

to the economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories concerned (other than trust territories).

The First Part of the General Assembly in London had adopted a resolution on non-self-governing territories which included a direction to the Secretary-General that information received in respect of such territories should be summarized and presented to the next meeting of the Assembly.

Prior to the New York meeting, the Secretary-General had circularized all States administering territories which might be regarded as non-self-governing, inquiring what factors should, in their opinion, be taken into account in defining the term "non-self-government" and whether there were any such territories under their control in respect of which they proposed to submit information.

The reply transmitted by the Government of New Zealand expressed the opinion that an attempt to define non-self-governing territories raised problems of such a nature that it would be extremely difficult to arrive at any satisfactory formal definition. The New Zealand Government proposed in any event that it would regard the Tokelau Islands as coming within the category of non-self-governing territories. Moreover, believing that the fullest possible information about economic and social conditions would be valuable to the United Nations, the Government were willing, without prejudice to any interpretation which might be placed on the term "non-self-governing territories," to submit data in respect of the Cook Islands which are constitutionally an integral part of New Zealand.¹

The sub-committee was confronted with two main issues—first, to consider in the light of the replies received from member Governments whether it was necessary or desirable that the term "non-self-governing territories" be defined, and secondly, to recommend what action, if any, should be taken by the Assembly on the summaries prepared by the Secretary-General.

On the first issue it was apparent from the various replies and from the debate in the sub-committee that a definition of the term which would be generally accepted would be extremely difficult to settle, and would, it seemed, serve little purpose. The Governments concerned had interpreted it very liberally in relation to their own territories, thus indicating a desire to co-operate to the fullest extent with the General Assembly in supplying the information desired. It was quite apparent that the immediate result of any attempt to force a definition might well be to discourage some States from continuing to send information.

The discussion on the second issue revealed fundamental differences of opinion in the sub-committee as to the implications of Chapter XI. Several delegations were of the opinion that the proper body to consider the information was the Trusteeship Council, their view being based

¹ Information concerning Western Samoa, which is a trust territory, is sent annually to the Trusteeship Council.