



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41: <i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):</i>	
(a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;	
(b) Information on economic conditions;	
(c) Information on other conditions;	
(d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General	
<i>Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .</i>	113

Chairman: Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina); Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEMS 37, 39, 40 AND 41**

- Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4360-4368, A/4371) (continued):
- (a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter (A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128 and Corr.1, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr.1, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER.A/15/vol.5);
  - (b) Information on economic conditions (A/4371);
  - (c) Information on other conditions (A/4371);

- (d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
- (e) New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General (A/4470)

*Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4471 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) (continued)*

*Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General (A/4472 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1) (continued)*

*Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4473 and Corr.1 and Add.1, 2 and 3) (continued)*

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.639/REV.1 AND REV.1/ADD.1) (continued)**

1. Mr. DJERDJA (Yugoslavia), introducing the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1), of which his delegation was a sponsor, said that the question of the direct participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies had already been the subject of a number of General Assembly resolutions. The General Assembly had stated in resolution 566 (VI) that the direct association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies was an effective means of promoting the progress of the peoples of those Territories; in resolution 647 (VII) it had declared that direct participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information could be of further assistance in promoting the progress of those Territories towards the goals set forth in Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and that it considered it desirable that there should be associated in the work of the Committee on Information qualified indigenous representatives from Non-Self-Governing Territories. In resolution 744 (VIII) the General Assembly had requested the Committee on Information to continue the study of means of securing a progressive increase in the participation of duly qualified representatives of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in its work. Unfortunately the Administering Members had not seen fit to comply with those resolutions. The question of accession to independence was now more urgent than ever and it was the duty of the United Nations to help the dependent countries to pass smoothly from a state of dependence to the enjoyment of full sovereignty. The draft resolution before the Committee was accordingly designed to

enable the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to participate directly in the work of the United Nations; it was in keeping with Chapter XI of the Charter. Not only would the direct participation of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories enable the United Nations and the Administering Members to fulfil their obligations under the Charter more efficiently, but it would make a useful contribution to the work of the United Nations and would enable the indigenous inhabitants to obtain some good practical experience of administration.

2. It would manifestly be wrong to obstruct the participation of the indigenous inhabitants. Nevertheless it should be made clear that the participation the sponsors of the draft resolution had in mind was that of "duly qualified" people, including political leaders, and not colonial officials from the metropolitan country. It might also be well to add that the draft resolution could not apply to such Territories as West Irian or Goa, which were the subject of a dispute between Members of the United Nations. In submitting their draft resolution the sponsors had been prompted solely by the desire to make the achievement of independence by the Non-Self-Governing Territories as smooth a process as possible. The draft resolution was perfectly clear: he hoped that it would receive unanimous approval.

3. Miss SHELTON (Cuba) said that her delegation had eagerly associated itself with the sponsors of the draft resolution because it felt that the participation of duly qualified indigenous representatives in the work of the United Nations would be in the interests of all concerned and would be of particular value to the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the process of emancipation.

4. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would receive the enthusiastic support of all members of the Committee, who were well aware that measures designed to accelerate the attainment of independence by those peoples would be of benefit to them and to mankind. The Committee should strive to ensure that all men might live happily, without hatred or bitterness, and free of all prejudice and discrimination.

5. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the draft resolution was sponsored by twenty-one States. His own delegation had always advocated the participation of the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in the work of the United Nations and had proposed various measures to hasten the development of those Territories. It therefore approved of the draft resolution in principle and would support it.

6. He felt, however, that it might legitimately be asked who among the Administering Members, the political parties of the Territories and the General Assembly was to decide who were the "duly qualified" representatives of the Territories. That point needed clarification.

