

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 17 November 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. H. LANNUNG (Denmark).

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of the draft resolution concerning publication of information relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories submitted jointly by the delegations of Cuba, Ecuador, and Guatemala (A/C.4/L.40/Rev.1), and of the amendment to that text submitted at the 126th meeting by the delegation of Canada as well as the amendment proposed at the same meeting by the delegation of Cuba.

2. Mr. BENSON (Secretariat) pointed out that in the English text of the Cuban amendment the word "appropriate" should be substituted for the word "necessary". Also, the date on which the General Assembly had adopted resolution 218 (III) should be added at the end of the amendment.

3. Mr. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said that the same corrections as those just indicated for the English text should be incorporated in the French text of his amendment. He would like to make it clear that he had submitted his amendment in a spirit of conciliation and subject to its acceptance by the Administering Powers. He personally would prefer the original text of the joint draft resolution.

4. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) was not satisfied with the expression "if it is deemed appropriate" in the Cuban amendment because the use of the word "deemed" would seem to imply that the Secretary-General was being given responsibility in the matter. It would be contrary to the Committee's desire that the Secretariat should always maintain a neutral attitude. He therefore proposed the substitution for the expression in question of the words "when appropriate".

5. Mr. JOBIM (Brazil) remarked that the substance of the joint draft resolution would be completely changed if the idea contained in the Canadian amendment were introduced, namely, that information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter would be comparable with information published by Member States. He would therefore vote against the draft resolution if it was modified in that way.

6. Moreover, the Brazilian delegation could not accept the Cuban representative's compromise proposal to the effect that the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 218 (III) should be implemented. Data not comparable with each other did not admit of comparison. For example, appropriations in Non-Self-Governing Territories for social, medical or other services could not be compared with appropriations for such services in independent countries since the budget for those latter services supported the heavy expenditure for administration, justice and defence which had to be borne by sovereign States but not by Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, some in-

formation communicated by Member States which the Secretary-General might have to employ in establishing comparisons related to the matters referred to in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter; it could not therefore be used for the purpose suggested. The text of paragraph 3 of resolution 218 (III) was vague and might lend itself to many interpretations. Reliance on the provisions of that paragraph would therefore only complicate the Secretary-General's task.

7. For those reasons he asked that the Cuban amendment should be put to the vote separately. The Brazilian delegation would vote against that amendment and, if it was adopted, against the draft resolution.

8. Mr. FARRAG (Egypt) recalled that he had stated at the previous meeting that the information transmitted under Article 73 e was inaccurate and incomplete. In support of that contention, he read certain passages from the speech made by the representative of the World Health Organization at the 15th meeting of the fourth session of the Trusteeship Council, which showed that the information provided was not comparable from one territory to another because there was no strictly equivalent terminology.¹

9. He then read a statement made by the French representative at the 33rd meeting of the fourth session of the Trusteeship Council to the effect that it was wrong to base one's judgment solely on statistical comparisons; the history of each country must be studied if comparisons were not to lead to absurd conclusions.²

10. The possibility of a comparison should not even have been considered, for inaccurate and incomplete information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter could not be compared with the accurate information communicated by the States Members of the United Nations. For that reason he would vote against the Cuban amendment.

11. Mr. MUGHIR (Syria) opposed the Canadian and Cuban amendments; he would vote against the draft resolution as a whole if those amendments were adopted. The delegation of Syria was of the opinion that the question of the comparison of information should not be considered by the Committee, whose duty was to deal with Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, the adoption of those amendments would make it more difficult to secure a majority for the original joint draft resolution. He therefore suggested that the Cuban representative should withdraw his amendment.

12. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said that after hearing the remarks made by the Egyptian representative, he would like to give a few additional explanations on the subject of the discussion that had taken place in the Trusteeship Council. After the WHO representative had spoken, it had been pointed out that there was no real basis of comparison between the data contained in the various

¹ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council*, fourth session, pages 200 and 201.

