



UNITED NATIONS

11 SEP 1950

GENERAL

A/AC.35/SR.23

7 September 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

*[Handwritten signature]*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73(e) OF THE CHARTER

First Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Wednesday, 6 September 1950, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS: Report of the Education Sub-Committee (A/AC.35/L.21) (continued)

- |                    |                 |             |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| <u>Chairman:</u>   | Mr. Shiya RAO   | India       |
| <u>Rapporteur:</u> | Mr. SPITS       | Netherlands |
| <u>Members:</u>    | Mr. HAY         | Australia   |
|                    | Mr. HOUARD      | Belgium     |
|                    | Mr. JOBIM       | Brazil      |
|                    | Mr. LANNUNG     | Denmark     |
|                    | Mr. EL MESSIRI  | Egypt       |
|                    | Mr. GARREAU )   | France      |
|                    | Mr. LAURENTIE ) |             |

Any corrections to this record should be submitted in triplicate in one of the working languages (English, French or Spanish), within two working days, to the Director, Language Services Division, Room F-302, Lake Success. Corrections should bear the appropriate symbol number and be enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

*[Handwritten mark]*

<u>Members:</u> (cont'd)	Mr. de ARAOZ	Mexico
	Mr. CRAW	New Zealand
	Mr. LOPEZ	Philippines
	Mr. WOLLIN	Sweden
	Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. GERIG	United States of America

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. PAWLEY	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. DESTOMBES	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Secretariat:

Mr. HOO	Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories
Mr. BENSON	Secretary of the Committee

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE (A/AC.35/L.21) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN called for the resumption of the consideration of the report of the Education Sub-Committee (A/AC.35/L.21).

Paragraphs 15 to 18 inclusive

Paragraphs 15 to 18 inclusive were adopted with minor drafting changes.

Paragraphs 19 and 20

2. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) requested that the word "countries" should be substituted for "Non-Self-Governing Territories", in paragraphs 19 and 20.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 were adopted as amended.

Paragraphs 21 to 27 inclusive

Paragraphs 21 to 27 inclusive were adopted with minor drafting changes.

Paragraph 28

3. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) felt that since UNESCO dealt with the whole field of education in all countries, the Committee could not avoid entering, to some extent, into the field of competence of that organization. He therefore suggested that the first three sentences of the paragraph should be altered to read: "In stating this, the Special Committee is aware that its task is to examine the information transmitted..."
4. Mr. HAY (Australia) thought that the third sentence of the paragraph might raise objections in the minds of some delegations, and suggested that both the United States representative's point and his own might be met if the first three sentences of the paragraph were deleted.
5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at one stage in its debates the Committee had indeed stood in danger of assuming the task of UNESCO. In the opinion of his delegation, it was necessary, in that connexion, to stress the particular function of the Committee; he therefore objected to the proposed deletions from paragraph 28.
6. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) could not agree to the retention of the third sentence as it stood. It was not a correct description of the Committee's task, which, as laid down in its terms of reference, included the submission of reports to the General Assembly, together with such procedural and substantive recommendations as the Committee deemed desirable. Moreover, he objected to the word "hastening", which implied that there was need for the Administering Powers to be spurred on to more rapid action. The tempo of development in the Non-Self-Governing Territories had not been prescribed by the General Assembly.
7. Mr. HAY (Australia) modified his proposal, suggesting that the first sentence should read: "In stating this, the Special Committee is aware that its composition and terms of reference make it in no sense a replica of UNESCO," and that the third sentence should be deleted.

8. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) withdrew his proposal in favour of the Australian amendment.

9. The CHAIRMAN thought that the objection of the United Kingdom representative would be met by a revision of the third sentence to read, "...with a view, in the field of education -- as, indeed, in other fields -- to facilitating, within the limits of its own competence, the fulfilment of the objectives of Chapter XI of the Charter."

10. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) supported the Chairman's amendment.

