

14 MAR 1952



GENERAL

3057

A/AC.35/SR.49
21 December 1951ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCHDual Distribution

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73e

OF THE CHARTER

Second Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 26 October 1951, at 2.30 p.m.CONTENTS:

pages

1. Information communicated under resolution 222 (III) concerning the cessation of the transmission of information (item 11 of the agenda) (resumed from the 47th meeting):
 - (a) Cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73e of the Charter: Communication from the Netherlands Government in respect of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. (A/AC.35/L.55, A/AC.35/L.55/Corr.1, A/AC.35/L.77, Conference Room Papers Nos. 6 and 7) (continued) 3 - 12
2. International collaboration in regard to economic, social and educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories (item 13 of the agenda) (A/AC.35/L.35, A/AC.35/L.51, A/AC.35/L.58, A/AC.35/L.64, A/AC.35/L.65, A/AC.35/L.65/Add.1) 12 - 16
3. Future work of the Special Committee (item 14 of the agenda) (A/AC.35/L.71) 16 - 19

Present:

Chairman:

later

Mr. ZIAUD-DIN
Mr. KERNKAMP

Members:

Australia	Mr. PEACHEY
Belgium	Mr. RYCKMANS
Brazil	Mr. ROCQUE da MOTTA
Cuba	Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS
Denmark	Mr. LANNUNG
Egypt	Mr. PHARAONY
France	Mr. PIGNON
India	Mr. PANT
Mexico	Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG
Netherlands	Mr. KERNKAMP
	Mr. SPITS
New Zealand	Mr. SCOTT
Pakistan	Mr. ZIAUD-DIN
Philippines	Mr. INGLES
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. SOLDATOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. MATHIESON
United States of America	Mr. GERIG

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. GAVIN
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. DESTOMBES
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST

Secretariat:

Mr. Benson	Representative of the Secretary-General
Mr. van Beusekom	Secretariat
Mr. Cottrell	Secretariat
Mr. Kunst	Secretary to the Special Committee

1. INFORMATION COMMUNICATED UNDER RESOLUTION 222 (III) CONCERNING THE CESSATION OF THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION (item 11 of the agenda) resumed from the 47th meeting)

(a) Cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter: communication from the Netherlands Government in respect of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. (A/AC.35/L.55, A/AC.35/L.55/Corr.1, A/AC.35/L.77, Conference Room Papers Nos. 6 and 7) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the previous discussion of the item under discussion, drew the attention of the members of the Special Committee to the resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation and to two further draft resolutions, submitted by the delegation of Cuba (Conference Room Paper No. 6) and jointly by the delegations of Denmark, India, the Philippines and the United States of America (Conference Room Paper No. 7).

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that he had referred to the substance of the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/AC.35/77) at a previous meeting.

At the 1949 session of the Special Committee, the Soviet Union delegation had stated that it could not agree that the Administering Authorities had the right arbitrarily to cease to transmit information on Non-Self-Governing Territories, and had pointed out that the United Kingdom had ceased to supply information on Malta, and that France had ceased to submit information on its Non-Self-Governing Territories in French Oceania, New Caledonia and Dependencies, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, Martinique, Guadeloupe, French Guiana and other areas.

The Soviet Union delegation considered that the Administering Authorities had no right to cease to transmit information on the territories under their administration until the Special Committee had considered all the relevant data concerning the changes in the status of those territories, and had submitted to the General Assembly a recommendation that Article 73e of the Charter should cease to apply to the territories in question.

General Assembly resolution 334 (IV) stated that it was within the responsibility of the General Assembly to express its opinion on the principles which had guided or which might in future guide the Members concerned in enumerating the territories for which the obligation existed to transmit information under Article 73e of the Charter. That resolution also indicated that Member States had no right to decide that they would cease to submit

information. Paragraph 2 of the same resolution invited any Special Committee which it might appoint on information transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter to examine the factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether any territory was or was not a territory whose people had not yet attained a full measure of self-government. The Special Committee therefore had the power and the duty to examine data concerning changes in the status of any given territory.

