



C O N T E N T S

	Page
Agenda item 31:	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Information on economic conditions;	} 177
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) Transmission of information;	
(d) Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories	
Statement by the representative of Denmark concerning agenda item 32 (a).....	182

Chairman: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2651, A/2652, A/2653, A/2654 and Add.1 to 3, A/2655, A/2656, A/2657 and Add.1 to 4, A/2658, A/2729) (*continued*):

- (a) **Information on economic conditions;**
- (b) **Information on other conditions;**
- (c) **Transmission of information;**
- (d) **Participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO (A/C.4/L.346, A/C.4/L.349) (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to resume their consideration of document A/C.4/L.346.
2. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) thought that the draft resolution was somewhat premature and that a better time to submit it would have been after the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had been renewed. He realized, however, that the resolution might form a good basis of discussion at the Committee's next session. He would also have preferred paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution to include a broader proposal for improvement of the Standard Form.
3. Subject to those considerations, and to the amendment proposed by the representative of Venezuela at

the previous meeting, he would vote for the draft resolution.

4. Mr. CLAREY (Australia) observed that the Australian delegation had consistently held the view that the United Nations had no right of supervision over the Territories covered by Chapter XI and that the United Nations could not therefore consider those Territories in detail, or make recommendations on conditions in them.

5. In General Assembly resolution 332 (IV), adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions, the General Assembly had clearly recognized that recommendations might be made relating to functional fields generally but not with respect to individual Territories. A similar recognition of the limits of the functions of the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter, which had preceded the present Committee on Information, had been made as early as the second session of the General Assembly (resolution 146 (II)).

6. The draft resolution now before the Committee departed from the principles he had stated. If the intention was to avoid the difficulty rightly raised by many representatives that certain general recommendations were not applicable to certain Territories, the draft resolution was not the proper method of dealing with the problem. The division of Territories into regions or groups was a difficult matter in itself and could in many cases be achieved only by isolating one or two Territories, with the result that recommendations would be made concerning those individual Territories. That had virtually been admitted by the Syrian representative in his statement introducing the draft resolution at the previous meeting. The Australian delegation felt that the draft resolution represented an attempt to broaden the scope and functions of the Committee on Information so that it could make detailed studies of conditions in individual Territories. From there to supervision as it existed under the International Trusteeship System was but a short step; the Australian delegation could not support any proposal which would facilitate or lead to such supervision, which was not provided for in Chapter XI. On grounds of general principle, he would therefore oppose the draft resolution. At the same time he would take the opportunity of commenting on certain points in its text.

7. Paragraph 1 of the operative part appeared to represent a clear decision to amend drastically the terms of reference of the Committee on Information. Its wording seemed to preclude the Committee on Information from expressing any opinion on the principle of a regional or group approach to the Non-Self-Governing Territories or on whether such an approach was feasible. On those grounds alone the Fourth Committee would do well to give the question further consideration.

