



Wednesday, 6 February 1957,  
at 3.25 p.m.

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Requests for hearings ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	375
Agenda item 35: Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	375

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

**Requests for hearings (continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that communications had been received from the Association des notables Kamerunais de la zone littorale de Kribi and the Union des populations du Cameroun regarding requests for a hearing. If there were no objections, they would be circulated in accordance with the usual procedure.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 35**

**Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter: report of the Secretary-General (A/3196, A/C.4/348) (*continued*)**

2. The CHAIRMAN announced that Burma and Liberia had joined the sponsors of the joint draft resolution before the Committee.<sup>1</sup>

3. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that after the debate on the subject during the tenth session of the General Assembly he did not think there would be any differences of opinion on the draft resolution under consideration. His delegation considered that the proposed report would be a real contribution to the progress of the Non-Self-Governing Territories because it would provide a synthesis of the information transmitted on an annual basis over the past ten years. The collaboration of the specialized agencies in such a report would be valuable both to the United Nations in general and to the Administering Members, while the co-operation the Administering Members gave the specialized agencies led him to hope that they would co-operate also in the proposed study. Moreover, such a study might help to improve the programme of technical assistance for the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Those were the reasons which had led its sponsors to submit the draft resolution, which in general followed the outline suggested in the Secretary-General's report (A/3196).

<sup>1</sup>The text of this draft resolution, with the amendment to operative paragraph 3 suggested in paragraph 56 below, was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/L.470.

4. Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), recalling that the Indian representative had suggested at the previous meeting, the inclusion of an item concerning the development of local languages among the points to be dealt with in the proposed study, said that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had already made a number of studies of that problem and would have no objection to including it in the proposed study. He suggested, however, that in order to make the study of the item more specific it should be entitled "Development of local languages as media of instruction".

5. Mr. SINH (India) accepted the wording suggested by the UNESCO representative for the additional item of the proposed study. He expressed the hope that the question of local languages as media of instruction would be given the consideration it deserved in the projected report.

6. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) said that now that the United Nations had completed its first decade it would be useful to pause and take stock of one important aspect of its work, in the manner proposed by the draft resolution. In doing so, it should be borne in mind that it was necessary to approach the question of the Non-Self-Governing Territories objectively and to have the co-operation of all Member States, if the goals of the United Nations were to be furthered.

7. It was stated in the draft resolution that the proposed report should deal with the progress that had taken place in the Non-Self-Governing Territories in accordance with the objectives set forth in Chapter XI of the Charter. One of the most important of those objectives was the development of self-government and of free political institutions; in his delegation's opinion no report which neglected to deal with that aspect of conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be complete. For that purpose, however, it would be necessary to have information on constitutional developments within the Territories. Provision was made for the transmission of such information under part I, section D, of the Standard Form, but since it was optional, the Secretary-General might receive such information from some States but not from others, with the consequence that his report would be incomplete. In order to obviate that contingency, his delegation felt it might be useful to insert in the draft resolution as operative paragraph 6 an additional paragraph worded as follows:

"6. *Appeals* to the Administering Members, who have not given optional information under part I, section D, of the said Standard Form, to render valuable assistance to the Secretary-General in the preparation of a complete report on Non-Self-Governing Territories, by voluntarily supplying him with information, in respect of the Territories under their administration, showing the progress achieved

between 1946 and 1956 in the field covered by the said part I, section D, of the Standard Form.”

It should also be pointed out that the Administering Members who had not submitted such information would have everything to gain by supplying it for the purposes of the proposed report and that to do so would imply no obligation on their part to continue the transmission of such information.

8. The information transmitted on other aspects of the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories was also inadequate in some cases. It was his delegation's view that in order to remedy that deficiency the Secretary-General should be in a position to take cognizance of other official information issued by Administering Members, such as that contained in the official gazettes, laws and documents of the Territories under their administration. In the field of human rights, for example, the information on Cyprus transmitted in 1956<sup>2</sup> had included the statement that conditions in 1955 had been exactly the same as during the previous year, whereas it was common knowledge that they had been totally different. If the Secretary-General was restricted to the use of the information transmitted by the Administering Members under Article 73 e of the Charter, he would be unable to present an accurate picture of the situation.