7. Moreover, he wished formally to propose an amendment (A/C.4/L.642) to the effect that the phrase "with the right fully to be heard on matters of particular concern to them but without the right to vote" should be added at the end of operative paragraph 2. It was essential that the participation of such representatives should be limited to the right to speak, and then only when the discussion concerned the Territory

which they represented. There could be no question of giving the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories the right to vote, a privilege reserved to Members of the United Nations; that would run counter to the provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He therefore hoped the sponsors of the draft resolution would be so good as to include that essential stipulation. He would also be glad if, in order to obviate any misunderstanding, they would specify in operative paragraph 2, as they had done in operative paragraph 3, that the participation of indigenous representatives in the work of the appropriate organs of the United Nations was to be in conformity with the constitution of such organs. Without that stipulation it might seem that the object of the sponsors was to give the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories the right to participate, without any restriction whatever, in the debates of the United Nations. The resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly must of course be in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

*Mr. Pachachi (Iraq) took the Chair.*

8. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said his delegation endorsed the principles set forth in the draft resolution.

9. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that he was speaking on behalf of a number of delegations in order to explain the difficulty in which they found themselves. The General Assembly was to discuss, in plenary session, a draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union which would recognize the independence of the colonial countries and peoples (A/4502 and Corr.1); if that vitally important declaration were adopted, it would affect every decision the Committee might take in the future in connexion with the Trust and the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That being so, the question arose of what attitude the Fourth Committee should adopt towards the draft resolution it was at present discussing. As that draft resolution made a specific reference, in operative paragraph 4, to the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, and as the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union provided for the immediate abolition of the colonial system, the impression might be created that the Committee was now proposing to take a decision which ran counter to the draft declaration. It was difficult to adopt a final position until the decision of the General Assembly was known. As, moreover, the 21-Power draft resolution was not of an urgent character, he wondered whether it would not be better and more logical to wait until the General Assembly took up the draft declaration on independence in plenary session and then to be guided by whatever decision the Assembly might take. He appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution not to press for consideration of and a vote on their draft at the present juncture. He proposed that the Committee should go on to the next item on its agenda.

10. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that no date had as yet been set for the consideration, in plenary session, of the draft declaration on independence. It therefore lay with the Committee to decide what procedure to adopt.

11. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said he gathered that the Bulgarian representative was asking the Committee to suspend its consideration of the various draft resolutions that might be submitted to it, pending the results of the examination of the draft decla-

ration on independence in plenary session, and in the meantime to proceed with the succeeding items on its agenda. That seemed a very illogical procedure, inasmuch as all the items on the Committee's agenda concerned Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, as did the draft declaration on independence. In any case, he saw no point in examining the substance of the problem and leaving the consideration of the draft resolutions in abeyance.

12. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) stressed that some way must be found of settling the real difficulty in which the Committee found itself. Since the problems dealt with in the various draft resolutions were not of extreme urgency, it would be better to wait for a while before putting them to the vote and to go on with the succeeding items on the agenda, while at the same time endeavouring to arrange, perhaps through the Chairman of the Fourth Committee and other members of the General Committee, for the General Assembly to take up the draft declaration on independence in plenary session as soon as possible.

13. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 seemed to be working on the assumption that the Fourth Committee would still have to deal with Non-Self-Governing Territories for some time to come. They thus seemed to be entering into a formal commitment to vote against the declaration on independence. It was indeed clear that giving immediate independence to all Territories without exception, regardless of their size or degree of readiness, involved a serious risk of seeing them break down, as had just happened in one case, as a result of the cupidity of more powerful countries.

14. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) recognized the cogency of the arguments advanced by the Bulgarian representative, for the Fourth Committee had no right to ignore the importance of the declaration proposed to the General Assembly. But if that thesis were wholly accepted, the Committee might be precluded from considering both the next agenda item and even the question of South West Africa. It would therefore be better to continue studying the various proposals and to put them to the vote, with a request to the Rapporteur of the Committee not to transmit them to the General Assembly before that body had ruled on the draft declaration. The question would thus remain open and it would subsequently be possible to see, depending on the tenor of the declaration, which of the Fourth Committee's resolutions could still serve a purpose.

15. Mr. EMILIANI (Colombia) thought that the Bulgarian representative's proposal was unacceptable; since all the agenda items referred to dependent territories, such action would result in the suspension of all the Fourth Committee's work. It was also wrong to allege, as the Philippine representative had done, that every vote on the draft resolution would be a vote either for the retention or for the elimination of the colonial system.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal was not that the Committee's work should be suspended, but that the consideration of the various points under discussion should not be concluded. He thought that the Venezuelan proposal would raise some difficulties, for it would be hard for the Committee to reconsider its earlier decisions.

17. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that he was aware of those difficulties, but thought nevertheless that the Venezuelan proposal would enable the Committee to solve its problems. Moreover, he did not think that it was possible to present the declaration both as a political question, which the General Assembly was to discuss in plenary session, and as a question so closely related to the problems studied by the Fourth Committee that the latter was obliged to suspend its work. It was the duty of the Committee to continue its work on behalf of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in order to help them attain independence in peace and security. That was clearly the spirit which had prompted the twenty-one Powers to present their draft resolution and which would lead the other countries to support it.

18. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) admitted that the Venezuelan proposal was not without merit, but he did not think that it would do anything to resolve the difficulties experienced by the various delegations in trying to take a position on the draft resolutions before knowing the decision of the General Assembly.

19. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) wished to make it clear to the Philippine representative that the fact of the delegation of Ceylon being one of the sponsors of the draft resolution was no advance assurance of the position which that delegation would adopt when the question of the elimination of colonialism came up before the General Assembly in plenary session.

20. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) endorsed the view of the representative of Ceylon.

21. Mr. DJERDJA (Yugoslavia) and Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) asked for a short suspension of the meeting to enable the sponsors of the draft resolution to consult one another.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.*

22. Mr. BA (Mali), after congratulating the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur on their election, said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had carefully studied the Bulgarian proposal but could not agree that it was necessary to make all the Committee's work dependent on the adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on the independence of colonial peoples. They feared that such an attitude might finally paralyse the Committee. They were in no way belittling the importance of the declaration and would indeed endeavour to secure the adoption by the Assembly of a text which would not merely express a pious wish but would satisfy the legitimate aspirations of dependent peoples. They could not, however, lose sight of the practical problems still arising in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, as the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union—which was undoubtedly the most far-reaching—apparently called for the abolition of the colonial system before the end of 1961, there would still be Non-Self-Governing Territories for another year. If the 21-Power draft resolution was not adopted, no representative of a Territory which was still non-self-governing at the time of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly would be able to take part in the work of the United Nations. Before attaining independence, Mali had taken part without the right to vote in the discussions of certain

organs of the ILO and had noted that its statements had helped to guide the decisions of those organs in the direction desired by the dependent peoples. Representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories could exercise the same influence in the General Assembly. The sponsors of the draft resolution therefore felt that the Fourth Committee should proceed with its examination of the draft resolution and should approve it unanimously. They would undertake to ensure that their text did not subsequently become a pretext for impeding the adoption of a declaration on independence which would enable the United Nations to put an end to the colonial system.

23. Mr. COMAY (Israel) thought that the discussion on which the Committee had embarked was aimless, for it was the duty of the Committee to consider the agenda items referred to it by the Assembly and listed in the letter from the President of the Assembly (A/C.4/441). The Committee should study the questions within its jurisdiction without worrying whether those questions overlapped matters studied by other Committees or by the General Assembly or whether they were in any way connected with such matters. The Committee's discussion was, after all, only preliminary, and the final decision would be taken by the Assembly upon receipt of the Committee's report. If there were any questions of co-ordination, it was the General Assembly, assisted by the General Committee, which would settle them, in accordance with rule 41 of the rules of procedure.

24. Mr. CAMARA Maurice (Guinea) pointed out that no one had challenged the Fourth Committee's competence. Moreover, he wished to mention that it was his country which had taken the initiative at the General Assembly's fourteenth session of calling for the adoption of a declaration on the independence of the colonized peoples—a step which had been taken up at the present session by the Soviet Union. Guinea's position with regard to the declaration on independence was therefore clear.

25. The problem would best be dealt with by instructing the Chairman of the Committee to raise the matter with the President of the General Assembly with a view to having the draft declaration considered as soon as possible for it would necessarily have important repercussions on the Fourth Committee's work.

26. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) wished first to thank the representative of Mali for having given the Committee his assurance that the draft resolution should not be interpreted as being at variance with the draft declaration on independence.