General Assembly resolution 222 (III) stated that, having regard to the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter, it was essential that the United Nations be informed of any change in the constitutional position and status of any such territory as a result of which the responsible Government concerned thought it unnecessary to transmit information in respect of that territory under Article 73e of the Charter. Any Administering Authority which decided that there was no longer any need to supply information concerning a territory must, therefore, give its reasons for its decision.

He hoped that the Soviet Union draft resolution would be thoroughly studied by the members of the Special Committee, and that they would reach a decision which was in conformity with the provisions of the Charter.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) withdrew the Cuban draft resolution (Conference Room Paper No. 6) in favour of the joint draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Denmark, India, the Philippines and the United States of America (Conference Room Paper No.7.)

Mr. PANT (India) had listened with great attention to the remarks of the Soviet Union representative, but doubted whether the Special Committee was competent to take the action suggested in the draft resolution submitted by that representative. He felt that such action could be taken only by the General Assembly.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said the Soviet Union draft resolution raised a very serious problem regarding the interpretation of the Charter.

He recalled that in a previous statement he had emphasized the contradiction which existed between certain Articles of the Charter, which might lead to various interpretations being placed on Chapter XI, and had pointed out that at San Francisco the Preparatory Commission for the United Nations had decided that the supreme organ of the United Nations alone would have the power to interpret the

Charter. The Special Committee could not, therefore, exercise that power. The Cuban delegation therefore reserved its position regarding the question of the interpretation of the Charter which had been raised by the Soviet Union draft resolution, as such a problem could be dealt with only by the General Assembly. He would vote against the competence of the Committee to consider that draft resolution.

Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) said the Soviet Union draft resolution did not refer specifically to the question of the cessation of the transmission of information on the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam. In any case, the Netherlands Government had supplied all the relevant data on that matter.

He did not wish to repeat the statement he had made in the general debate on item 10 of the agenda, but merely to point out that the Netherlands Government considered that neither the General Assembly nor the Special Committee was competent to decide when a territory was ready for self-government, or when the Administering Authority might cease to transmit information on such a territory. He stated that it was the considered view of the Netherlands Government that the granting of self-government could never depend on a decision of the General Assembly.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was unable to understand the questions raised concerning the competence of the Special Committee, especially when such views were expressed by members who in 1949 had voted for the Soviet Union proposal.

The problem before the Special Committee was of great importance, particularly with regard to the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories towards full self-government and independence. Not a single convincing argument had been adduced to support the view that the Soviet Union delegation's proposal lay outside the competence of the Special Committee. The Special Committee was an organ of the General Assembly and, therefore, had, in that respect, the same rights as the General Assembly itself. Approval of the Soviet Union proposal would contribute to a more effective implementation of the provisions of the Charter regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), referring to his previous statement, pointed out that the Soviet Union representative had made no reference to the Special

Committee's terms of reference. There was nothing in those terms of reference which would convince the Cuban delegation that the Special Committee was competent to deal with the problem raised by the Soviet Union proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether the Special Committee was competent to take the action suggested in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation (A/AC.35/L.77).

The Special Committee decided by 13 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, that it was not competent to take the action suggested.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union delegation considered that its proposal came within the competence of the Special Committee, and that the decision just taken was incorrect.

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) introduced the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Denmark, India, the Philippines and the United States of America (Conference Room Paper No.7) and remarked that it was a compromise text.

Mr. PANT (India), supporting the joint draft resolution, said that the Indian delegation was always anxious that the Special Committee should reach unanimous decisions.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba) said he had withdrawn the Cuban draft resolution (Conference Room Paper No.6) in favour of the joint draft resolution because he felt that the latter was a compromise text which left it to the General Assembly to take a final decision on the matter.

Mr. ROCQUE da MOTTA (Brazil) had carefully considered the joint draft resolution and, in the spirit of co-operation and conciliation which should guide the work of the Special Committee, was ready to accept it as a compromise, since the Brazilian delegation would be able to express further views on the matter at the sixth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico), referring to a statement he had made at a previous meeting, in which he had explained the Mexican delegation's position on the item of the agenda under discussion, said the Cuban draft resolution approximated very closely to his delegation's point of view. In view of the withdrawal of that text, he would support the joint draft resolution, provided that the following words were added at the end of paragraph 6: "with a view to obtaining its directives on the subject." That amendment would make the paragraph clearer. It was logical that the General Assembly should study the problem of the

cessation of the submission of information under Article 73e of the Charter and give the Special Committee the necessary instructions.