9. His delegation also considered that the non-governmental organizations might be able to supply indisputably authentic information which would be valuable in that connexion.

10. Mr. BARROS (Chile) said that the draft resolution was in accordance with his delegation's ideas on the subject; he asked that Chile should be included among its sponsors. His delegation especially approved of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, for it considered that any step which would bring about the closer co-operation of the specialized agencies in the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories was greatly to be welcomed.

11. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation had repeatedly demonstrated its devotion to the promotion of progress towards self-government everywhere in the world, although it did not think that such progress would be facilitated by dwelling on the faults of Administering Members. When the idea of the proposed study had first been suggested to the Committee by Ecuador at the previous session (477th meeting), his delegation had warmly supported it, and since the present draft resolution embodied that idea in a constructive and balanced form his delegation would support it. The Administering Members should bear in mind the fact that the draft resolution called for a summary of their achievements, not a catalogue of their shortcomings. He would also call their attention to the care the authors of the draft resolution had taken to limit the scope of the information requested to social, educational and economic conditions.

12. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that his delegation viewed the draft resolution with some misgivings, although it had not had an opportunity to study it fully. Australia had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 932 (X) because his delegation had considered that resolution vague and had failed to see to what use the proposed report would be put. The present draft resolution provided no further informa-

tion on that point. It might be presumed, however, from the wording of certain parts of the draft resolution, that the report would be examined and used as a basis for recommendations. Since his Government transmitted information under Article 73 e of the Charter for information purposes, it could not approve of such a use. Moreover, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution seemed to imply that the report would deal with all the matters referred to in Chapter XI of the Charter. His delegation could not accept that implication.

13. In connexion with paragraph 4, it should be pointed out that the information transmitted to the United Nations by Administering Members was transmitted in accordance with their obligations to the United Nations. The information supplied to specialized agencies was, however, supplied under other agreements and for other purposes. His delegation did not consider it proper for the United Nations to make use of that information in a report such as the one proposed.

14. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution also seemed to go beyond the framework for the transmission of information provided by the Standard Form and thus to go beyond the obligations assumed by Administering Members under Article 73 e of the Charter.

15. The additional paragraph suggested by Greece made quite explicit the implication, already embodied in paragraph 2, that the report should include developments in the political field. That was a position which his delegation could not accept.

16. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation attached the greatest importance to the question of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and considered that it would be an appropriate and valuable step for the United Nations to sum up and appraise the progress made in those Territories over the last ten years. Furthermore, it was convinced that the proposed report would be of great value to Administering Members in drawing up plans for the future development of the Territories.

17. His delegation welcomed the addition of Chile to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had listened with particular interest to the statement made by the Under-Secretary at the 616th meeting and to the request implied in it that Administering Members should in their coming communication of annual information pay particular attention to the survey on general trends already asked for in the Standard Form. Such a request would entail a great amount of work on the part of his Government. His delegation had taken little part in the original discussion of the proposed study because it had never been made clear what the purpose, scope or cost of such a study would be.

19. There was also the question of the audience to which the report would be addressed: in other words, the use to which it would be put. He did not think that a document of the kind envisaged would be of great value as a historical record: he used the word "historical" advisedly, for although the report would be submitted to the General Assembly in 1959 it would not cover information submitted after 1956. The whole character of the report would be such that the information it would present would of necessity be out of date. Hence it would seem that the report would be intended for the benefit of research historians. For

<sup>2</sup> See ST/TRI/B.1956/9.

them it would serve as a convenient reference work and he could not therefore say that it would be of no value. Apart, however, from the question of whether the cost was justified, he wondered if the Secretariat could rightly be asked to spend its time on the preparation of such a report.

20. He had referred to the Under-Secretary's appeal because when the matter had been discussed at the previous session it had been thought that the subject was one which could not conceivably give rise to any differences of opinion among the members of the Committee as far as its substance was concerned. He would have thought that, when the Under-Secretary had made his additional request to the Administering Members, the sponsors of the draft resolution would have tried to eliminate any possible differences there might be between the Administering and non-administering Members on the matter. In paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, however, the Secretary-General's tentative request was presented as a formal one, which meant that if the draft resolution were adopted the Administering Members would immediately be under pressure from the General Assembly to take action. He agreed with the Australian representative that the paragraph was undiplomatically worded if it was hoped to obtain the compliance of the Administering Members.

