

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE · 765th  
MEETING**

Monday, 20 October 1958,  
at 3.20 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 39:	
Question of South West Africa ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa	
Consideration of draft resolutions ( <i>continued</i> ) . . .	101
Question of a verbatim record of the debate on sub-item (a) . . . . .	101
Organization of work . . . . .	102
Requests for hearings ( <i>continued</i> )	
Requests concerning agenda item 13 (Report of the Trusteeship Council) ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	102

**Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).**

**AGENDA ITEM 39**

**Question of South West Africa (*continued*):**  
**(a) Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa (A/3900, A/C.4/L.531)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.531) (*continued*)**

1. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that a number of delegations were trying to work out an agreed text of a draft resolution on the report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa (A/3900). She therefore proposed that the discussion of sub-item (a) of agenda item 39 should be postponed until such a text could be submitted.

It was so decided.

2. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), supported by Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), suggested that as a number of delegations were awaiting instructions from their Governments on the important matter before the Committee, no vote on a draft resolution should be taken until such instructions had been received.

It was so decided.

**QUESTION OF A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE DEBATE ON SUB-ITEM (a)**

3. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that, in view of the importance of the debate that had been held on sub-item (a) and the crucial stage reached in the development of the question of South West Africa, a verbatim record of that debate should be made.

4. Mr. OSMAN (United Arab Republic) supported the Liberian proposal in view of the fact that any new efforts to negotiate with the Union of South Africa must take into account the discussions that had been held in the Fourth Committee. He felt that the extra expenditure involved would be amply justified.

5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Fourth Committee should be careful not to come to a decision

which might conflict with a decision of the Fifth Committee. He suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to study the Liberian proposal and to set out for the information of members the various considerations involved.

6. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said his delegation had always been under the impression that each Committee could decide in what form its records on any particular discussion should be maintained. He suggested that the Fourth Committee might communicate to the Fifth Committee its view that a verbatim record of the debate on sub-item (a) should be made available.

7. Mr. BAWUMIA (Ghana) supported the Liberian proposal. The issue was one which concerned public opinion throughout the world and a verbatim record should be made available so that posterity would be able to judge.

8. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) considered that if the Good Offices Committee were to continue its work it should have available to it not only summaries of the speeches made during the debate but a verbatim report so that every aspect of the question raised by the various delegations would be recorded.

9. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) stressed that if the Good Offices Committee were to continue its work it must take into consideration the various views expressed in the Fourth Committee. Furthermore, the Fourth Committee was being called upon to take a decision which would in fact imply agreement to a partition plan, to which Liberia was definitely opposed. Her delegation would not necessarily vote against a suggestion that was acceptable to a majority of the Committee, but it might be obliged to abstain, and it wanted the world to know what Liberia's position in the matter was.

10. The CHAIRMAN recalled the General Assembly's decision that verbatim records should be provided for the First Committee and summary records for the other committees. The proposal now before the Committee was directly contrary to that decision. He therefore pressed his suggestion that the Secretariat should be asked to examine the matter and circulate a paper showing the different considerations involved.

11. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) did not feel that the facts recalled by the Chairman implied that no committee except the First Committee could have a verbatim record of its debates in any circumstances and at any time, whatever the importance of the subject under discussion. He pointed out that paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.4/L.531) referred to the Good Offices Committee the record of all the opinions voiced during the debate. Whatever final form the draft resolution took it would undoubtedly make a recommendation on those lines. He urged that the Fourth Committee should recommend to the Fifth Committee that the case should be treated as a special one.

12. Mr. LONGDEN (United Kingdom) did not think it was beyond the Committee's competence to decide that verbatim records should be provided of the debate on sub-item (a). There was, however, a practical consideration, quite apart from the question of expense: the Fourth Committee could hardly ask the members of the Good Offices Committee to read every word that had been uttered in the debate on South West Africa. It would be amply sufficient if they were to read the abridged account, to which delegations had every opportunity to make corrections if they were dissatisfied with the manner in which their speeches had been reported. He supported the Chairman's suggestion that the Secretariat should be asked to study the matter and report back to the Committee.

13. Mr. GEBRY-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that while it was true that the General Assembly had in principle agreed that verbatim records should be provided only for the First Committee, that was not a hard and fast rule. In view of what was at stake in the present instance it was essential that the Good Offices Committee, if requested to continue its efforts, should be in a position to make a detailed study of the views expressed in the Fourth Committee with all their implications, regardless of the time required to do so.

14. Mr. BAWUMIA (Ghana) thought that as the Fifth Committee had not yet submitted its report on agenda item 51 (Control and limitation of documentation) the fact that it was considering that item need not concern the Fourth Committee. He saw no reason why the General Assembly should not be asked to review its decision on verbatim records in so far as that decision had a bearing on the vital question now before the Committee.

15. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the members of the Good Offices Committee could make arrangements with the Secretariat to listen to the recordings of the debate if they so desired. The suggestion under consideration involved an important constitutional point, for the Secretariat could not accede to a request by the Fourth Committee which was contrary to a decision of the General Assembly itself. He therefore suggested that any resolution on the subject should be submitted to the General Assembly. In that connexion he drew attention to rule 154 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure to the effect that no resolution involving expenditure should be recommended by a committee for approval by the General Assembly unless accompanied by an estimate of expenditures prepared by the Secretary-General.

16. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) thought that the relevant part of rule 154 in the present case was the provision that no such resolution should be voted by the General Assembly until the Fifth Committee had had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon budget estimates. He therefore suggested that the Fourth Committee as such should make its recommendation to the Fifth Committee, which would then

proceed in accordance with rule 154. The Fourth Committee would not be obliged to submit an estimate of expenditure unless it was making a recommendation direct to the General Assembly.

17. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) thought that in accordance with the rules of procedure the only course open to the Committee would be to submit a recommendation direct to the General Assembly, which would receive it together with the views of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on its financial implications. It would then as a matter of course be referred to the Fifth Committee. The decision that a verbatim record was to be kept of only one committee at a time was a decision of the General Assembly and could not be amended by the Fifth Committee without the authorization of the Assembly itself.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had two courses open to it: it could submit a resolution to the Fifth Committee recommending that, in view of the importance of the question dealt with in the Good Offices Committee's report, financial provision should be made so that the records of the Fourth Committee's debate on that subject might be available in verbatim form; the alternative would be for the Committee to submit such a recommendation direct to the General Assembly. He suggested that, if the Committee so desired, he should consult with the Chairman of the Fifth Committee before the next meeting in order to ascertain which of the two procedures the latter considered more appropriate.

It was so decided.

#### Organization of work

19. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should begin at its next meeting its general debate on sub-items (b) and (c) of agenda item 39. He suggested that the list of speakers in the debate on those sub-items should be closed at 10.30 a.m. on 21 October.

It was so decided.

#### Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 13 (REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL) (continued)

20. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a letter from Mr. Moumié, whose request for a hearing had been granted by the Committee at its 745th meeting, asking that he should be heard before 23 October. The Chairman suggested that the date for hearing Mr. Moumié, as well as the other petitioners whose requests had been granted by the Committee, should be decided upon when it took up consideration of the report of the Trusteeship Council, which was the next item on its agenda.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.