Article 73 e of the Charter, since it constituted a province of the Territory under the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia and as such was represented in the Indonesian Parliament and Constituent Assembly.

29. Moreover, the question of West Irian was a political item and would be discussed in the First Committee; it should not therefore be touched upon by the Fourth Committee.

30. Mr. VIXSEBOXSE (Netherlands) said that in his delegation's opinion such questions as that of Netherlands New Guinea were not within the Fourth Committee's competence, and any reference to it in that Committee was out of order. Nevertheless he would reiterate, as in previous years, that the Netherlands Government had no doubt regarding its sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea. The Netherlands Government administered the Territory in accordance with its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter and had therefore presented a report for 1955 in accordance with the provisions of Article 73 e.

31. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia), replying to the assertion that his delegation was out of order in raising the issue of West Irian in the Fourth Committee, pointed out that the Netherlands delegation had discussed political information on West Irian under the optional clause. In any event the Indonesian delegation was entitled to discuss all information submitted, and especially if it was of so litigious a nature as the question of sovereignty over a disputed Territory.

32. Furthermore, there were many precedents for the Fourth Committee's discussing political questions during the consideration of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, even when political information had not been submitted.

33. Mr. SINH (India) said that his delegation supported the Indonesian position in regard to the question of West Irian which was before the United Nations.

34. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala), referring to the Mexican representative's statement relating to the alleged future rights of his country in the event of a change in the status of Belize, said that Mexico's recent claim did not represent a joint claim with Guatemala, which had for some hundred years proclaimed its exclusive rights to Belize in defiance of the occupying Power.

35. He had no intention of initiating a debate on the subject and stressed the close bonds of friendship which existed between Guatemala and Mexico.

36. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that, as he had already reserved his Government's position, he would only associate himself with the Guatemalan representative's remarks concerning the cordial relations uniting the two countries.

37. Mr. LOJENDIO (Spain) observed that the United Kingdom called Gibraltar a Non-Self-Governing Territory and submitted information with regard to it. He reserved his Government's position in that respect, reaffirmed the inalienable rights of Spain over Gibraltar, and expressed the hope that that matter, as well as other matters which had been raised, especially those affecting Spain's sister republics, would be solved in a spirit of understanding so as to promote the maintenance of international peace and security.

38. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) stated that his Government had no doubt concerning its sovereignty

over the Territory of Gibraltar and formally reserved its rights on the question.

39. Mr. BARROS (Chile), referring to a statement by the United Kingdom representative, wished to place on record the fact that Chile, for its part, did not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Antarctic problem, because it considered that that was a question of sovereignty, that Chile had indisputable rights over the Chilean Antarctic territory and hence that those rights could not be discussed. The International Court and its opinions deserved the deepest respect, but he felt that the Court's jurisdiction could not be extended to that question.

40. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said that document A/3115 contained information concerning Tunisia. His Government, having recovered its total sovereignty, requested that that information should be deleted from the list.

41. Mr. BARGUES (France) pointed out that the information in question covered a period prior to Tunisia's attainment of independence. Nevertheless, at the request of the French delegation and as a courtesy to the delegations of Tunisia and Morocco, the information submitted concerning those countries had not been examined by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.