

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.35/SR.129
7 June 1955
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 12 May 1955, at 11.20 a.m.

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT MASTER

JUN 13 1955

CONTENTS

Procedures for the consideration of communications relating to
the cessation of the transmission of information (General Assembly
resolution 850.(IX))

Amplification or amendment of Standard Form for the transmission
of information

Resumption of the session in September 1955

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SCOTT	New Zealand
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. JAIPAL	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. LOOMES	Australia
	Mr. FRAZAO	Brazil
	U HLA AUNG	Burma
	Mr. LIU YU-WAN	China
	Mr. de CAMARET	France
	Mr. ARENALES	Guatemala
	Mr. KHALIDY	Iraq
	Mr. VIXSEBOXSE	Netherlands
	Mr. CALLE y CALLE	Peru
	Mr. GIDDEN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. SEARS	United States of America
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. COHEN	Under-Secretary
	Mr. BENSON	Secretary of the Committee

PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE CESSATION OF THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION (General Assembly resolution 850 (IX))

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) referring to General Assembly resolution 850 (IX) and more particularly to paragraph 4, considered that the Committee had been given a precise task with regard to the communication of information. Unfortunately, it did not have enough time to complete that task.

There were however, a number of precedents. Pursuant to resolution 222 (III), the Administering Powers must, within a maximum period of six months, inform the Secretary-General of any change in the constitutional status of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Furthermore, under resolution 448 (V), the Committee was expressly requested to examine the information transmitted in pursuance of resolution 222 (III) and to report thereon to the General Assembly. The Committee therefore had not only the right but the duty to examine and discuss that information.

In that connexion, he read out an extract from the statement which he had made in French on 31 August 1953 (A/AC.35/SR.82), when the Committee had examined the communication from the United States Government concerning Puerto Rico.

At that time his delegation had already affirmed that the Committee was competent to deal with the matter. It had invoked paragraph 2 of the operative part of resolution 448 (V) and stated that the General Assembly should base itself on the Committee's conclusions in taking a decision on the question of Puerto Rico. Nevertheless, the Assembly could, if it wished, request another body to study those conclusions, since under resolution 448 (V) it was not obliged either to adopt or reject them without asking for further information. For its part, the Committee was not bound to accept that situation and its terms of reference were in no way affected.

He was glad to note that the procedure established had been scrupulously observed by the United States, Denmark and the Netherlands in the three cases which had arisen since the adoption of resolution 222 (III). It was also gratifying that the three Administering Powers had included local representatives in their delegations and had thus given the Committee an opportunity to hear a

(Mr. Frazao, Brazil)

full account of the situation in the former Territories. One difficulty, however, had arisen: members of the Committee had not always been able to obtain instructions from their Governments in sufficient time. Some provision should be made for that.

On the grounds that the Committee was not now in a position to study in detail a number of questions of principle raised by resolution 850 (IX), he proposed that it should merely allude to the matter in the report to be drafted by the Rapporteur. That report would indicate the views expressed on the item and would state that, if the General Assembly so wished, the Committee would study in detail at its 1956 session the question of the procedure to be followed in examining communications transmitted in pursuance of resolution 222 (III).

Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal.

There being no objections, the Brazilian proposal was adopted.

AMPLIFICATION OR AMENDMENT OF STANDARD FORM FOR THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION

Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) speaking as Chairman of the Sub-Committee, recalled his earlier statement (A/AC.35/SR.127) that the Committee, when considering item 13 of its agenda, should decide what amendments to make in the Standard Form with regard to community development, and that the Sub-Committee had made no recommendation in the matter.

Speaking as the representative of Guatemala, he said that the protracted discussions in the Committee and the work of the Social Commission testified to the interest that community development had aroused. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee's report itself had shown that such action was assuming increasing importance in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Standard Form, which had been revised in 1951, dealt with community development only in general terms, in connexion with adult education.

