

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1021st
MEETING**

Monday, 24 October 1960,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 45 (Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi) (continued).</i>	119
<i>Agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41:</i>	
<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>	119

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

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 45 (QUESTION OF THE FUTURE OF RUANDA-URUNDI) (continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received a request for a hearing signed by five petitioners and concerning the future of Ruanda-Urundi. If there were no objections, the request would be circulated to the members of the Committee for consideration at a later meeting.

It was so decided. 1/

* Resumed from the 1010th meeting.

1/ The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/444/Add.3.

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)**

2. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) shared the opinion of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, who, through the representative of Mali, had very clearly expressed at the previous meeting their desire that the Committee should continue its debate on that draft without waiting for the decision of the General Assembly with regard to the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (A/4502 and Corr.1).

3. He found it particularly significant that the draft resolution, which related to the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, had been submitted by delegations which for the most part represented countries that had formerly been colonies. The value and importance of the draft resolution were greatly enhanced by that circumstance.

4. He also noted that consideration of the draft resolution came within the scope of an item included on the agenda. He added that there would be nothing to prevent delegations from taking whatever position they saw fit in plenary session when the general problem of the elimination of colonialism was taken up.

5. In conclusion, he observed that adoption of the draft resolution would constitute a further step on the path of progress and expressed the hope that the Committee would examine the draft and take a stand on it.

6. Mr. WEEKS (Liberia) shared the hope of the Tunisian representative that the delegations which were opposed to a continuation of the debate on the draft resolution would reconsider their position. The Committee should take a definite stand, and if the General Assembly voted in favour of the elimination of colonialism once and for all, the cause of the sponsors of the draft resolution would be strengthened.

7. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) feared that the Committee would not be able to finish its work on schedule if it wasted too much time on a sterile procedural debate.

8. He thought that he was expressing the views of a number of delegations in noting that there was an undeniable contradiction between the item to be discussed in plenary session and the draft resolution, which implied that the colonial system would be maintained for a number of years. He wondered, on the other hand, whether the Committee could be sure that the General Assembly would take up the draft declaration on the granting of independence at an early date and that the discussion would not be a prolonged one. If the Committee proved unable to complete its work within the time allotted, its prestige, and with it the prestige of the entire Organization, would suffer.

9. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) thought that as the Bulgarian delegation had not submitted a formal motion for adjournment of the debate, there was nothing to prevent the discussion on the draft resolution from continuing.

10. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) confirmed that it was not the intention of his delegation formally to move adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution before the Committee; it simply wished to ascertain the opinions of the other delegations.

11. He would like to refute two of the arguments put forward by the representative of the Philippines. In the first place, the Philippine representative seemed to be apprehensive that if the Committee proceeded to discuss draft resolution A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, it might give the impression that it was opposed to the draft declaration to be discussed in the General Assembly. The sponsors of the draft resolution themselves, however, had said that that was not the correct interpretation. In the second place, the Philippine representative had stated that the effect of the suggestion made by the Bulgarian delegation would be to paralyse the work of the Committee and in the final analysis to compromise the work of the United Nations itself. That was going too far. Furthermore, the Bulgarian delegation had

suggested several ways in which the Committee might continue its work.

12. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) recognized that the Bulgarian delegation's position, namely, that the Committee's resolutions might be outstripped or nullified by the decision taken in the Assembly on the problem of colonialism as a whole, was logical. Nevertheless, since the sponsors of the draft resolution did not think there was a contradiction between their text, which related to practical measures, and the decision which might be taken by the General Assembly, he was in favour of continuing the debate. In any case the resolutions approved by the Fourth Committee were always submitted to the General Assembly. Hence he saw no reason why the draft resolution and the other draft resolutions of the same character which had been submitted to the Committee should not be considered and approved. The General Assembly would be free to reject them or declare them unnecessary if it took a more radical position with regard to the elimination of colonialism.

13. Mr. KUCHAVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Fourth Committee's course of action would depend on the position taken by the General Assembly on the fundamental problem of the elimination of the colonial system. Moreover, there could be no doubt that the majority of delegations were aware of the need to relate the decision taken on practical and specific measures to the more general problem which was to be discussed in plenary session.