Mr. KAMUKAMA (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands delegation could not support paragraphs 5 and 6 of the joint draft resolution, and accordingly asked that they should be put to the vote separately. Paragraph 5 referred to the forthcoming conference to be held at The Hague, which would deal principally with the common affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and therefore, in his opinion, had nothing to do with the problem of self-government. Paragraph 6 referred to General Assembly resolution 334 (IV) which the Netherlands delegation had not supported. He could not accept the view that the factors listed by the Subcommittee on Factors Indicative of Degree of Self-Government were necessary to enable an Administering Authority to determine whether a given territory was or was not self-governing.

He would have welcomed a resolution stating that the Special Committee noted with satisfaction the fact that the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam had, of their own free will, expressed the view that they had achieved the status of self-government. As the joint draft resolution did not prejudice the Netherlands delegation's point of view, he would abstain from voting on it as a whole. He felt that that resolution might be interpreted as denying the claim of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam that they had already attained self-government. The Netherlands Government and the Governments and Legislative Councils of the West Indian territories would be very much interested to learn on what grounds immediate and full recognition should not be given to their claims that they had achieved self-government.

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said he would prefer the original text of the joint draft resolution to stand, and asked the Mexican representative not to press his amendment.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) considered that the joint draft resolution should have expressed satisfaction that two additional territories had reached the status of self-government. The Netherlands Government had gone beyond its obligations under the Charter in submitting a full explanation of the reasons for the change in the status of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam, but the data submitted was for information only and should not be discussed by the Special Committee.

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said he would be happy to vote for the joint draft resolution, but could not support the Mexican amendment.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) was unable to withdraw his amendment.

Referring to the Belgian representative's statement he said that the Special Committee was not called upon under its terms of reference to express satisfaction or otherwise with the action taken by Administering Authorities. It had merely to study the question of the cessation of the transmission of information and to request the General Assembly for directives to enable it in future to reach decisions on problems of the kind at present before it.

In view of the Mexican Government's cordial relations with the Kingdom of the Netherlands, his delegation would await the General Assembly's directives before taking any further action.

Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines), referring to the Mexican representative's amendment, said that as paragraph 6 now stood it was left open to the General Assembly to take any action it thought fit in the circumstances. One possibility was that the General Assembly might return the matter to the Special Committee for further action. The insertion of the Mexican amendment would therefore tend to limit any action which the General Assembly might think fit to take to that possibility. He asked the Mexican representative whether it would not be preferable to leave it to the General Assembly to decide what action should be taken, particularly as the joint draft resolution was a compromise text. He also asked whether it would not be better to replace the phrase "Takes note of the communication" in the first line of paragraph 6 by the words "Transmits the communication", to avoid a certain duplication in the text.

Referring to the Belgian representative's statement, he emphasized that many of the views expressed in the debates had not been included in the draft resolution, which was a compromise text, and was accepted as such by the delegation of the Philippines.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) supported the Philippines representative's statement. Although he appreciated the spirit in which the Mexican representative had submitted his amendment, he felt it would have a limiting effect. As one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution he would be willing to accept the suggestion of the Philippines representative concerning paragraph 6. He also asked whether the words "Having noted" at the beginning of paragraph 4 might not be replaced by the words "Having examined".

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) and Mr. PIGNON (France) supported the wording proposed by the United States representative for paragraph 4.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) supported the Mexican amendment to paragraph 6 and the suggestion of the Philippines representative concerning the same paragraph.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) supported the Philippines suggestion.

Referring to the statements of the Philippines and United States representatives regarding the Mexican amendment, he pointed out that it would merely clarify paragraph 6 and would certainly not limit the General Assembly's action. The Mexican delegation could not vote for paragraph 6 as at present drafted.

Mr. PANT (India) asked whether the words "for necessary action" could not be added at the end of paragraph 6 of the joint draft resolution instead of the Mexican amendment.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) withdrew his amendment in favour of the Indian representative's proposal.