² *Ibid.*, page 435.

annual reports of the Administering Authorities, and that it was precisely the task of the specialized agencies, particularly of WHO, to provide each of those Authorities with clear definitions, so that the data would be comparable in the future.

13. Proceeding to consider the Cuban amendment, he remarked that he understood the objection raised against it by the representatives of Egypt and Iraq. Comparison of the information could obviously lead to friction within the Committee. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in 1948 the General Assembly had reaffirmed the position it had adopted on the principle of the matter in 1947. Since resolution 218 (III) was still in force, it seemed difficult to ignore it when requesting the Secretary-General to undertake additional work in the same field as that covered by the draft resolution.

14. Mr. LAURENTIE was not in favour of the joint draft resolution, for in existing conditions it seemed premature. It would probably be very difficult for the Secretary-General to establish guiding principles to assist him in preparing the special studies requested. Mr. Laurentie thought that he should be requested to make, not special studies, but a study of all the factors of the question under discussion. Such a study would enable the Committee to take a decision with a full knowledge of the case at its following session.

15. Mr. LAURENTIE thought that the Canadian proposal was the most satisfactory, and regretted that the Committee had not considered it at greater length. If the joint draft resolution was not amended, he would have to vote against it.

16. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that the Cuban representative's intention in submitting his amendment had been to obtain the largest possible number of votes for the joint draft resolution. Unfortunately, the Administering Powers had not responded to his conciliatory gesture and had not expressed their opinion on his amendment. Some had even rejected it. It was therefore obvious that it had had the opposite effect to that expected and Mr. Mendoza wondered whether the Cuban representative should not withdraw it.

17. The Guatemalan delegation would vote against the Canadian amendment, for it considered that the Committee should not go beyond the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 218 (III).

18. Mr. MENDOZA recalled that the Administering Powers had, in the past, rejected a proposal that living conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be compared with those in the metropolitan territories. It was therefore obvious that States which did not administer Non-Self-Governing Territories could not admit a proposal that information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be compared with official information communicated to the United Nations by sovereign States.

19. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) said that it was his delegation which had suggested that the Cuban representative should submit an amendment taking into account the wishes expressed by the United Kingdom representative. The debate had shown that the Administering Powers were not willing to accept that amendment or to vote for the joint draft resolution. In those conditions, since the object was to obtain the greatest possible

majority, he asked whether the Cuban representative would agree to withdraw his amendment.

20. Mr. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) regretted that his efforts at conciliation had been in vain and, in compliance with the suggestion of the Mexican and Guatemalan representatives, withdrew his amendment.

21. Mr. FAHY (United States of America) wished to remind the Cuban representative that the United States delegation had expressed its opinion on the Cuban amendment as soon as it had been submitted. The United States representative had said that it was particularly suitable, for it presented the question in the most appropriate form. He had added that he would prefer it to the Canadian amendment and hoped that it would be adopted.

22. He pointed out that the withdrawal of the Cuban amendment did not in any way alter the situation, for the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 218 (III) enabled the Secretary-General to follow precisely the procedure suggested by the Cuban amendment.

23. Mr. HARMAN (Israel) said he would have voted for the Cuban amendment, which would have given the draft resolution more weight and added interest. In fact, the question of economic, social and cultural development concerned all countries, whatever their status. The comparison of statistical information could only serve the general interest, for it was undeniable that the experience acquired in certain countries was useful to all those who had similar problems to solve.

24. As the Cuban amendment had been withdrawn, the delegation of Israel would vote for the Canadian amendment.

25. Major-General BURNS (Canada) said that he would have withdrawn his delegation's amendment if the Cuban amendment had been maintained, and that he would have voted for the latter.

26. He regretted that the attempt at conciliation made by the Cuban and Mexican representatives had not met with success.

27. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) expressed his regret that he had not had an earlier opportunity of expressing his opinion on the Cuban amendment, which had now been withdrawn.