14. His delegation recognized the validity of the Ceylonese representative's argument that the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution would paralyse the Committee's work. That situation, however, would probably be of short duration, for he understood that the General Assembly would take up the draft declaration on the granting of independence very shortly, probably in the middle of the week. The best course would accordingly be to adopt the Guinean representative's suggestion that the Chairman of the Committee should be instructed to request the President of the General Assembly to schedule consideration of the draft declaration as early as possible.

15. In any case, the draft resolutions before the Committee were not so urgent as to justify their precipitate approval. For example, draft resolution A/C.4/L.641 requested the Administering Members to transmit, before the next session of the Committee on Information, special reports setting out all available information concerning training facilities and the current strength, composition and state of preparation of the civil and technical services of the Territories for which they were responsible. He did not doubt that the sponsors of that draft resolution and of the others that had been submitted to the Committee had the best of intentions. He feared, however, that it might appear that they were in favour of the colonial system being maintained for a while longer and of certain measures being taken within the framework of that system. It was in that sense that the Philippine representative had interpreted the content of draft resolution A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 at the previous meeting. There was a possibility that the highly laudable motives of the co-sponsors, who firmly desired the elimination of

colonialism, might be interpreted in the opposite sense.

16. Since the African and Asian delegations were more eager than any one else to eliminate colonialism, the advisability of submitting a draft resolution which would have the effect of associating the peoples of the colonies with the work of the United Nations not on a footing of equality but in the capacity of poor relations was open to question. Those peoples could no longer be content with half-way measures; they wanted complete independence, the chance to be more than just observers, and the right to participate not only in the work of the United Nations but also in its decisions. He appealed to those delegations, therefore, not to press for a vote on their draft resolution but to wait until the General Assembly had taken up the fundamental problem concerning the millions of people who were still under the yoke of colonialism.

17. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) observed that the information supplied by the USSR representative introduced a new factor which should be taken into account. Although she did not agree with the Soviet delegation with regard to the desirability of postponing the examination of the draft resolution before the Committee, the Liberian delegation hoped the Chairman of the Committee would ascertain from the President of the General Assembly the probable date on which the Assembly in plenary session would engage on its discussion of the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

18. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the President of the General Assembly was at present carrying on consultations with a view to fixing the date for the debate on the draft declaration. While it was true the dates of 26, 27 or 28 October had been suggested, no definite decision had yet been reached. The Chairman would immediately advise the Committee of any new developments in the situation.

19. Mr. EL AMIN (Sudan), in reply to the remarks made at the previous meeting by the Philippine representative, stated that the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution in no way prejudiced the attitude they would adopt when the draft declaration on the granting of independence was debated. The only purpose of the twenty-one sponsors in requesting the participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and specialized agencies had been to ensure that those Territories should make a good start once they had achieved independence. It was therefore essential that the Committee should immediately examine and adopt the draft resolution, it being understood that if the General Assembly took a more progressive attitude, the Sudanese delegation would unhesitatingly follow it.

20. Mr. DJERDJA (Yugoslavia) also stated that the active part he had taken in drawing up the draft resolution in no way prejudiced the attitude of the Yugoslav delegation with regard to the draft declaration which was to be debated in plenary session. The draft resolution before the Committee was of great importance, since if it were put into effect, the progress of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would be accelerated. It would not in any way hamper the efforts of its sponsors to obtain even more radical decisions in plenary session.

21. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) felt that the fact that a number of delegations had wished to express their views proved the importance of the problem facing the Committee. Although no formal proposal had been made for postponing the examination of the draft resolution, the new factors introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union in his statement supported the opinion of those delegations which were in favour of adjourning the debate, and he therefore hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would change their attitude.

22. Mr. CABA (Guinea) defined the position of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Having noted once again that the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories had never been associated in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and that the Administering Members continued to speak on behalf of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and, as it were, to commit them in their absence, the sponsors had wished to submit a draft resolution recommending that genuine representatives of the dependent territories should be admitted as observers to meetings of United Nations bodies.