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) expressed the hope that the Indian representative would not press his proposal, which involved a change to the compromise reached among the sponsors of different proposals. He would, however, prefer that paragraph 4 should begin with the words "Having examined."

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) suggested that the Indian proposal be amended to read "for any necessary action".

Mr. PANT (India) accepted the New Zealand representative's suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that the words "for any necessary action" be added at the end of paragraph 6.

The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions.

Mr. BOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated, with regard to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73e, that the basic task of the Special Committee was to alleviate the distressing situation of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. That duty should be taken as a starting point by the Committee in its activities. With regard to the joint draft resolution before the Committee, he believed that the latter should consider all the facts connected with the change in status of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The discussion on the draft resolution showed that the Committee had

avoided fulfilling that task. Certain representatives had sought to explain their attitude by claiming that they were acting in a spirit of compromise and collaboration. The Soviet Union delegation could not accept that claim as valid, when it was accompanied by tacit or explicit concessions to the Administering Authorities and when there was no insistence on the strict observance of the provisions of the Charter concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such an attitude was not conducive to improving the lot of the peoples concerned. He accordingly could not support the joint draft resolution.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) asked whether his co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution would be prepared to accept the substitution of the word "Examined" for the word "Noted" in paragraph 4.

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) and Mr. PANT (India) were prepared to accept the United States suggestion.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) stated that if the United States representative were to submit the suggestion as a formal amendment he would ask that it be put to the vote separately. Hitherto he had expressed his readiness to accept the joint draft resolution on the basis of the existing wording of paragraph 4.

Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) opposed the United States suggestion, which he regarded as a departure from what had been previously agreed to.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) withdrew his suggestion.

Mr. HARAO NY (Egypt) stated that the position of the Egyptian Government with regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories was well known. It had noted with concern that by 1948 the number of those territories as enumerated by the General Assembly in resolution 66 (I) had fallen from 74 to 63. His Government would always maintain its insistence that the provisions of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly should be faithfully implemented. The Egyptian delegation regarded the draft resolution before the Committee as a compromise, and would be prepared to support it on that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 1 to 4 inclusive of the joint draft resolution (Conference Room Paper No. 7).

Paragraphs 1 to 4 inclusive were adopted by 14 votes to 1.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 9 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked that a separate vote be taken on the first three lines of paragraph 6, which in the French text ended at the words "l'Assemblée générale".

Mr. CALDERON PUIG (Mexico) stated that to put the second part of paragraph 6 to the vote separately would be tantamount to reconsideration of an amendment which had already been adopted.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) agreed with the Mexican representative.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) stated that, although he had voted in favour of the amendment, he would vote against the second part of paragraph 6 as amended. Under the rules of procedure any representative had a right to ask for a separate vote on any part of any proposal or draft resolution. He wished to make it clear that he was in favour of the communication of the Netherlands Government being transmitted to the General Assembly, but that he was not in favour of the remaining documents mentioned in paragraph 6 being so transmitted. It was for that reason that he had asked for a separate vote.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first three lines in the French text of paragraph 6 which read "Prend acte ... à l'Assemblée générale".

These words were adopted by 14 votes to none.

Mr. PIGNON (France) stated that the French translation of the amendment to paragraph 6, which read in English "for any necessary action", was not happy, as neither the word "action" nor the word "mésures" was appropriate.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) asked whether the amendment might not be rendered in French by the words "pour toute action qu'elle jugerait nécessaire".

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the remainder of paragraph 6.

The remainder of paragraph 6 was adopted by 9 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to 2 with 3 abstentions.

The joint draft resolution (Conference Room Paper No. 7) as a whole and as amended was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.¹⁾

1) For the final text of the joint draft resolution, see document A/AC.35/L.79.

Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) explained that he had abstained because the resolution was at variance with the views of the Netherlands Government on the subject.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained from voting against the draft resolution, since there was nothing in it that would prevent the people of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles from continuing to enjoy self-government. But he could not have voted for the draft resolution, since it contained a reference to a conference which had no bearing whatsoever on the enjoyment of self-government by the people of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. He also considered paragraph 6 unsatisfactory in that it did not mention all the factors which justified the cessation of the transmission under Article 73e of the Charter of information concerning Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) and Mr. PIGNON (France) said that they had abstained from voting for reasons similar to those given by the United Kingdom representative, and also because they considered that there was no need for the General Assembly to take any action in the matter.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines) did not consider that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would be on an equal footing with the Netherlands until the conference referred to in paragraph 5 of the resolution opened.

Mr. Kernkamp (Netherlands) resumed the Chair.

2. INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN REGARD TO ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (item 13 of the agenda) (A/AC.35/L.35, A/AC.35/L.51, A/AC.35/L.58, A/AC.35/L.64, A/AC.35/L.65 and A/AC.35/L.65/Add.1)

Mr. BENSON (Representative of the Secretary-General) explained that the documentation submitted to the Special Committee for consideration under item 13 of its agenda consisted mainly of notes for the Special Committee's information. The Special Committee had already dealt under other items of its agenda with all the points of substance in those documents which called for action by it.

The first document (A/AC.35/L.35) contained formal communications from specialized agencies concerning the subject under discussion; they showed that the specialized agencies attached great importance to it. Document A/AC.35/L.51 was a report submitted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United

Nations (FAO) in response to General Assembly resolution 445 (V), containing information for the Special Committee. Document A/AC.35/L.58 was a document on relations with Member States concerning the subject before the Committee; document A/AC.35/L.64 was a short summary of the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which might be of interest to Authorities responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Lastly, documents A/AC.35/L.65 and A/AC.35/L.65/Add.1 contained relevant information on decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council and on studies undertaken under its auspices.

Mr. DESTOMBES (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) pointed out which were the most important items in the document submitted by his Organization (A/AC.35/L.64), stressing the importance of UNESCO's fight against racial prejudices. He gave an assurance that the pamphlets mentioned in the section of the report on that subject would be made available to delegations to the sixth session of the General Assembly. He also referred to a few of UNESCO's activities which were not mentioned in the document, but which he thought might be of interest to the Committee.

Mr. PEACHEY (Australia) said that there was one instance of international collaboration in regard to economic and social development in Non-Self-Governing Territories which had not been brought to the notice of the Special Committee, and that was the South Pacific Commission set up by the Governments of Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The Agreement setting up that Commission which had been discussed at a conference held in Canberra in 1947, had been ratified in July 1948; the Commission had thus been in operation for approximately three years. The Commission's territorial scope covered all those Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific Ocean which were administered by the participating governments and which lay wholly or in part south of the Equator and east of and including Netherlands New Guinea. Its expenses were borne by the six member Governments according to proportions fixed by the Agreement; its budget for 1951 was approximately £150,000 sterling.

Under the terms of the Agreement, the Commission was a consultative and advisory body to the participating governments in matters affecting the economic

and social development of the territories concerned and the welfare and advancement of their peoples. To that end, the Commission's functions included studying, formulating and recommending measures for the development, and where necessary, the co-ordination of the services affecting the economic and social rights and the welfare of the inhabitants of the territories, particularly in respect of agriculture, communications, transport, fisheries, forestry, industry, labour, marketing, production, trade and finance, public works, education, health, housing and social welfare. The Commission also provided for and facilitated research in technical, scientific, economic and social fields in the territories and ensured the maximum co-operation and co-ordination of the activities of research bodies. It also made recommendations for the co-ordination of local projects in those fields and for the provision of technological assistance which would not otherwise be available to territorial administrations. Another function was the provision of technical assistance, advice and information, including statistical material, for the participating Governments, while also promoting co-operation with non-participating governments and with non-governmental organizations of a public or quasi-public character having common interests in the area in matters within the competence of the Commission.

The Commission itself, which met twice yearly, consisted of twelve Commissioners, two from each Government. In view of the special importance of research for carrying out the aims of the Commission, there was provision in the Agreement for the establishment of a Research Council to serve as a standing advisory body to the Commission. That Research Council was composed of a small number of persons highly qualified in the fields of health, economic development and social development, who devoted their full time to the work of the Council. The functions of the Council included inter alia, maintaining a continuing survey of research needs in the territories and making recommendations to the Commission on research to be undertaken; arranging for the carrying out of research studies, using existing institutions where appropriate and feasible; co-ordinating the research activities of other bodies working within the field of the Commission's activities and, where possible, availing itself of the assistance of such bodies; and appointing standing technical research committees to consider problems in particular fields of research.