8. With reference to paragraph 2, he considered that the Administering Members were themselves able to provide any available information and that the Standard Form had little relevance in that connexion.
9. He could see little purpose in paragraph 3, since the Committee on Information would automatically give full consideration to the views expressed in the Fourth Committee.
10. He wondered whether the General Assembly should at the present time give consideration to so far-reaching a principle. The appropriate time to discuss the Committee's terms of reference would be at the Assembly's tenth session when it would be considering whether to extend the life of the Committee. He asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to defer their proposal until the following year.
11. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had as yet formulated no view on the future of the Committee on Information and felt that it would be premature to do so at the present stage. He would, however, vote against the draft resolution for two reasons. First, in effect it prejudged a matter that had not been settled. Paragraph 1 of the operative part requested the Committee on Information to consider, not whether it was to undertake a certain task, but how it was to carry out that task. He would have voted against the draft resolution for that reason alone, since that paragraph would commit his Government to an assumption which it was not ready to accept. Secondly, the draft resolution would clearly extend the Committee's present terms of reference. His delegation had always made it clear that in its view even the existing terms of reference exceeded the provisions of the Charter.
12. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) asked the sponsors of the draft resolution whether they would be willing to replace the expression "concerning particular regions or groups of Territories", in operative paragraph 1, by "concerning the specific problems common to particular regions or groups of Territories". Subject to that amendment, he would vote for the draft resolution.
13. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that his delegation would take no part in the discussion or vote. If the draft resolution were adopted, his Government would be obliged to consider whether or not to continue its collaboration with the Committee on Information.
14. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) said that he would vote for the draft resolution.
15. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that the object of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been that, at the tenth session, the Fourth Committee should have some basis of discussion when devising new terms of reference for the Committee on Information. As he had already said, his delegation felt that the approach in future should be based not on general studies with regard to functional fields as they covered all the Non-Self-Governing Territories, but on problems as they existed in those Territories on the basis of common factors in certain regions. That method was used in connexion with the Trust Territories, and conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be studied on a similar basis.
16. He did not agree with the United Kingdom representative that the draft resolution would extend the Committee's present terms of reference. All that was being done was to suggest future terms of reference for the Committee if it should be re-established.
17. In reply to the representative of Australia, and in order to meet his objection to paragraph 1 of the operative part, he would be ready to delete "the manner in which" and replace it by "whether".
18. He agreed to the amendment proposed by the Lebanese representative.
19. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would vote for the draft resolution.
20. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had been much impressed by the remarks made during the 412th and 413th meetings by the representatives of Australia and Denmark about the relative validity of recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Information with regard to certain Territories and certain regions. There was undoubtedly a gap which ought to be filled as soon as possible. He thought the draft resolution would serve that purpose and felt that its very lack of precision might enable it to obtain greater support. He would therefore vote for the draft resolution.
21. Mr. HARARI (Israel) said that he would vote for the draft resolution. He could not see that it exceeded the provisions of the Charter or extended the Committee's rights. It should in fact be of assistance to the Administering Members themselves in the debates on the various problems that arose.
22. Mr. KHADRA (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution, hoped that the United States representative had had time to reconsider his attitude as expressed at the previous meeting.
23. In reply to the objection that the draft resolution was outside the scope of the Committee's terms of reference, he pointed out that since the Committee on Information had been created by the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee could widen its terms of reference if it so wished; that was what the draft resolution was designed to do. The fact that the Committee's term of office would expire in 1955 had no bearing on the subject. The Committee's usefulness was generally acknowledged and it was to be hoped that its life would be extended indefinitely. The conference to review the Charter would give an opportunity to remove all doubts with regard to the constitutionality of the Committee and it could then be put on a permanent basis.
24. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece) said that he would vote for the draft resolution.
25. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) did not agree that the draft resolution would change the Committee's terms of reference; it merely tried to ensure that when the question of the Committee's future was studied the following year the Fourth Committee would be in a better position to reach a decision.
26. On that understanding, and subject to acceptance of the Venezuelan amendment, he would vote for the draft resolution.
27. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that, with a view to allaying certain apprehensions that had been expressed, he would agree to the amendments to paragraph 1 of the operative part proposed by the representatives of Syria and Lebanon.
28. With regard to certain remarks that had been made in the course of the debate, no committee's terms of reference were immutable; it was for the General Assembly to consider whether the time had come to revise the terms of reference of any of its committees.

29. Mr. CLAREY (Australia) thanked the representatives of Syria and Thailand for their conciliatory approach to the questions he had raised. However, while the suggestions they had made improved paragraph 1 of the operative part, unfortunately they did not overcome the Australian delegation's vital problem—the question of principle as to whether or not any discussion dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories on a regional basis would lead to individual comparisons or to dealing with individual Territories.

30. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that the substitution of the word "whether" for "the manner in which" in paragraph 1 of the operative part fundamentally changed the entire question. As originally drafted, the paragraph had assumed that the principle was acceptable and had merely asked the Committee on Information to study how its work should be carried out. By the introduction of "whether", it was asked to decide the principle first. The answer, in that case, would undoubtedly be in the negative and the whole purpose of the draft resolution would be defeated, since the Committee on Information could only decide that the matter was outside its competence. Consequently, if the word "whether" was adopted, he would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

31. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation's main objection to the draft resolution was that it was premature. The future of the Committee on Information would be discussed at the tenth session of the General Assembly and that would be the proper time to discuss its terms of reference. With regard to the contention—in his view erroneous—that the draft resolution did not extend the Committee's terms of reference, if that was really the case, the Committee would have no authority to make the proposed study and, as the Iraqi representative had said, it would have no alternative but to agree that the matter was outside its competence. For those reasons and the reasons advanced by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution if it were put to the vote, but he appealed to the sponsors to agree that final action should be postponed until the following session of the General Assembly. Otherwise, every Administering Member would have to vote against the draft resolution, a fact which should give the sponsors of the draft resolution food for thought. It was a further argument in favour of postponing the vote.

32. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Iraqi representative that it was open to question whether the Committee on Information could decide the issue of principle raised by the word "whether". He therefore appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to abide by the original text of paragraph 1.

33. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) seconded that appeal. It would be dangerous to the cause of those who advocated the consideration of information and recommendations on a regional basis to leave the decision of principle to the Committee on Information.

34. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) emphasized that his delegation did not question the praiseworthy motives by which the sponsors of the draft resolution had been inspired. It appreciated their efforts to improve the text by eliminating the element of prejudgment. Nevertheless, the proposal was a step towards the discussion of individual Territories, and it would not permit a truly regional approach to eco-

nomic, social and educational problems. He agreed with the New Zealand representative on the advisability of postponing final action until the tenth session of the General Assembly.

35. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) pointed out that the word "whether" would not necessarily limit the Committee on Information to a discussion of principle: if the question of principle was decided in the affirmative, the Committee could go on to a discussion of ways and means. Furthermore, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would ensure that the Committee on Information bore in mind all the points raised in the Fourth Committee. That was why the sponsors of the draft resolution had been willing to introduce the word "whether", in the hope that that would make it possible for the Administering Members to support the proposal. Nevertheless, as it was evident from the Australian representative's statement that that had been a vain hope and as he realized the practical difficulties to which the word "whether" would give rise, he thought it would be better to revert to the original text.

36. He regretted that he was unable to accede to the appeal to defer final action until the tenth session. The fact that the Administering Members could not support the draft resolution scarcely seemed a valid argument in favour of postponement. In fact it would be helpful to all the members of the Fourth Committee, including the administering Powers, to have the results of a preliminary study by the Committee on Information before them at the tenth session when the Committee's terms of reference were discussed.

37. Mr. KHADRA (Saudi Arabia) agreed that there were no grounds for postponement.

38. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) drew attention to a certain inconsistency between the wording of the fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 as a result of the incorporation of the Venezuelan and Lebanese amendments.

39. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) suggested that operative paragraph 1 should be amended to read: "concerning the specific problems common to certain regional groups of Territories", thus combining his amendment and the Venezuelan amendment. The Venezuelan amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble would remain unchanged and operative paragraph 2 would be brought into line with the rest of the text by replacing the words "particular regions or groups of Territories" by the words "certain regional groups of Territories".

40. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) and Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) accepted those suggestions.

The joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.346), as amended, was adopted by 37 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

41. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) explained that he had not participated in the vote because his delegation could not vote on a draft resolution addressed to a committee in whose work it had not participated for two years. The draft resolution implied an obvious extension of the Committee's competence and its adoption would have to be borne in mind by his Government in judging the nature of the Committee's future work.

42. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/L.349, on the voluntary transmission of information on political development, on behalf of its sponsors—Burma, Egypt, Lebanon and the Philip-

pires. He was well aware of the solid opposition which the proposal would encounter in certain quarters. Nevertheless, he considered that even among friends there could be room for honest differences of opinion, in the interest of the basic principles of the Charter. Among those basic principles, his delegation included the so-called sacred trust, the principle of the equal rights of countries to self-determination, and the paramountcy of the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The foreign policy of the Philippines was firmly based upon those principles. He recalled the part played by his Government in connexion with the South-East Asia Collective Defense Treaty, signed by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, which reaffirmed the principle of the right of all nations to self-determination. In the light of those principles, therefore, his delegation had joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.4/L.349.