23. Certain delegations had asserted that the draft resolution, if it were adopted, might be superseded by a decision of the General Assembly with regard to the declaration on the granting of independence. The delegation of Guinea would spare no effort in plenary session to obtain the liberation of the colonial Territories before the end of 1961. Since, however, it felt no certainty that the Administering Members would comply with the desire of the General Assembly and liberate the Territories they occupied, it had decided to sponsor draft resolution A/C.4/L.639/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 with a view to the immediate participation of the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, even before their liberation, in the work of the United Nations for the purpose of helping to prepare them for independence. Hence there was no fundamental opposition between the draft resolution before the Committee and the draft declaration on the granting of independence; on the contrary, the adoption of the former would assist the General Assembly to decide its attitude with regard to the latter. As the Administering Members would undoubtedly do their utmost to postpone the debate in plenary session to as late a date as possible, he asked that the Committee proceed immediately to examine the substance of the draft resolution.

24. The CHAIRMAN stated that in the absence of any formal proposal for the adjournment of the debate, the Committee should resume its discussion of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) observed that all the arguments advanced during the procedural debate showed that the members of the Committee realized the close relationship between the draft resolution before the Committee and the draft declaration on the granting of independence which, in the agenda, had been allocated to plenary meeting. He therefore wondered whether the Committee would not be exceeding its powers by assuming the right, which was within the competence of the President of the General Assembly under rule 41 of the rules of procedure, to co-ordinate its work with that of the General Assembly in plenary session and by continuing its examination of the draft resolution.

26. The CHAIRMAN replied that rule 41 concerned the functions of the General Committee. That Committee had reached no decision, and was unlikely to reach one, on the problem facing the Fourth Committee. There could be no doubt that it was for the Fourth Committee alone to fix the date at which it wished to examine the items allocated to it by the General Committee.

27. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) recognized the importance of the information provided by the USSR representative and the explanations given by the Chairman. Nevertheless, as the representative of Guinea had pointed out, the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was of a general character, whereas the draft resolution before the Committee related to a specific subject; no matter what decision was reached by the General Assembly with regard to the draft declaration, the steps proposed in the draft resolution would continue to be fully valid. It was therefore essential for them to be considered, and he formally proposed that the Committee should continue with the discussion of all draft resolutions of a specific character which might be submitted to it.

28. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) recalled the proposal made by him at the previous meeting under which the Rapporteur, after the adoption of one or more of the draft resolutions, would be asked not to submit his report to the General Assembly until the latter had come to a decision on the question of colonialism. If the Iranian proposal were adopted, that suggestion might be borne in mind.

29. He recalled further that the fact of his delegation being among the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee, or of any other draft resolutions which might be submitted to the Committee, in no way prejudiced the attitude which his delegation would adopt in the General Assembly in connexion with the problem of colonialism.

30. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that he was in complete agreement with the representative of Venezuela. There was no conflict between that representative's suggestion and his own proposal, and the Committee would be well advised, after adopting the draft resolution, to await the decision of the General Assembly on the whole problem of colonialism in order not to influence its work.

31. Mr. Zaid RIFAI (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said he was unable to understand how the Committee could vote on a formal proposal to continue its work, which would be the normal procedure, in the absence of any formal proposal to adjourn the debate.

32. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) agreed with the representative of Jordan. There was no point in making a formal proposal that the Committee should continue its work. In raising the question which had provoked such a lengthy procedural debate, the Bulgarian delegation had not intended to cause any delay, however slight, in the Committee's work.

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the substance of the draft resolution immediately, on the understanding that the Rapporteur would not submit a report on those items of the agenda before the General Assembly had

taken a final decision on the draft declaration of the granting of independence.

34. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) wished to assure all the representatives who had criticized his interpretation of the draft resolution submitted that he had never intended to question their motives. He was willing to believe that they saw no inconsistency in asking the General Assembly to do away with the colonial régime and at the same time asking the Fourth Committee to take measures which presupposed the maintenance of that régime for a further period. Nevertheless he thought that he was fully entitled, if such was his opinion, to maintain that there was a flagrant inconsistency. Indeed, if there were none, why should the Committee delay the submission of its report and wait for the General Assembly to take a decision on the draft declaration on the granting of independence?