11. Mr. GARREAU (France) supported the Australian proposal for the deletion of the sentence. He felt that the reference to Chapter XI of the Charter was misplaced, since the Committee's terms of reference dealt only with Article 73 (e).

12. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) shared the French representative's objection in principle and supported the Australian proposal.

Paragraph 28 was adopted as amended by the Australian delegation.

Paragraph 29

13. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) recalled that at the preceding meeting he had stated that his delegation would propose a brief text for insertion as the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 29. That text read as follows: "(a) In order that the campaign against illiteracy may be pursued effectively, it is necessary that UNESCO should be asked to define the term 'illiteracy' and suggest a uniform method of presenting statistics of percentages of illiteracy."

14. Mr. Houard accepted the suggestion of Mr. GERIG (United States of America) that the new text should be the second, rather than the first sub-paragraph.

/15. In reply

15. In reply to a suggestion by Mr. CRAW (New Zealand), that the phrase "it would be useful if" would be preferable to "it is necessary that", Mr. Houard pointed out that the French word "indispensable" might be translated as "essential" rather than "necessary".

16. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that since the text would be preceded by the introductory phrase, "...The Special Committee records its view that..." the new text might well begin, "The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should, in order that the campaign against illiteracy may be pursued effectively, be asked to define.."

17. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) accepted the United Kingdom amendment.

18. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) felt that in sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (f), the word "must" should be replaced by "should".

19. Mr. GARREAU (France) pointed out that the phrase "il faut", in sub-paragraphs (d) and (f) of the French text, should accordingly be replaced by "il faudrait", and the phrase "il est extrêmement urgent", in sub-paragraph (e) by the words "il serait extrêmement urgent".

20. Mr. de ARAOZ (Mexico) drew attention to the fact that while the chapter of the report, which dealt with the most important phase of the education question, contained numerous references to UNESCO, that organization was not mentioned in the conclusions given in paragraph 29, except in the new sub-paragraph just proposed by the Belgian delegation. The delegation of Mexico had previously expressed the hope that there would be close co-operation between the Administering Powers and UNESCO with respect to the eradication of illiteracy, and Mr. de Araoz proposed that a statement to that effect should properly appear in paragraph 29.

21. In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. de Araoz said that he did not consider the references to UNESCO in paragraph 28 and the new sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 29 sufficient. Nor would a reference to paragraph 1 of the General Assembly's resolution 330 (IV) meet his point, since that paragraph called for co-operation b;

UNESCO "at the request of the Members concerned". He proposed the following text as an additional sub-paragraph in paragraph 29: "Expresses the hope that there will be close co-operation between the Administering Powers and UNESCO in the solution of the problems connected with the eradication of illiteracy."

22. Mr. GARREAU (France) supported the Mexican proposal.

23. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) appreciated the value of the Mexican proposal. He suggested, however, that since the recommendation was of a general nature, it should more properly appear among the final conclusions at the end of the document, and should be couched in broader terms in order to cover other subjects besides illiteracy. He pointed out, moreover, that the text should read "...that there will continue to be close co-operation..." since such co-operation already existed in large measure.

24. Mr. de ARAOZ (Mexico) accepted the suggestion of the United States representative, and, at the request of the CHAIRMAN, agreed to present his proposal again in connexion with the examination of paragraph 31.

Paragraph 29 was adopted as amended by the Belgian and United States delegations.

Paragraph 32

25. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) suggested the deletion of the word "isolated" in paragraph 32, sub-paragraph (a).

26. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested the deletion of the words "enjoy the advantages of the main streams of" in sub-paragraph (a).

Paragraph 32, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 33

Paragraph 33 was adopted without comment.

Paragraph 34

Paragraph 34 was adopted with a slight drafting change.

Paragraphs 35 to 38 inclusive

Paragraphs 35 to 38, inclusive, were adopted with slight drafting changes.

Paragraph 39

27. Mr. HAY (Australia) suggested the deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 39 on the grounds that it might be controversial. He further suggested the re-arrangement of the remainder of the paragraph by the inversion of the sequence of the two remaining sentences, substituting the word "accordingly" for the words "in general".

