



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fifth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 5 February 1960,
at 2.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Administrative Unions affecting Trust Territories: report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions</i>	31
<i>Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (concluded)</i>	31
<i>Appointment of the members of the Standing Committee on Petitions</i>	32
<i>Appointment of the members of the Committee on Classification of Communications</i>	32
<i>Examination of petitions (continued)</i>	32
<i>Organization of the work of the twenty-sixth session</i>	33

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories: report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions

[Agenda item 7]

1. Mr. BACON (United States of America), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, had no formal report to present to the Trusteeship Council but referred the Council to the record of the Committee's last meeting (T/C.1/SR.135). At that meeting, the Committee had decided not to consider administrative unions affecting Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration at the present session if the Trusteeship Council decided to defer consideration of conditions in those two Territories. The Council had taken that decision at its preceding meeting.

2. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with regret that there was no report from the Standing Committee. It was surprising that the Committee's decision had been taken before that of the Council. He expressed the hope that in future the Committee would take its responsibilities more seriously and would devote the necessary attention to the

problem of administrative unions, the importance of which was repeatedly stressed by the Council.

3. The PRESIDENT took it that the Council approved the Standing Committee's recommendation not to consider administrative unions affecting Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration at the present session.

It was so decided.

Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1503) (concluded)*

[Agenda item 2]

4. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Government Territories) announced that the Secretary-General had just received a telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. Paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report (T/1503) should therefore be deleted and the representative of the Soviet Union should be included in the list of representatives in paragraph 2 of the report which the Secretariat had not had time to revise.

5. Mr. HOOD (Australia) proposed that the Council should approve the Secretary-General's report.

6. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the only legitimate representative of China on the Trusteeship Council and on all the other United Nations organs could only be the representative appointed by the Government of the Chinese People's Republic. His delegation therefore did not recognize the credentials of the followers of Chiang Kai-shek and asked for a separate vote on them. He would vote against the acceptance of those credentials and would abstain on the report as a whole.

7. Mr. KIANG (China) said that the USSR representative's remarks were out of order. The Government of the Republic of China was the only freely and legitimately constituted Government and the only one which could speak on behalf of the Chinese people in the United Nations. The regime of tyranny in favour of which the USSR representative had just spoken had been condemned by the United Nations.

8. The PRESIDENT pointed out that only the accredited representatives of Governments recognized by the United Nations had seats on the Council and he asked the members of the Council to show restraint in their remarks.

9. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that so far during the present session all the members of the Council has shown restraint. With regard to the malicious and slanderous statement which was made against the great Chinese People's Republic and its people, he thought the person who

* Resumed from the 1044th meeting.

made such a statement did not even deserve to have these slanders and these evident lies refuted.

10. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) felt that the Secretary-General's report could not properly be voted on by division; he moved that the USSR proposal should be put to the vote.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 4.

11. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1503).

The report was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

12. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his delegation had voted in favour of a separate vote on part of the report because that procedure was legitimate, as the credentials were issued in respect of individual delegations and not in respect of all delegations together as a whole; furthermore, that procedure had been followed at the twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Council. His delegation had voted in favour of the report as a whole, but he wished to state that his Government recognized the Government of the Chinese People's Republic as the only Government of China and that, in its view, only that Government was qualified to accredit representatives to the United Nations. His vote in favour of the report was subject to that reservation.

13. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) made the same reservations regarding the credentials of the representative of China.

14. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) regretted that the USSR proposal had been rejected. If it had been adopted, his delegation would have voted against the acceptance of the credentials of the present representative of China.

15. Mr. SOLANO-LOPEZ (Paraguay) said that he had voted against the Soviet proposal because its purpose had been to contest the validity of the Chinese representative's credentials. His delegation considered that the present representative was the legitimate representative of China.

Appointment of the members of the Standing Committee on Petitions

[Agenda item 14]

16. The PRESIDENT said that, under rule 90 of its rules of procedure, the Council was required to appoint three members administering Trust Territories and three members having no administering responsibilities to serve on the Standing Committee on Petitions until the close of the twenty-sixth session. He proposed the following States for the approval of the Council: Belgium, China, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

17. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would have had no objection to the membership suggested by the President for the Standing Committee on Petitions had it not been for the fact that there was no legal representative of China on the Trusteeship Council. Therefore he requested a separate vote on the nomination of China.