35. He drew the Committee's attention to the amendment he had submitted (A/C.4/L.642) to the draft resolution under consideration.

36. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said she was glad that the Philippine representative had submitted an amendment to the draft resolution because by so doing he implied his ultimate approval of the purposes of its sponsors. The twenty-one Powers had considered the amendment unnecessary, however, because clearly the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories wishing to participate in the work of the international organizations could hardly expect to be allowed to speak on questions which were not of direct concern to their Territories. Moreover, operative paragraph 3 provided that the participation of those representatives should be in accordance with the constitution of the organ concerned, which surely implied that in organs like the Economic Commission for Africa they would not enjoy the right to vote.

37. Mr. Zaid RIFAI (Jordan) said that as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution he interpreted the draft resolution quite differently from the Philippine representative. The latter could hardly complain that the sponsors of the draft had been unco-operative since they had accepted one of the suggestions that he had put forward at the meeting of sponsors. It was for them alone to decide as to the best way of drafting their text.

38. Mr. Najmudine RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said that in co-sponsoring the draft resolution the delegation of the United Arab Republic had not wished to give the impression that it foresaw a prolongation of the colonial régime in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. On the contrary, it was convinced that the General Assembly would do everything in its power to hasten the end of that system of domination. Pending that happy event, however, the Fourth Committee should continue to supervise the development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to take constructive measures to enable them to achieve the objectives enunciated in the Charter. For the reasons set forth very clearly by the representatives of Yugoslavia and Guinea, he hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

39. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his country attached great importance to participation by representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Terri-

tories in the work of the international organizations. Sierra Leone, Singapore and the Federation of the West Indies, for example, were associate members of UNESCO, and Mauritius and Tanganyika intended to become members. Representatives of several Territories had also taken part as members of the United Kingdom delegation in various meetings on questions of particular concern to them, such as the meeting of ministers and directors of education in tropical Africa, held in February 1960, and the conference on the access of women to education, held in May 1960. Some Territories under United Kingdom administration were associate members of IMCO, ITU, FAO and WHO. They had also taken part in the work of the ILO in the manner provided for by its Constitution, in other words, they had sent tripartite observer delegations to the International Labour Conference or participated in its regional conferences, or they had become members of the advisory committees. Brunei, Hong Kong, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore were associate members of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, while the Federation of the West Indies and British Guiana were associate members of the Economic Commission for Latin America. Gambia, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Kenya, Zanzibar and Tanganyika were associate members of the Economic Commission for Africa; in addition, the United Kingdom intended to request associate membership in that Commission for the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland. He thought that the Territories had already played a very useful part in such organizations and had themselves undoubtedly gained a great deal from their co-operation in the various projects undertaken. Lastly, since the Charter made no provision for associate membership in the United Nations, the United Kingdom had included representatives of such Non-Self-Governing Territories as Nigeria before its independence, and Sierra Leone, in the United Kingdom delegation in order to enable them to take part in the work of the United Nations.

40. The United Kingdom delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution which had been submitted provided it was left as it now stood. It considered that the Philippine amendment served no purpose, for the reasons explained by the Liberian representative.

41. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) recalled that his delegation as well as the delegation of Ghana had already stressed in the Committee on Information the need for fuller participation by the indigenous inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the preparation and execution of development plans in order to ensure not only their technical but also their psychological success. His delegation had also hoped that qualified representatives of the indigenous peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would take a direct part in the work of United Nations organs. Having noted with satisfaction that such participation had become possible now that the majority of the specialized agencies had revised their constitutions to that effect, his delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution, wishing thereby to stress the urgency of the measures advocated. It was high time for the administering Powers to include in their delegations, not only, as in the past, the administrators of the Territories, however useful their participation and their advice might be, but also the indigenous inhabitants, the duly qualified representatives of the peoples of the Territories. That was essential if the Territories were to be able to play an active part in the international organizations after they had attained independence, and it applied to all Non-Self-Governing Territories, whether under Portuguese or United Kingdom administration. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution unanimously and that all the Administering Members would put it into effect, thus proving the complete sincerity of their statements.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.