43. The acceptance of those principles depended ultimately on the interpretation of those provisions of the Charter which related to the competence of the General Assembly in connexion with the administration of the dependent peoples. The Committee had already heard several denials of the right of the United Nations to supervise the administration of dependent peoples. There appeared, however, to be little difference between the concepts of supervision and of accountability. International accountability was the basic philosophy underlying Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter. It was true that there was no provision in Article 73 e for the transmission of political information, but the omission was obviously intended to leave it to the experience and wisdom of the General Assembly to devise a system whereby the principles of the Charter could be observed and implemented. Under Article 73, the Administering Members accepted as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was also implicit in Article 73 that in administering those Territories, the Administering Members should recognize that the interests of the indigenous inhabitants were paramount. A third new principle derived from Article 73: the obligation of the sacred trust ceased to be a mere vague obligation of the civilized world in general and became a national obligation of those Powers which were responsible for administering dependent peoples. All those factors should be borne in mind when considering the competence of the United Nations to supervise the administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

44. He noted that he did not advocate interference by the United Nations in the administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He agreed that the Administering Members alone were responsible for their administration. However, that factor did not preclude the discussion by the General Assembly of political as well as economic, social and educational conditions in those Territories, for political conditions were fundamental to the happiness of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and to the improvement of their standards of living.

45. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter was frequently invoked when the competence of the United Nations to discuss political problems in the dependent territories was disputed. However, it had never been adequately explained how political problems in the Non-Self-Governing Territories could be essentially

within the domestic jurisdiction of the Administering Members. Since the Administering Members had, in Article 73, made the so-called unilateral declaration assuming the three obligations he had outlined, it was hardly conceivable that they should claim subsequently that such matters were essentially within their domestic jurisdiction, particularly in the light of Article 10, which gave the General Assembly the right to discuss any question or any matters within the scope of the Charter.

46. The first and second paragraphs of the preamble to the joint draft resolution were self-evident statements, to which he was sure there could be no objection. The third and fourth paragraphs were also statements of fact: since 1950, only the United States and Denmark had responded to the repeated entreaties of the United Nations for voluntary information on political development, and it was undeniable that co-operation was the moral basis of the United Nations. Paragraph 1 of the operative part reiterated a statement made on three previous occasions in General Assembly resolutions. Paragraph 2 simply invited the Administering Members to co-operate with the United Nations. Paragraph 3 of the operative part merely called on the Committee on Information to be guided accordingly. Since the Committee on Information was an organ of the General Assembly, it would appear to be quite in order for the Assembly to determine its conduct.

47. He felt that the only clause in the joint draft resolution which could possibly give rise to any objections was the invitation to the Administering Members to co-operate with the United Nations. It could hardly be argued, however, that that was an interference in their domestic affairs. The General Assembly would merely propose; the Administering Members would dispose. The adoption of the joint draft resolution would give the Administering Members an opportunity of showing that they practised what they preached. The colonial peoples of Asia and Africa were on the march. Concessions granted to dependent peoples were apt to be too small and to come too late. If the Administering Members were to retain the goodwill of those peoples, who would soon be independent, they must act speedily.

48. He could not understand why, if the Administering Members were willing to supply information on economic, social and educational conditions, they should refuse vigorously and consistently to transmit information on political advancement. It would seem that if all was going well with their implementation of the sacred trust, and development toward self-government was proceeding properly, the political administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories would certainly bear public scrutiny. The refusal to permit such scrutiny implied that all was not well.

49. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) said that he was sympathetically disposed towards the draft resolution. The principle underlying it was logical and legal. Article 73 a made it an obligation for the Administering Members to ensure political as well as economic, social and educational advancement. In promoting the political advancement of a country the ultimate objective must be independence or self-government. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, subject to certain amendments.

50. The phraseology of the first preambular paragraph was rather outdated. It would be enough to

speak of "functions" and "principles"; the adjectives "important" and "lofty" should be deleted.

51. While he understood the spirit behind the fourth paragraph of the preamble, the reference to Charter obligations was in contradiction with the second paragraph of the preamble, which cited a number of General Assembly resolutions expressing the hope that Administering Members would voluntarily transmit information. The fourth paragraph should either be amended or deleted.

52. The third paragraph of the operative part was very vague. If the Committee on Information were to be faced with such instructions, it would not know what was expected of it. The paragraph should be deleted.

53. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) said that he was happy to co-sponsor the draft resolution, which was in keeping with his delegation's views on the responsibilities and competence of the United Nations with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. His delegation's position had been clearly defined in his statement in the general debate (418th meeting). It was quite clear from Article 73 that the principal objective of the sacred trust was to lead the non-self-governing peoples to self-government and political independence. All those who believed in the right of all peoples to freedom and self-determination should support the draft resolution. He assured the Administering Members that his delegation was inspired by the best intentions and the greatest readiness to co-operate with them in carrying out the sacred trust.