18. Mr. KIANG (China) requested a separate vote on each of the nomination.

19. Mr. SOLANO-LOPEZ (Paraguay) supported the Chinese representative's request.

The nomination of Belgium was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of China was approved by 9 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of India was approved by 12 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was approved by 11 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of the United States of America was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Appointment of the members of the Committee on Classification of Communications

[Agenda item 15]

20. The PRESIDENT said that the Council was required to appoint two members of the Committee on Classification of Communications to hold office until the close of the twenty-sixth session. He proposed Australia and the United Arab Republic for the approval of the Council.

The nomination of Australia and the United Arab Republic were approved.

Examination of petitions (continued)*

[Agenda item 5]

21. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), speaking as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, said that the two hundred and forty-fourth report of the Committee, which dealt with two petitions from Ruanda-Urundi, had been completed, but had not yet been circulated. The Committee would also have to draw up a draft resolution concerning another petition and draft its final report.

22. The PRESIDENT considered that in those circumstances it would be preferable to postpone consideration of the question until the next meeting.

23. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that during the current session the Standing Committee had examined only three petitions, although the Council's agenda included several hundred. In spite of the efforts made by the Chairman of the Committee and the representative of the Soviet Union, the Administering Powers, in violation of the Council's rules of procedure, had not submitted their written observations on the petitions within the prescribed time-limit and had not sent to New York their special representatives, who might have been able to supply additional information and answer questions put by members of the Committee. The Standing Committee confronted with a "fait accompli", had been unable to accomplish useful work.

24. However, one of the Council's most important tasks was to examine petitions and take the appropriate decisions on them. The petitioners expected the United

* Resumed from the 1047th meeting.

Nations to take action on their complaints or requests. But the petitions accumulated in the Organization's archives without being examined. That abnormal situation could not but disappoint the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. His delegation therefore reserved the right to bring that situation to the notice of the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly. The Trusteeship Council should see to it that the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of its rules of procedure, as well as its own decisions, were respected.

25. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should postpone consideration of the question to the next meeting.

It was so decided.

Organization of the work of the twenty-sixth session

26. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said he understood that some members of the Council contemplated fixing Friday 15 April, as the date for the beginning of the twenty-sixth session. Since the consideration of two annual reports, for Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, had been postponed until that session, he thought that the date chosen should be Monday 11 April. If the Council so decided, the Secretariat could prepare a time-table for the work of the session for submission at the next meeting.

27. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the eleventh session of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories would probably continue until 14 April. In those circumstances, the Secretariat, without, of course, prejudging the Council's decision, had assumed that the Council's twenty-sixth session might begin on 14 April, and he was prepared to distribute to members of the Council a tentative time-table which provided for two meetings a day from the beginning of the session.

28. Miss TENZER (Belgium) thought that representatives should study the Secretariat document in order to decide whether the opening date for the twenty-sixth session was realistic and particularly whether the reports to be considered would be ready in time. She therefore proposed that the Council should defer its decision to the next meeting.

29. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) recalled that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had a very heavy agenda. The French delegation would find it difficult to take part in the work of the Committee and the Council at the same time. He would prefer for the Council to meet at the end of April.

30. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) supported the suggestion of the representative of the United Arab Republic. As the six-member Committee appointed by the General Assembly in pursuance of resolution 1467 (XIV) was to meet early in July, it was absolutely essential that the work of the twenty-sixth session should be completed by the end of June. The session of the Council should therefore begin about the middle of April. Furthermore, since the Committee on Information would perhaps have completed its work by the beginning of April, the opening date for the session could be set for 14 April, or even, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had suggested, for

11 April. In any case, the Indian delegation felt it would be useful for the Secretariat to circulate the tentative time-table drawn up for the summer session.