Paragraph 39, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 40

28. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) suggested that the same formula should be used throughout in introducing the Special Committee's views, namely "The Special Committee therefore reports its view that:".

It was so decided.

29. Mr. GARREAU (France) referring to paragraph 40, sub-paragraph (a), suggested that the words "wherever possible" should be inserted between the words "should" and "be".

The French amendment was accepted.

30. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that the word "authorities" should be substituted for the word "administrations" in paragraph 40 sub-paragraph (b).

31. Mr. HAY (Australia) suggested that the beginning of paragraph 40, sub-paragraph (b) should read "The peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories whose languages differ from those of the authorities...."

32. Mr. GARREAU (France) stated that the French text of paragraph 40, sub-paragraph (b) should read "autorités qui assument leur administration".

The amendments submitted by the United Kingdom, Australian and French representatives were adopted.

33. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that, for the sake of uniformity with paragraph 37 where the same phrase occurred, the word "wider" should be substituted for the word "broader" in paragraph 40, sub-paragraph (d).

That amendment was adopted.

34. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) suggested that the word "views" should be substituted for the word "judgments" in paragraph 40, sub-paragraph (e).

That amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 40, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 41 to 45, inclusive

Paragraphs 41 to 45, inclusive, were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 46

Paragraph 46 was adopted with a slight drafting change.

Paragraphs 47 and 48

Paragraphs 47 and 48 were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 49

35. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) stated that he approved of the principle enunciated in paragraph 49, sub-paragraph (c). He hoped he would not be misunderstood, however, if he expressed the thought that the principle had perhaps been worded somewhat too sweepingly. There were, for example, some Moslem schools in certain Non-Self-Governing Territories under United Kingdom administration which presumably were intended exclusively for students of the Moslem faith; similarly there were Chinese schools in Malaya which probably were restricted to Chinese students. The difficulties to which he had alluded might be overcome by making it clear in the sub-paragraph that it referred to government schools only.



36. The CHAIRMAN thought that the introductory phrase of paragraph 49, sub-paragraph (c), which recognized that there were indeed schools which might legitimately use group criteria in their admission policy, might cover the difficulties to which the United Kingdom representative had referred. To make the point clearer, the words "in receipt of government funds" could be inserted after the word "schools" in the third line of paragraph 49, sub-paragraph (c).

37. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) stated that in ordinary circumstances parents were likely to send their children to schools attended predominantly, or even exclusively, by members of their own group; there was nothing wrong with such a practice provided that equal facilities were afforded by the schools concerned. It was only when there was a shortage of schools in a given area that a problem arose, and in such cases the governing principle should be that no one should be excluded from school as such on discriminatory grounds. He proposed that the last part of paragraph 49, sub-paragraph (c), should be amended to read "No pupil should be excluded from the opportunity of education on the grounds of race, religion, or social status."

38. Mr. GARREAU (France) considered that sub-paragraph (c) should be retained in its present form. It enunciated an excellent principle which, in its broad outline, should be applicable also to private schools. That principle was being applied in schools in French territories: while there were confessional schools, Moslem, Christian, Jewish, they were open to any qualified student wishing to attend them.

39. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested a further modification of his amendment, so that the final part of sub-paragraph (c) would read "it should be accepted as a general principle that no schools should exclude pupils on grounds of race, religion, or social status."

The United Kingdom amendment was adopted.

40. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) suggested the substitution of the word "should" for the word "must" in sub-paragraph (e).

That amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 49, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 50 and 51

Paragraphs 50 and 51 were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 52

41. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) proposed the addition of the following sentence to paragraph 52: "Other speakers pointed out that the participation of the inhabitants in the formulation of educational policies would be premature in the territories where education has not yet reached a level such as to make such participation practicable."

42. He recalled that statements to that effect had been made by the Belgian and Australian delegations in connexion with Non-Self-Governing Territories under their respective administration. He wished to emphasize that the statement was neither a reservation nor an expression of opinion, but simply one of fact.