54. He had not had time to consider the Mexican suggestions and reserved his right to speak about them later.

55. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that the draft resolution raised two questions. First, there was the problem of the transmission of information of a political nature, a problem on which the French position was well known and unchanged. Secondly, there was the question of the very vague instructions to the Committee on Information in the final paragraph. That paragraph would inevitably lead to new difficulties when the French Government came to consider its participation in the Committee's work.

56. In conclusion he asked for a separate roll-call vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

57. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that his delegation's position on the transmission of political information was well known. It submitted information on United States Territories and felt that other Governments were free to do likewise although the Charter did not call on them to do so. No useful purpose would be served by exhorting the Administering Members further. Hence, he could not support operative paragraph 2. Neither could he accept the incorrect statement in the third paragraph of the preamble. The resolution as a whole implied that the Administering Members were not giving full consideration to previous General Assembly resolutions. He would vote against it.

58. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) said that his delegation was in full agreement with the point of view expressed in the joint draft resolution, because of its belief that information on political advancement in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was necessary to help the General Assembly to evaluate the progress made by the Administering Members in implementing the

provisions of Article 73 b of the Charter. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

59. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation was in agreement with the basic principles of the joint draft resolution. However, it could not accept the terms of the third paragraph of the preamble. The paragraph should be redrafted in order to recognize that in some cases political information had been transmitted, although that information had not in all instances been sufficient.

60. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) also objected to the terms of the third paragraph of the preamble, despite his sympathy with the principles underlying the joint draft resolution. He agreed with the representative of Mexico that the meaning of the last paragraph of the operative part was obscure.

61. Mr. Fida Muhammad KHAN (Pakistan) said that the views of his delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, on the importance of the transmission of political information were well known. The voluntary transmission of such information was in complete conformity with the provisions of Article 73. It would also be in the interests of the Administering Members to let it be known how much they had done to promote the ideals they had accepted. The absence of any such information from official sources meant that the non-administering Powers often had to rely on information from other sources which were not always reliable.

62. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) felt that the wording of the joint draft resolution should be modified. Certain mis-statements and connotations to which objection might be taken should be removed. The third paragraph of the preamble, for example, disregarded the fact that certain Administering Members had voluntarily transmitted political information. The real point was that although some information had been transmitted, more was desired. The fourth paragraph of the preamble, on which the French representative had already called for a separate vote, implied that the Administering Members had not faithfully observed their obligations under the Charter. The obscure last paragraph of the operative part would seem to call upon the Committee on Information, which was a subsidiary technical organ of the General Assembly, to settle a question of political policy which ought to be dealt with by the parent body. He urged the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to consider those points together, with a view to preparing an amended version.

63. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) associated himself with the remarks made by the representatives of Iraq, El Salvador and Yugoslavia in regard to the mis-statement of fact in the third paragraph of the preamble.

64. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the joint draft resolution was in conformity with her delegation's convictions regarding the paramountcy of the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and of the ultimate aim of the Charter in respect of political progress. Her delegation would agree to corrections in the text of the draft resolution which would leave its basic principles unchanged while giving credit to those Administering Members which deserved it.

65. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) sympathized with the statement of principle made by the representative of the Philippines. At the same time he agreed with the representatives of Mexico and Yugoslavia that there were certain shortcomings in the text of the joint draft

resolution. In particular, the last paragraph of the operative part was extremely vague. If the appropriate improvements were made in the text, he would gladly vote in favour of the draft resolution.

66. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) associated himself with the remarks made on the obscurity of the last paragraph of the operative part of the joint draft resolution, and hoped that the sponsors would agree to make certain rectifications in the text along the lines suggested.

Statement by the representative of Denmark concerning agenda item 32 (a)

67. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said that in order to facilitate the study of agenda item 32 (a), dealing with the cessation of transmission of information concerning Greenland, which would be considered by the

Fourth Committee in the near future, the Danish delegation would circulate to the members of the Committee the full *Report on Greenland 1954* published in Copenhagen by the Prime Minister's Greenland Department and submitted to the Secretary-General in accordance with Chapter XI. It would also circulate a publication by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs entitled *Greenland*. Furthermore, it would circulate to any members of the Committee who might be interested a booklet in Danish and Eskimo on the objectives and activities of the United Nations which was being used in study circles and discussion groups in Greenland.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that the documents in question would be circulated to the members of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.