21. He had thought from the discussion at the previous session and from the sponsors' remarks that in essence the report was to have been a synopsis rather than a report of progress in Non-Self-Governing Territories and that it was to have been based on information transmitted under Article 73 e. Paragraph 2 was deliberately vague in that respect, referring only to Chapter XI whereas resolution 932 (X) had referred to Article 73 e, which specified exactly the type of information to be transmitted.

22. In addition to the constitutional difficulties which the Australian representative thought might prevent the Secretary-General's using the information supplied by the Administering Members to the specialized agencies, there was a practical difficulty, in that the amount of material supplied to such agencies by the United Kingdom Government, for example, was enormous and would take weeks to assemble.

23. It was unfortunate that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution made a direct request to the specialized agencies, for the normal procedure would have been to request the Secretary-General to enlist their assistance.

24. He had not had time to study in detail the implications the draft resolution might have for his Government, but he had thought it advisable to express his immediate reactions since it was his delegation which would be most affected by the adoption of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. ABDEL HAMID (Egypt) said that his delegation wished to be added to the sponsors of the draft resolutions.

26. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that in any activity it was necessary to pause at intervals and take stock of what had been accomplished. The report envisaged in the draft resolution would help to bring into focus the material transmitted by the Administering Members in their annual reports. With regard to the nature of the report, the Committee should be guided by the principles laid down in a series of General Assembly resolutions, which had been adopted by substantial majorities and in some cases supported by

the Administering Members themselves. The sponsors thought that each specialized agency should be responsible for the preparation of the part of the report relating to its particular sphere of activity, while the Secretary-General should co-ordinate them into a unified whole which would offer a panoramic view of the subject, and also prepare the other sections specified in the plan set forth in document A/3196.

27. The basis of the report would be the information provided by the Administering Members over the past ten years. No information would be used which did not come direct from the Administering Members. He could not understand why the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia questioned the use by the Secretary-General of information supplied to the specialized agencies, for although such information might be more detailed and might show a difference in emphasis, it was not likely to differ in essence from that submitted to the United Nations itself.

28. With regard to the suggestion that the cost of preparing the report might not be justified, the Secretary-General's report (A/3196) seemed to indicate that the cost would be small in comparison with the magnitude and importance of the task.

29. While he presumed that the Administering Members kept their own citizens informed of the progress achieved in the Territories they administered, he felt it would enhance their prestige if the United Nations itself were to produce for world-wide distribution a report describing that progress. If certain United Nations documents, such as the summaries of information transmitted in accordance with Article 73 e, were not as widely read as they might be, that was perhaps because the information they contained was so highly specialized and condensed that in order to be able to use and understand it the reader must have a knowledge of the material provided in earlier documents. A report summarizing the achievements of the past ten years and showing the general trends which were emerging would be more easily comprehensible to the layman, in addition to being useful to the delegations in their work. Comparative studies had the virtue of making clear the general direction in which developments in any particular field were leading. He could not, therefore, share the United Kingdom representative's apprehension that by the time the report appeared some of the information in it would no longer be of interest. In his opinion, the purpose of a document of the type proposed was to present a comprehensive picture and to facilitate the examination of the general trends observed in the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

30. In reply to the Australian representative's query about the use to be made of the report, while he could not predict exactly how it might be used, he could say that the purpose for which it was intended was to show what progress the Administering Members had made in fulfilling their obligations under the Charter and to enable the General Assembly to assist them in doing so.

31. The United Kingdom representative had wondered whether the document envisaged was to be a synopsis or a report. It seemed to him that the text of the draft resolution itself gave the answer. He would point out, however, that a synopsis of the material supplied by the Administering Members over the past ten years would be even drier than a report. More than a mere synopsis was needed to give an indication of the developments which were taking place.