28. The Cuban representative had considered it necessary to remind the Secretariat in his draft resolution of its obligation to publish the summaries and analyses in all the working languages, although that was already provided for in a separate resolution of the General Assembly. Similarly, Mr. Fletcher-Cooke felt it necessary to remind the Secretariat of the need for including comparable material, although that too was already covered by a separate resolution of the Assembly.

29. He did not think that the Cuban amendment, since withdrawn, was precise enough on that point, and he preferred, and would vote for, the Canadian amendment. In any case, although the Cuban amendment had been withdrawn, and whether the Canadian amendment was accepted or not, he agreed with the United States representative that paragraph 3 of resolution 218 (III) was still in force and should not be overlooked.

30. He appreciated the efforts at conciliation made by the Mexican representative, who would have liked the position of the Administering Powers to be taken into account.

31. In the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation, the Canadian amendment was more precise than the Cuban amendment. It would vote for the former and would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

32. The United Kingdom delegation was glad to note the observation of the Egyptian representative, who had said that all States Members communicated complete and accurate information while the same could not be said of the Administering Powers in regard to the information transmitted for Non-Self-Governing Territories.

33. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to take a decision on the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Ecuador and Guatemala (A/C.4/L.40/Rev.1). He recalled that the Committee also had before it a proposal submitted by the USSR delegation at the 126th meeting to the effect that the second paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, as well as the Canadian amendment.

34. He put to the vote the USSR proposal that the second paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 17 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Canadian amendment.

At the request of the New Zealand representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Union of South Africa, Venezuela.

The Canadian amendment was rejected by 24 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution of the delegations of Cuba, Ecuador and Guatemala (A/C.4/L.40/Rev.1).

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Belgium, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

37. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) explained that he had voted against the Canadian amendment because the proposed comparisons would have been made practically obligatory. If the Cuban amendment had been put to the vote, he would have voted for it, since it did not have the obligatory character of the Canadian amendment.

38. The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted by the Australian delegation on information on technical assistance accorded to Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/L.43).

39. Mr. HOOD (Australia) pointed out that the Australian delegation had submitted a similar draft resolution in the Special Committee, which had not been able to give its views on the matter because certain delegations had asked for more time to study the draft and its implications. The Australian delegation had informed the Special Committee that it would submit its draft direct to the Fourth Committee.

40. He thought that that draft resolution should be considered as an appropriate supplement to the draft resolution adopted by the Committee on international collaboration in regard to economic, social and cultural conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

41. The purpose of the text was to draw attention to resolution 200 (III) of the General Assembly establishing an expanded programme of technical assistance and to the decision of the Economic and Social Council¹ to authorize the Secretary-General to enter into negotiations with appropriate officers of inter-governmental regional organizations with a view to ensuring the desirable co-ordination for the carrying out of technical assistance activities. The operative part of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to keep the Special Committee informed of the nature of the technical assistance which was accorded from time to time to Non-Self-Governing Territories by international instrumentalities.

42. He stated that the last two words of the text should be replaced by the phrase "specialized international bodies", since those terms were used in Article 73 d of the Charter.

43. He recalled that during the fifth session of the Trusteeship Council, the representatives of the Administering Authorities had described the difficulties with which they were confronted in ensuring the services of specialists in certain fields, especially in the fields of health and economic development. The Administering Powers were confronted with similar difficulties with regard to the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

44. Technical assistance afforded to Non-Self-Governing Territories would help the Administering Powers to achieve the purposes of Chapter XI of the Charter and would best serve the

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, Fourth year, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 1, resolution 222 (IX) B, page 15.

interests of the populations of those territories. The satisfactory conclusion of the recent work of the Second Committee on the question of technical assistance warranted the statement that the implementation of the provisions of the Australian draft resolution would not give rise to any difficulties.