Some very significant information had been submitted to the Committee at the current session and there was every indication that there would be more in the future. Unfortunately, in its present layout, the Standard Form precluded

(Mr. Arenales, Guatemala)

any request for fuller information. The Rapporteur's report should therefore note the Guatemalan proposal that the Standard Form should be amended so as to obtain fuller information on community development, and more especially on the plans of local administrations, the arrangements made for expert consultations on the spot and the steps taken to keep the local inhabitants informed on community development. His delegation did not propose a text, since the decision rested with the General Assembly. Accordingly, the Committee need do no more than express its agreement in principle and instruct the Rapporteur to record the fact in the report.

U HLA AUNG (Burma) asked if it could be made clearer how the question, whose importance had been stressed by several delegations, would be submitted to the General Assembly.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) said he understood that the Rapporteur would mention the statements on the subject in his report.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) considered that the Committee should merely point out to the General Assembly the advisability of expanding the Standard Form in some respects and leave it to the Rapporteur to find a suitable formula; delegations would in no way be bound to endorse amendments to the Standard Form when they were submitted to the Fourth Committee.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) thought it would be best not to make any specific recommendation to the General Assembly.

Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) said that as some delegations seemed to have certain reservations, he would agree to the Rapporteur's merely noting the views expressed by the Guatemalan delegation, without indicating whether or not they were shared by all the members of the Committee.

Mr. de CAMARET (France) declared that if the report was to propose alterations of substance in the Standard Form, the French delegation would certainly wish to examine them; but if it was only a matter of mentioning the observation made by one Committee member, it would have no objection.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) and Mr. LOOMES (Australia) explained that they had not intended to raise any objections, and that they would be satisfied if the report noted the various opinions expressed by the members of the Committee.

Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that his delegation fully appreciated the importance of community development and wished to have more detailed information on the subject. It felt, however, that no text should be proposed to the General Assembly, which should be allowed to prepare a text that the delegations could freely criticize. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Social Commission also was studying the problem of community development and that the results of that study would have to be taken into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that it would be useful to study the Social Commission's conclusions on the subject. He said that if there were no objection, the Committee would instruct the Rapporteur to include an appropriate reference in his report.

Mr. JAIPAL (India) inquired whether it was the Committee's decision to take into consideration the problem of community development and the additions to be made to the Standard Form, since they were not mentioned in the Sub-Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Rapporteur should confine himself to indicating the purport of the discussion at that meeting.

RESUMPTION OF THE SESSION IN SEPTEMBER 1955

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had directed him to consult the Secretary-General with regard to the date of resumption of the session. The understanding had been that it would be as close as possible to the date of the opening of the General Assembly. However, under General Assembly resolution 332 (IV), paragraph 4, the Committee could not choose the week prior to the opening of the Assembly. He would be reluctant not to comply with that provision.

The Secretariat had indicated that the Committee could be convened at a suitable date, probably during the second week of September. For the Secretariat's convenience, the Committee might perhaps have to hold night meetings and content itself with consecutive interpretation.

Mr. SEARS (United States) noted that under such an arrangement representatives would have to come to New York two weeks before the opening of the Assembly. To avoid that, he proposed that the Committee should meet during the three days following the opening of the Assembly.

Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) pointed out that the Committee must not meet during the week preceding the opening of the Assembly and accordingly proposed that the Committee abide by the Chairman's suggestion. His own preference would be for the Committee to meet one or two weeks before the Assembly, so as to make it easier for the delegations to distribute their work.

Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) shared that view, but, as a compromise, he would agree that the Committee should meet two or three days before the General Assembly.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) doubted that the Committee could not meet during the week preceding the opening of the General Assembly. In any case, the Committee could surely leave it to the Chairman to settle the matter.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) pointed out that the Committee was to meet in September in order to examine the question of information concerning Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. If the Committee met before the General Assembly, he would probably be unable to vote, for the question was of particular importance and the decision would have to be taken by the head of his delegation.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America) withdrew his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the opinions expressed by the representatives he would request the Secretary-General to convene the Committee in September at a suitable date.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.