27. His proposal that no vote should be taken on the draft resolution ought not to hold up the Committee's proceedings; there was nothing to prevent the Committee from taking up other items on its agenda—for example, the question of South West Africa.

28. In answer to the Israel representative, he pointed out that the Third Committee had recently taken a decision (994th meeting) to postpone consideration of a draft resolution on a question relating to Africa until the General Assembly had voted on the draft declaration on independence.

29. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) disagreed with the Israel representative; the Committee was at liberty to follow whatever procedure it thought most proper.

He agreed with the representative of Mali that the Committee ought to vote on the draft resolutions before it, leaving its final decision on them to await the General Assembly's vote on the draft declaration on independence. He agreed also with the Guinean representative's proposal.

30. In reply to the Bulgarian representative, he said that in the Iranian delegation's view the present debate was entirely without prejudice to the much more general discussion which would be held in plenary session on the draft declaration.

31. Mr. LAMANI (Albania), speaking on a point of order, said that under rule 121 of the rules of procedure, no proposal could be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting unless copies of it had been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1) had been circulated to the Committee during the meeting. He therefore moved the suspension of the meeting under rule 121 of the rules of procedure.

32. The CHAIRMAN put the Albanian delegation's motion to the vote.

*The Albanian motion was rejected by 29 votes to 13, with 28 abstentions.*

33. Mr. Zaïd RIFAI (Jordan) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

34. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) opposed the motion. The matter under discussion was of very high importance; it far transcended the bounds of mere procedure and it was important that representatives should be able to consult their heads of delegation before taking any decision. He asked the Jordanian representative not to press his motion for closure.

35. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said he was unable to see the point of the Jordanian representative's motion for closure. There was no formal motion of a procedural character before the Committee and the debate was actually on draft resolutions. The closure of the debate could therefore refer only to closure of the debate on the draft resolution.

36. The CHAIRMAN explained that the motion was to close the procedural debate on whether the Committee should decide on the draft resolution before the Assembly had voted on the draft declaration on independence.

37. Mr. Zaïd RIFAI (Jordan) said that the Ceylonese delegation's argument surprised him. Ceylon was one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, as was Jordan. The co-sponsors had already agreed during the recess not to accept a delay in the discussion of draft resolutions. But since the representative of Ceylon had changed his mind, and for the sake of the solidarity of the co-sponsors, he would withdraw his motion.

38. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), speaking on a point of order, said she wished to protest emphatically against the Philippine representative's interpretation of the draft resolution. The Liberian delegation had absolutely no intention of voting in plenary against the draft declaration on independence.

39. She fully agreed with the representative of Mali. She would speak again, if she felt it necessary, during the discussion on the draft resolution.

40. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania), explaining the Romanian delegation's view, said that the latter had had no need to hear the representatives of Ceylon, Mali and other countries in order to understand the reasons that had prompted them to submit the draft resolution now before the Committee. Nevertheless, it was still in some doubt about how it should vote if the draft resolution was put to the vote. On the other hand, the Malian delegation's idea, which had been supported by the Iranian delegation, seemed hard to accept. He felt that the most constructive suggestion had been made by the representative of Guinea: namely, that the Chairman of the Committee should be asked to approach the President of the General Assembly.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that he had talked the matter over with the President of the General Assembly and that the President would inform him without fail of the date on which the General Assembly was to take up the draft declaration on independence.

42. Mr. KABBANI (Saudi Arabia) did not agree with the Bulgarian representative. Admittedly, the draft resolution could not be regarded as a final remedy to colonialism; the only remedy was the abolition of the

colonial system. Nevertheless, the draft resolution did constitute a step towards that glorious goal. The Committee ought therefore to vote without hesitation on the draft resolution.

43. He agreed with the representative of Ceylon, moreover, that delegations' votes on the draft resolution in no way affected their position on the more general problem of the abolition of the colonial system.

44. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Bulgarian representative. The General Assembly's decision would guide delegations in their vote on the draft resolution now before them. In any event, the Committee's proceedings would in no way be held up if the vote was postponed. Some of the petitioners the Committee proposed to hear were already in New York; by the time the hearings had ended the General Assembly would have been able to vote on the draft declaration on independence.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.