45. He considered that if the draft resolution submitted by his delegation was adopted, it would contribute, together with the draft resolutions already adopted by the Fourth Committee, to rendering the task of the Special Committee more constructive and effective.

46. Mr. JOBIM (Brazil) wished to stress two points in particular. In the first place, it was quite clear to all members of the Fourth Committee that the Administering Powers had the real responsibility for the economic and social development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In the second place, those Powers might resort to the assistance provided for in the programmes drawn up and approved by the Organization if their means were insufficient to ensure the satisfactory development, in certain fields, of the territories for which they were responsible. Nevertheless, there was no reason to expect that the Administering Powers would resort extensively to the assistance of the Organization, since that would in a sense be a confession of weakness, and would cast doubt on their capacity to carry out the obligations they had assumed under Articles 73 and 76 of the Charter.

47. Moreover, the European Administering Powers had, through the agency of the Marshall Plan, benefited most largely by the international assistance so far accorded and that had given them some help in promoting the development of the territories they administered. In that connexion, he pointed out that the sum of 8 million dollars reserved under the Marshall Plan for technical assistance greatly exceeded the total credits provided for that purpose by the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

48. Thus, if it was decided to give regular United Nations technical assistance to the Non-Self-Governing Territories while those territories already enjoyed greater facilities procured for them by the Powers that administered them, a spirit of dependence would be encouraged that would be contrary to the fundamental principles of the Charter. He was sure that all the members of the Committee realized the necessity of avoiding any competition between the assistance provided by the United Nations and that which the Non-Self-Governing Territories received from the Administering Powers.

49. The distribution of the slender resources at the disposal of the United Nations would obviously not be an easy task, owing to the large number of requests for assistance that had been received. It was for the Economic and Social Council to avoid any overlapping, so that existing resources might be used to the best advantage.

50. The Brazilian delegation had no objection to make with regard to the Australian draft resolution, since it was a sincere and constructive effort to promote the co-ordination necessary in the existing circumstances.

51. Mr. FAHY (United States of America) considered that international co-operation in the field

of technical assistance might be extremely useful. He thought that both the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the sovereign States should benefit by the advantages of such assistance, for that would be in the spirit of the Charter. The regional economic Commissions might study with advantage the assistance requirements in the areas with which they were respectively concerned. He thought it would be desirable to keep the Special Committee informed of the nature of the technical assistance received by the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He would therefore support the Australian draft resolution.

52. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) stated that he could not vote for the Australian draft resolution. The United Kingdom delegation considered that the adoption of such a resolution would give the Special Committee functions which would go far beyond the basic provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. It was the responsibility of the Administering Powers themselves without the interposition of the Special Committee to formulate requests for technical assistance for the Non-Self-Governing Territories to any organization which might be established for the provision of such assistance. Moreover, he could not agree with the Brazilian representative, who had stated that the Administering Powers would be admitting failure if they asked the United Nations for technical assistance for their Non-Self-Governing Territories. He pointed out that the Administering Powers had been engaged in the administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and had promoted their development long before the United Nations had been established. That task had not been entrusted to the Administering Powers by the United Nations as was sometimes suggested.

53. Mr. MUGHIR (Syria) realized the difficulties confronting the Administering Powers and considered that technical assistance should be provided on a world-wide scale without discrimination of any kind. The Syrian delegation would vote for the Australian draft resolution.

54. Mr. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) stated that he would vote for the Australian draft resolution. Nevertheless, he suggested that it might be desirable to add the words "and results" after the words "of the nature" in the last paragraph of that text.

55. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) unreservedly supported the Australian draft resolution, because it was designed to bring about an effective improvement of the situation prevailing in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He also supported the suggestion just made by the Cuban representative.

56. Mr. HOOD (Australia) thought it would be better if the representatives of Cuba and Guatemala did not insist on the addition of the words they proposed in the last paragraph of the draft resolution. He considered it was perhaps still too early to speak of the results of technical assistance, for it might not be possible to evaluate them for several years. From the practical point of view, therefore, he thought it would be better to keep to the text as it stood.