32. He regretted that some delegations found the wording of paragraph 5 undiplomatic. However, the use of the word "Invites", which introduced that paragraph, seemed to him the most courteous way of asking for the collaboration of the Administering Members.

33. Replying to the United Kingdom representative's objection that paragraph 2 did not specify that the report was to be based on information transmitted under Article 73 e, he pointed out that if the resolution was considered in its entirety, there could be no uncertainty with regard to the sources of information on which it was to be based.

34. He thought that all delegations could agree on the substance of the draft resolution, which in essence did not seem to him controversial.

35. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that he himself did indeed consider the draft resolution controversial, which was the more regrettable because it need not have been so. With regard to paragraph 5, he had not criticized so much the way in which it was worded as the fact that it had been included at all. He could not share the Guatemalan representative's conviction that the report would necessarily be of value from the point of view of public opinion in the countries of the Administering Members themselves. He also wished it to be understood that, while he did not think the report would be of interest to the Fourth Committee, he recognized that it might be useful to research workers and others, having occasion to consult the material in reference libraries. If it was true that the information transmitted annually by the Administering Members was dry, that was because Article 73 e called for information of a statistical character. Statistics were indeed dry and difficult to interpret but they were one of the criteria upon which reliable information could be based.

36. Until the present draft resolution had been introduced it had been clearly understood that the report was to be a synopsis, since it was to be based on information transmitted by the Administering Members during the previous ten years. If such information were arid, the report also would to a certain extent inevitably be arid; if it were not to be, new sources of information would have to be used. In that connexion, too, it seemed to him that a matter which need not have been controversial, in the political sense as opposed to the administrative question of whether the report should be undertaken at all, had now shown signs of becoming so.

37. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) said that, while he felt that the Secretary-General's report and the Under-Secretary's statement at the 616th meeting were to be commended, he was disappointed that the annex to the former did not include under the heading "General" a section (C) in which the basic objectives of the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be enumerated. Such a section could have called for a summary of the achievements of the Administering Members in promoting political advancement, as stipulated in Article 73 a of the Charter, and an indication of the steps taken to develop self-government in accordance with Article 73 b. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution but he suggested that since some delegations had criticized paragraph 4, it might be amended to read as follows:

"Considers that the report should be based on information transmitted under Article 73 e of the

Charter and on supplemental information of an official nature."

38. With regard to the amendment suggested by the Greek representative, which his delegation would support in the event of its being formally proposed, it might be better at the present stage to eliminate the word "voluntarily", since there was disagreement on the question of whether the transmission of information on political development was or was not an obligation.

39. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) considered that the expense involved in the preparation of the proposed report would be entirely justified. In his opinion the effect of the draft resolution would be to encourage friendly relations and understanding among the nations. It was difficult to form an idea of the progress made in any Territory without considering information covering a period of years. That would be the purpose of the report.

40. With regard to the reservations made by the United Kingdom and Australian representatives with regard to paragraph 2, he stressed that the Administering Members were not being asked to submit information on political development in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The report would be limited to economic, social and educational questions and he could therefore see no reason why the Administering Members should object to providing the information requested.

41. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had hoped it would arouse no controversy and he still hoped that the views expressed by the Australian and United Kingdom delegations could be regarded as requests for clarification rather than objections.

42. In reply to the Australian representative, he observed that the report would serve the usual purposes of any report.

43. With reference to the Australian representative's remarks concerning paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, he observed that it should be read in conjunction with paragraphs 3 and 4 and with Chapter XI of the Charter. The proposed report would be based on information transmitted under Article 73 e and supplementary information supplied to the Secretariats of the United Nations and the specialized agencies by the Administering Members as a gesture of good will. The nature of such information was clearly specified in Article 73 e; it would deal exclusively with economic, social and educational conditions.

44. In reply to the Australian representative's contention that information supplied to the specialized agencies should not be used by the United Nations, he said he was confident that the specialized agencies could be trusted not to misuse the small amount of information supplied to them which was not also supplied to the United Nations.

45. He could not agree with the United Kingdom representative that the report would be of no interest to delegations.

46. In reply to the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the wording of paragraph 3 might give rise to constitutional questions, he pointed out that in a number of General Assembly resolutions adopted at earlier sessions the specialized agencies had been invited to take some action.