43. Mr. HAY (Australia) supported the Belgian proposal.

44. Mr. JOBIM (Brazil) suggested that the words "two Administering Authorities" should be substituted for the words "other speakers".

45. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion and further suggested that the statement should be placed, not at the end, but at the beginning of paragraph 52.

46. Mr. HAY (Australia) feared that such a transposition would not be a completely accurate reflexion of the discussion that had taken place in the Sub-Committee.

47. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) feared that the statement would invite speculation as to which of the Administering Authorities were meant. Perhaps the position of all concerned could be made clear by altering the second line of paragraph 51 to read in part "...are associated as fully as possible...".

48. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that among illiterates there often were people who could make valuable contributions to education.

49. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) feared that the modification proposed by the United States representative would fail to give a clear picture of the actual situation. It would not reflect the thought that was in the mind of his own and the Australian delegations, namely, that it would be premature at present to associate the inhabitants of some territories with the formulation of educational policies.

50. He was willing to accept the amendment proposed by the Brazilian representative.

51. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, also was opposed to the United States representative's suggestion on the grounds that it could be construed as a derogation from the general principle enunciated in paragraph 51. He supported the suggestions of the Brazilian and Philippine representatives.

52. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) considered that the Belgian proposal confronted the Committee with a difficult problem. The document under consideration was meant to reflect the views of the Committee as such, as distinct from the views of any individual delegation. It represented a delicate balance which would, he feared, be upset by the inclusion of a statement such as had been proposed by the Belgian representative. The two delegations might perhaps protect their position by noting their reservations on the specific point involved in the report of the Special Committee to the General Assembly, rather than by pressing for the inclusion of the statement in the document under consideration.

53. Mr. HAY (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the document under consideration was not the proper place for entering reservations. He would, however, point out that, as the Belgian representative had observed, the statement concerned was not a reservation and that it did fit into the context of paragraph 52 as a purely factual account.

54. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) thought it would be unwise for the Special Committee to submit to the General Assembly a report which was accompanied by a series of reservations. Such a procedure would destroy the spirit in which the report had been drafted. He suggested, therefore, that every attempt should be made to arrive at a text acceptable to the Committee as a whole.

55. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) reiterated his view that the Belgian amendment was merely a statement of fact. He pointed out, in reply to the representative of the Philippines, that the different conditions prevailing in the various Territories would make it impossible to achieve complete unanimity on the paragraph in question. To meet some of the objections which had been raised, however, he suggested that the proposed Belgian text should be amended to read: "However, other Administering Authorities pointed out that participation of the inhabitants...".

56. The CHAIRMAN speaking as the representative of India, suggested that the Belgian delegation's concern might be satisfied if the words "not all" were inserted after the words "from the information transmitted by some" in the first line of paragraph 52. He also drew attention to paragraph 10 of the report which, in his view adequately safeguarded the position of the Belgian and Australian Governments.

57. In the Sub-Committee, as in the Committee itself, members had made considerable concessions in the hope of achieving a report which could be presented to the General Assembly without reservations. He deprecated any departure from that policy. It should also be borne in mind that each country would be free to present its views on particular points in the Fourth Committee.

58. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) pointed out that paragraph 52 merely stated that some Administering Authorities had transmitted information with regard to certain action taken by them in the Territories under their administration, but gave no explanation why that action had been possible. For that reason, he felt it would not be proper to accept the Belgian amendment which was merely a restatement of explanations given in the Sub-Committee.
59. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) suggested that the Committee might adopt the following text: "In other Territories, however, it is felt that participation of the inhabitants in the formulation of educational policy is premature since education has not reached such a level as to make such participation effective."
60. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) proposed that the words "by the Administering Authority concerned" should be added in the New Zealand text after the words "it is felt". If the New Zealand text was adopted, he further suggested that the second sentence of paragraph 52 should be amended to read: "While the efforts which have been made are appreciated".
61. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) suggested that the words "while these efforts are appreciated" should be deleted.
62. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) wondered whether the United States proposal would not destroy the unity of the paragraph. As an alternative, he suggested that the text should be amended to read: "Where this participation does exist, the question of primary importance...".
63. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) was opposed to both the United States and the Philippines proposals. In the light of the views expressed during the debate, he wished to put forward the following draft for the Committee's consideration:
- "From the information transmitted by the Administering Members in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories it is felt by the Administering Authorities concerned that participation of the inhabitants in the formulation of educational policy is premature since education has not reached such a level as to make such participation effective.  
/In other