57. Mr. PÉREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) stated, in reply to the Australian representative, that he had no intention of insisting on the amendment he

had proposed. He admitted that it was perhaps not necessary that the Special Committee should be informed of the results of technical assistance, especially since those results might not be perceptible in the coming year. He would like, nevertheless, to make it clear that his delegation reserved the right to raise the question again at the following session of the General Assembly.

58. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) thought the Australian draft resolution deserved consideration. He recalled that the Lebanese delegation had always supported the idea of technical assistance both in the Second Committee and in the Economic and Social Council. That was why it would vote for the Australian draft resolution.

59. Mr. Shiva RAO (India) said he would vote for the Australian draft resolution in accordance with the opinion he had already expressed in the Special Committee. He recalled that there already existed considerable international collaboration in technical assistance, collaboration which was largely due to the initiative taken by the Administering Powers themselves. He considered that it would be useful and instructive to be kept informed of the nature and scope of technical assistance to Non-Self-Governing Territories, whatever the international organs that rendered such assistance. If the Special Committee was kept informed, all possibility of duplication would be avoided, for the Special Committee would not draw the attention of the specialized agencies to questions with which they had already been dealing.

60. Mr. FARRAG (Egypt) said he would vote for the Australian draft resolution.

61. The CHAIRMAN put the Australian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.43/Rev.1) to the vote.

The Australian draft resolution was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

62. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) explained that the French delegation had abstained from voting, not because it disapproved of the content of the draft resolution as a whole, but because the last para-

graph mentioned the Special Committee, in regard to which the French delegation had already made the most express reservations.

63. Mr. DE BRUYNE (Belgium) said that he had also abstained from voting for the same reason as that just given by the French representative.

64. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) drew the Committee's attention to an Associated Press cable published on 6 November in the Press in America announcing that the Government of the United Kingdom was about to complete its arrangements for the federation of its possessions in the area of the West Indies, including British Honduras. He recalled that as early as 1945 the Government of Guatemala had made official protests with regard to the Territory of Belizé (British Honduras), the sovereignty of which was disputed. Until the dispute had been settled, the Government of Guatemala could not accept the modification of that territory's status by a unilateral decision.

65. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had not the slightest doubt as to its sovereignty over British Honduras and he fully reserved the United Kingdom Government's position in the matter.

66. The CHAIRMAN noted that the consideration of item 3 of the Fourth Committee's agenda was almost completed. It remained for the Committee to adopt its report on that item, but the draft report would not be ready for some days. He therefore proposed that the Committee should proceed immediately to the consideration of item 4 of the agenda, namely, the question of South West Africa.

67. Mr. Shiva RAO (India) thought it would be better not to begin consideration of item 4 at once, as delegations needed time to prepare for the discussion. Such a procedure was customary in all United Nations organs. He therefore proposed the adjournment of the meeting in accordance with rule 108 of the rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 18 November 1949, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. H. LANNUNG (Denmark).

Question of South West Africa: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/929, A/933, A/962)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would begin its discussion of the fourth item on its agenda — the question of South West Africa. The relevant documents were the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/933), a letter dated 11 July 1949 to the Secretary-General from Mr. J. R. Jordaan, deputy permanent representative of the Union of South Africa (A/929) and a note by the Secretary-General (A/962). The Committee also had before it a draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation (A/C.4/L.53).

2. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) said that, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 227 (III), the Trusteeship Council had been requested to examine such information on the administration of South West Africa as the Government of the Union of South Africa might continue to supply. At the 27th meeting of its fifth session the Trusteeship Council had discussed the communication from the Government of the Union of South Africa indicating its decision to discontinue the submission of reports on South West Africa. At that meeting the Council had adopted resolution 111 (V) noting that the South African Government had given effect to its intention to bring about a closer association between South