31. The PRESIDENT requested the Secretariat to circulate the tentative time-table of the twenty-sixth session so as to enable members of the Council to reach a decision on the question.

32. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) supported the proposal that the Council should begin its twenty-sixth session on 14 April. It would be awkward for some delegations if the work of the Committee on Information and that of the Council overlapped.

33. The tentative time-table which had just been circulated was very optimistic, but he hoped that the Council would manage to follow it. With regard to the discussion of conditions in Western Samoa, scheduled for 2 May, he was not certain that his delegation would be ready at that time; however, the New Zealand Government would do its best to meet that date.

34. Miss TENZER (Belgium) expressed surprise that in the time-table prepared by the Secretariat, five days had been allotted for the consideration of conditions in Nauru, six days for Western Samoa and, particularly, five days for Somaliland in June, when at the end of that same month, that Territory would become independent. If the Council began its work on 14 April, it could easily complete it by the established date. She asked the Australian representative whether his delegation thought it would be in a position to begin consideration of conditions in Nauru on 18 April, as provided in the tentative time-table.

35. Mr. HOOD (Australia) replied in the affirmative.

36. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) inquired whether, if the examination of conditions in Western Samoa could not be begun on 2 May, the United Kingdom delegation would consent to consideration of the report on Tanganyika on that date.

37. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) reminded the Council of his statement at the twenty-fourth session (1039th meeting) that, in order to expedite the work of the Council, his delegation might be prepared to accept 8 June as the date for the consideration of the report on Tanganyika. By dint of great effort, it might even manage the date of 6 June. It should be borne in mind, however, that the Visiting Mission would not submit its report until May. In any event, he suggested that the time-table drawn up by the Secretariat should be adopted on tentative basis.

38. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) still thought that it would be better to set the opening date of the session at 11 April. The Committee on Information would probably complete its work in early April. Moreover, if the session began earlier, the Council could meet twice a day only by way of an exception. He hoped that the Council would take no decision at the present meeting in order to allow time for consultation among the members.

39. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered it important for the Council to begin its work as early as possible, that is, on 11 April. However, he wondered when the Secretariat would receive the annual reports of the Administering Authorities and the reports of the Visiting Mission, and especially when the Administering Authorities would be able to send special representatives, so

that they might take part in the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions prior even to the discussion of the annual reports.

40. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) thought that the annual report on Western Samoa would be available for distribution in the first half of April. As for the date on which the special representatives would be able to participate in the Council's work, it would be set following consultations between the New Zealand Government and the Government of Western Samoa. That was why he could only agree tentatively to the date of 2 May for the discussion of conditions in Samoa.

41. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) explained that, in preparing the tentative time-table for the twenty-sixth session of the Council, the Secretariat had endeavoured to take into account the time required by members to study the reports, which often did not arrive on time, and the dates on which the Administering Authorities could make the special representatives available.

42. Mr. BERENDSEN (Secretary of the Council) added that the Secretariat, in discussions with the delegations of the Administering Authorities, had stressed the necessity for submitting the reports several weeks in advance of the dates fixed for their consideration; the delegations concerned had given assurances that they would do everything in their power to comply.

43. With regard to the reports of the Visiting Mission, there was no knowing how long it would deliberate upon its return to Headquarters. The Mission's first report would deal with Tanganyika, and 6 June appeared to be the earliest date on which the examination of conditions in that Territory could begin.

44. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) shared the view of the representative of the United Arab Republic that the Council's decision should be postponed until the following meeting. The French delegation did not feel that the tentative time-table took into account past experiences. Although the problems of Somaliland were no longer as urgent, conditions in such Territories—Western Samoa, for example—which were about to attain the objectives laid down in the Charter would require the Council's close attention. The French delegation maintained its earlier reservations regarding the date of 14 April.

45. Mr. TORNETTA (Italy) recalled that his delegation had to submit to the Council not only an annual report on Somaliland, but a special report on the latest steps taken before the Territory became independent. In order to prepare that report and to fix the date on which it would be submitted, the Administering Authority would have to consult the Government of Somalia. He hoped to be able to give the Council more definite information on the matter at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.