The South Pacific Commission Agreement stated that in order to associate representatives of the local inhabitants and of official and non-official institutions with the work of the Commission, there should be established a South Pacific Conference with advisory powers as a body auxiliary to the Commission. The first Conference had been held in Suva in April 1950, and a second would convene in Noumea early in 1953. In order to ensure the greatest possible measure of representation of the local inhabitants, delegates to the Conference were selected by the administrations.

The work programme of projects initiated by the Research Council and approved by the Commission and which had been completed or were in operation or to be undertaken in 1951, comprised over forty projects. Those were related, inter alia, to nutrition, including infant feeding, tuberculosis, leprosy and malaria, the growing of cash crops and tropical pasture, animal husbandry, the grading of fruits and vegetables, the economic development of coral atolls, fisheries, pest and weed control, the control of diseases in plants and animals, vocational training, visual education, mass literacy, linguistic research, co-operative societies and the preservation of archaeological sites and historical monuments.

The Commission was regarded as a most valuable instrument for exchanging views and experiences among the Administering Authorities responsible for Non-Self-Governing Territories in the South Pacific region.

Mr. PANT (India) wished to seize the opportunity to commend UNESCO for its fight against racial prejudice, a most urgent and vital problem. He attached great importance to its being discussed by the Special Committee at its next session when it took up social matters. He trusted that at that session all the documents at present before the Special Committee would be examined more closely. The root cause of the problem was fear. He would like the Administering Authorities of Non-Self-Governing Territories to fight the problem in schools, where it was possible to strike at its roots.

Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) suggested that until the Special Committee had a firm basis, for which General Assembly resolution 447 (V) failed to provide, for assessing conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the light of comparable data from independent countries where the same conditions prevailed, the specialized agencies might be able to provide the type of information required in that respect,

which would be of great value to the Special Committee in its essential task of considering information from the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) agreed with the remarks made by the representative of India; as he had had occasion to say at the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council, UNESCO's fight against racial prejudices was most commendable. He also hoped that the problem of racial prejudices would be discussed by the Special Committee when it took up social matters at its next session.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said that his views on the subject coincided with those just expressed by the representative of Mexico. UNESCO had displayed clear vision and praiseworthy determination in its fight to put an end to racial discrimination throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN said that, on behalf of the whole Committee, he would express appreciation for the work which UNESCO was doing to combat racial prejudices. Pointing out that there would be an opportunity, when the Committee discussed the next item on its agenda, to propose items for inclusion on the agenda for the next session of the Special Committee, he declared the discussion of item 13 of the agenda closed.

3. FUTURE WORK OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE (item 14 of the agenda) (A/AC.35/L.71 and Conference Room Paper No. 8)

Mr. BENSON (Representative of the Secretary-General) drew attention to document A/AC.35/L.71, which, he explained, was a preliminary plan of studies for 1952 on social conditions and development, submitted by the Secretariat in accordance with a suggestion made at an early stage of the session.

The Secretariat's work of preparing the plan of studies for the following year had not been made easier, as in past years, by the existence of relevant General Assembly resolutions, or by a discussion on its future work by the Special Committee itself. But the Secretariat had been able to consult the United Nations services and the specialized agencies concerned as to what the Special Committee would in practice be able to achieve on so vast a subject in 1952. Of course, the document did not commit the specialized agencies in any way.

The document had been submitted shortly before the Special Committee had adopted its resolution relating to human rights. As a result of that resolution, the Special Committee would, provided the resolution was approved by the General

Assembly, presumably discuss human rights in relation to social advancement at its next session. Provision could be made for that by adding a heading entitled "Human rights in Non-Self-Governing Territories", and adding such explanatory details as the Special Committee thought fit.