In other Territories, however, provision has been made, often in great detail, for the association in varying degrees of the inhabitants of those territories in the machinery by which educational policies and administration are directed. While these efforts are appreciated...".

64. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further discussion of paragraph 52 should be postponed until the following meeting, when the United Kingdom amendment could be circulated in writing.

It was so agreed.

Paragraphs 53 and 54

Paragraphs 53 and 54 were adopted with minor drafting changes.

Paragraph 55

Paragraph 55 was adopted without comment.

Paragraph 56

65. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, supported by Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom), suggested that the second sentence of paragraph 56 should be amended as follows: "The vicious circle of educational inadequacies can be broken only by simultaneous action at many different points."

That amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 56, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 57

66. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, proposed that the following sentence should be inserted at the end of paragraph 57: "Of significance is the fact that a substantial number of such students seeking higher education in the metropolitan countries are students who meet their own expenses. This establishes both a widening desire among the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories for higher education and a lack of adequate facilities in their own Territories."

67. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) supported the Chairman's proposal.

Paragraph 57, as amended, was adopted with minor drafting changes.

Paragraph 58

68. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) pointed out that the text of paragraph 58 did not correctly describe the prevailing French practice in matters of higher education. He suggested therefore that it should be amended to read "relating to finance, it is recommended that Universities should enjoy the greatest possible freedom of administration".

69. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) added that the existing text was contrary to Belgian practice and he therefore fully endorsed the remarks of the representative of France.

70. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, suggested the following draft of paragraph 58: "it is recommended that Universities should enjoy the widest practicable measure of autonomy and freedom from government control in matters of academic policy...".

71. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) could accept the Indian text, although he preferred to use the words "freedom of administration" inasmuch as in France universities were not free to set up their own programmes, as the Indian text might imply.

72. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) thought paragraph 58 could not be viewed as a statement of higher education policy applicable only to Non-Self-Governing Territories. For his part, he was not convinced that a uniform policy could not be applied to the Territory and the metropolitan country alike. He also doubted whether any State would completely relinquish all control over funds which it had allocated for education. From that point of view, the paragraph as a whole was open to criticism and he suggested, therefore, that it should be deleted.

73. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said that he was trying to ensure the universities in Non-Self-Governing Territories the largest possible measure of freedom and control over their internal discipline and administration. He thought a satisfactory text could be achieved, if the French amendment were adopted.

74. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, said that educational experts differed as to the extent to which the government should interfere in the internal administration of a university. In certain countries, it was felt that such institutions should be completely free, while other nations felt that some degree of control was desirable. It should be borne in mind, however, that paragraph 58 referred expressly to universities in Non-Self-Governing Territories. He felt that such institutions should be safeguarded from controls which might imply a degree of direction from the Administering Authorities with regard to the courses of instruction and educational policy. For those reasons he could not support the United States proposal. As an alternative, however, he suggested that the text should be amended to read: "including those relating to finance, it is recommended that the universities should enjoy the greatest possible freedom in respect of their internal discipline and administration".

75. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) withdrew his proposal in favour of the Indian amendment. He thought, however, that there were omissions from the text and proposed that a drafting group should be appointed to prepare a fresh draft of paragraph 58, taking into account the views which had been expressed during the debate.

76. The CHAIRMAN asked the representatives of France and the United States of America to prepare a fresh draft of paragraph 58 for submission to the Committee at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.