47. The United Kingdom representative had wondered what the basis of the report would be. It was clear from the draft resolution that nothing new would be involved except an additional effort which could reasonably be asked of any Member of the United Nations.

48. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) thanked the representatives of Guatemala and Yugoslavia for their explanations but said that his misgivings had not been entirely removed.

49. He agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the report could have no other than historical value. The representative of Guatemala had himself admitted that he did not know precisely of what use the report would be except for general information purposes. The representative of Yugoslavia had said that it would serve the usual purpose of a report but he was not clear what that meant.

50. He still considered that the wording of paragraph 2 was vague. If the scope of the report was to be limited as the Yugoslav representative had suggested, the paragraph might perhaps be reworded in clearer language.

51. His objection to the use by the United Nations Secretariat of information supplied by the Administering Members to the specialized agencies was based entirely on principle. Where information was supplied under a particular agreement it was presumably to be used for the purposes of the organization to which it was submitted. He was therefore doubtful whether another organization should be permitted to use such information for an entirely different purpose.

52. He drew attention to the fact that the Administering Members were invited by paragraph 5 to include in the information transmitted by them under Article 73 e of the Charter such information as might be necessary for the preparation of the report. That was a far-reaching proposal. The Administering Members were also asked to provide a survey of the principles and practical measures showing general trends in the Territories concerned. It was true that an Administering Authority might wish to show general trends in one of its regular reports, in accordance with section C of the explanatory preface of the Standard Form. The Standard Form, however, was for the guidance of the Administering Members; the draft resolution went a step further.

53. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) still felt some doubt whether the previous requests to the specialized agencies, to which the Yugoslav representative had referred, would have involved the kind of obligation paragraph 3 placed upon them. Nevertheless he accepted the Yugoslav representative's statement that there were precedents for the wording of that paragraph, while reserving his opinion on the desirability of the practice.

54. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), replying to the Australian representative's remarks concerning paragraph 2, said that what the sponsors wanted was a report based on information transmitted in accordance with Article 73 e. He could not see what objection there could be to the reference to the objectives set forth in Chapter XI of the Charter.

55. With reference to paragraph 5, it would be for the Administering Members to decide whether they wished to provide additional information to be used in the preparation of the report.

56. In reply to the United Kingdom representative, he said that the previous General Assembly resolutions to which he had referred had used the word "Invites"; he therefore suggested that the first word of paragraph 3 should be "Invites" rather than "Requests".

57. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that there was no need to stress the desirability and usefulness of a report on progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories during the past ten years. There could be no question now whether such a report should be prepared, for that question had been answered at the tenth session of the General Assembly; the only question concerned the form the report should take and its scope and contents.

58. He could not agree that the report would be a mere enumeration of facts and figures. General Assembly resolution 932 (X) expressed the opinion that an examination of the progress achieved in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should make it possible to ascertain the extent to which the peoples were advancing towards the attainment of the goals set in Chapter XI of the Charter. In that connexion he would emphasize that those goals were not only economic, social and educational but also political, as was clear from Article 73 b. He hoped that when submitting information to the Secretary-General the Administering Members would include data on the development of self-government and would indicate what progress had been achieved in that direction and how close the peoples had come to that goal.

59. He would give a broader interpretation to the provisions of the Charter regarding social questions than did many representatives. In Russian social advancement conveyed the idea of the development of a society, so that information on social advancement meant information concerning all types of advancement relating to society. Therefore, while not opposing the Under-Secretary's suggestions with regard to the contents of the report, he hoped that conclusions would be drawn and proposals made relating not only to economic and "social" advancement in the narrow sense but also to political progress.

60. Like the Indian representative, he had hoped that the report could be ready before the proposed date, but if for technical or other reasons that was impossible it might perhaps be supplemented before being submitted to the General Assembly in 1959 by the most recent data relating to the year 1957 and perhaps partially to 1958. Such additional data could perhaps be submitted in the form of an annex to the report.

61. He had no objection to the joint draft resolution.

62. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) moved the adjournment of the debate.

*The motion for adjournment was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.