He would draw attention to the note in the document stating that a high degree of selectivity would be left to the Secretary-General with regard to the topics listed in the document and to the breadth of treatment of any of those topics. It was not necessary to deal with them all in detail. It would be wise to deal with some of them in a general manner; topic I B (Participation of inhabitants), for example, was a general theme which should run through all the documents submitted to the Special Committee; and, as another example, there was no need for the Secretariat or the Special Committee to go into the technical details of topic III.C.1 on the prevalence of major diseases. The outline of the section entitled "Standards of Living" (IV.A) had similarly been limited to the work which the Secretariat and the Special Committee could usefully do on the subject. He would point out that many features of Section V (Social Problems of Economic Development) had been discussed at the current session.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) introduced Conference Room Paper No. 8, which contained suggestions which the United States delegation had drawn up regarding the future work of the Special Committee. He stated that the paper was to be considered as a tentative suggestion of a number of topics, and that it was not intended to replace the preliminary plan of studies for 1952 prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.35/L.71), which his delegation considered to be an excellent paper, listing the background studies that might be prepared for the discussion of social conditions and development at the next session.

The idea behind the United States paper was that the agenda for 1952 should contain a limited number of topics, which could not, of course, be treated technically, as the representative of the Secretary-General had himself pointed out. However, the Special Committee should survey the conditions affecting social development and also deal with programmes in Non-Self-Governing Territories to provide the requisite services and personnel for dealing with the social problems involved. It would, of course, be of great assistance to the Special Committee if it could expect a series of documents on relevant problems to be prepared by the appropriate specialized agencies.

Dr. FORREST (World Health Organization); stated that the World Health Organization (WHO) was ready and willing to help the Secretariat of the United Nations with the preparation of such studies as were listed in the document on relations with the specialized agencies (A/AC.35/L.35), in the Secretariat's preliminary plan of studies for 1952 and in the suggestions of the United States delegation. WHO had been consulted in the preparation of the section on public health in the Secretariat's preliminary plan of studies, which did not seem to conflict with the suggestions made in the United States paper; indeed, that paper selected the very points which WHO would have suggested as being appropriate for the Special Committee's attention.

He would point out that, although in the Secretariat's paper the term "vital statistics" was employed, the Committee should not expect to receive such full or accurate statistics on mortality and morbidity in Non-Self-Governing Territories as might be compiled for towns or countries at a higher stage of development. A better indication as to what might be expected was given under the heading "Health Conditions", where a general summary of the prevalence of major diseases was mentioned.

He would also point out that WHO firmly believed that a basic principle in developing medical and health services was to ensure that the local or indigenous population participated actively in all the work undertaken. That could only be done by appropriate education, as the Director-General of WHO had stressed in his reply of 21 May 1951 to the Secretary-General (A/AC.35/L.35, page 10). In that connexion, he would emphasize the importance of educational facilities either existing or to be established in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the development of all levels of the medical personnel of those territories.

In addition, public health services were increasingly becoming an integral part not only of the administration of countries, but of the very economic and social life of the people. He therefore suggested that, working in co-operation with the Secretariat of the United Nations, WHO should undertake a systematic study of health conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, with particular reference to the administration and organization of existing health services, the availability of health personnel, existing training facilities and the prevalence and control of communicable diseases, including their past history and a study of

the basic environmental sanitation measures existing and required, with an indication of the progress being made.

He would also draw attention to the fact that with the establishment of the regional organizations to which he had referred at a previous meeting, WHO hoped to see a development of co-operation within regions, so that, in the matter of fellowships, for instance, it would no longer be necessary to send fellows from one part of the world to study in another, but would become possible for them to study under conditions similar to those obtaining in their own countries.

If the Committee agreed to WHO's carrying out his proposals, he hoped that it would also agree that questions of detail should be worked out between the Secretariats of the United Nations and WHO.

Referring to the revised Standard Form, he wished to express WHO's appreciation of the way in which the Committee had received the work done on it by WHO. He added also that although the new Standard Form had been adopted, WHO would continue to consider any further revisions which might be necessary in a progressive effort to ensure that a common denominator could be found for the health information required by the Special Committee and by the World Health Organization.

Finally, he stated that if members of the Committee had any questions to put to WHO, he would appreciate their being submitted in writing, so that full and accurate answers might be returned.

The meeting rose at 6.0 p.m.