

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 796th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 12 November 1958,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .	279

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

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822, A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, A/C.4/L.543 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.545, A/C.4/L.547, A/C.4/L.548, A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.542/REV.1 AND REV.1/ADD.1, A/C.4/L.543 AND ADD.1, A/C.4/L.545, A/C.4/L.547, A/C.4/L.548, A/C.4/L.549/REV.1) (continued)

1. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said he was delighted that all the representatives who had spoken had recognized the importance of economic development in Somalia and Somalia's need for help. His Government had already offered its assistance to Somalia, as a concrete demonstration of its feelings in the matter. His delegation had been very pleased to see the six-Power revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) and had assumed that it would be adopted unanimously.

2. With regard to the amendments (A/C.4/L.553) to the draft resolution and the explanations given by the Iraqi representative at the previous meeting, he pointed out that, at its twenty-second session, the Trusteeship Council had carefully examined the idea of setting up a special United Nations fund for Somalia and indeed had had before it a suggestion to that effect made by the representative of the United Arab Republic at the 929th meeting—but it had not made any recommendation in favour of establishing such a fund. It was essential to take into account the views expressed by the Somali Government itself, in particular the statement of the Minister for Economic Affairs of the Government of Somalia reproduced on pages 45 and 46 of the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822, vol. I). The Italian delegation would be able to make clear the position with regard to the statement of the Prime Minister of the Government of Somalia mentioned in the amendments. The Trusteeship Council had assumed that assistance would be provided to Somalia from existing United Nations funds.

3. The first of the additional preambular paragraphs proposed in the first amendment (A/C.4/L.553, para. 1) was somewhat mystifying, because the report of the Mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (T/1296) did not refer to the setting up of an outside body, but to the reorganization of the

internal budgetary and financial services of Somaliland. That was not an argument either for or against some new United Nations machinery.

4. The second amendment (A/C.4/L.553, para. 2), which concerned operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, in suggesting a special fund for Somalia raised some serious difficulties for a number of delegations. There was no precedent for it. It was true that the proposed text for operative paragraph 4 merely requested the Trusteeship Council to study the feasibility of establishing a fund, but it also requested the Council to study the machinery for administering such a fund, a request which prejudged the conclusions of the Trusteeship Council.

5. Somalia was on the verge of attaining independence. Its Government was studying, jointly with the Administering Authority, the question of the assistance to be given to it, and the Administering Authority would submit a report on the subject. It would seem inappropriate at the present stage to establish principles which should be left to be examined later. The amendments (A/C.4/L.553) were therefore not acceptable to his delegation.

6. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) considered that one of the main tasks of the General Assembly at its present session was to lay down a definite time-table for the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories. His delegation had therefore welcomed the initiative of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. That text, however, was too general in character and would be substantially improved by the adoption of the Soviet amendments (A/C.4/L.552). His delegation would therefore vote in favour of those amendments and would support the draft resolution. It also supported the revision announced by the Yugoslav representative at the previous meeting whereby the words "and to be taken" had been inserted in operative paragraph 1 after the words "already taken".

7. His delegation would also vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.545 because it considered it in keeping with certain proposals made in the Trusteeship Council. The establishment of information centres would enable the inhabitants of Trust Territories to become acquainted with the work of the United Nations and the operation of the Trusteeship System. It was important that the centres should be directed by indigenous inhabitants, who would be in a better position than European officials to carry out that task. If a compromise text was proposed, he hoped that the essential idea of the draft would be maintained.

8. With regard to the amendments (A/C.4/L.553) to the revised draft resolution on economic aid to Somalia (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) his delegation favoured the principle of such aid and would vote accordingly.

9. Mr. KELLY (Australia) recalled that Australia had already awarded some thousands of scholarships under the Colombo Plan; that, in addition, many thousands of Asian students had come to Australia at their own expense; and that over 5 per cent of the tens of thousands of students now attending Australian universities were Asians. Australia had the capacity to provide whatever scholarships were needed and could be taken advantage of by students from Trust Territories under Australian administration. While approving in principle and implementing the principle of the provision of scholarships on an international basis, his delegation would not support any draft resolution which, in the matter of scholarships, sought to deny to the Administering Authorities any of the discretionary powers vested in them by the Trusteeship Agreements.

10. As the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of New Guinea, Australia would continue to adopt plans, with tentative targets and dates where appropriate, for the progressive economic, social and political advancement of the indigenous people, and whenever it was satisfied that that procedure would assist in the promotion of the objective expressed in Article 76 b of the Charter. It would do the same in the case of the Trust Territory of Nauru. The Trusteeship Agreement for New Guinea made the Australian Government the sole authority responsible for the administration of that Trust Territory. The adoption of targets and dates for New Guinea was a matter entirely within the discretion of the Australian Government, which would exercise that discretion in accordance with the principles of the Charter. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 because the preambular paragraphs, the expression "early successive intermediate targets and dates" in operative paragraph 2, and the text of operative paragraph 3 showed that the sponsors of the draft resolution had primarily in mind the concept of final targets and dates, which had no relevance to the present requirements and needs of the peoples of Trust Territories under Australian administration. Even if the draft resolution was considered as an expression of the concept of inflexible intermediate targets and dates, it must be regarded as impracticable and unrealistic.

11. The Soviet amendments (A/C.4/L.552) to the draft resolution were inconsistent with Article 76 of the Charter in that they in fact rejected the concept of "progressive development towards self-government or independence". In underestimating the necessities of the process of advancement or development, in ignoring the particular circumstances of the Trust Territories, the wishes of their peoples, or the considered judgements of the Administering Authorities, the Soviet delegation had shown an unawareness of the obligations imposed by the Charter on non-administering States.

12. His delegation could not support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.543 and Add.1. It was not possible for the Administering Authorities concerned to submit information on the effects on certain Trust Territories of their association with the European Economic Community, for those effects did not yet exist. In any event that matter would be more appropriately examined by GATT.

13. His delegation had given careful consideration to the revised draft resolution on economic aid to Somalia

(A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) and to the amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.553). It would be unable to support the amendments, but, in spite of certain reservations, would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution, as it had done with respect to a similar draft resolution concerning Togoland under French administration adopted by the Committee at its 788th meeting.

14. His delegation would also vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.547. In its future deliberations, the Trusteeship Council would no doubt take into account the eloquent silence of the many delegations who refrained from participating in discussions and who abstained in the voting on draft resolutions.

15. Mr. SHIMA (Japan) said that he generally supported the revised draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. Operative paragraph 2, in particular, represented a constructive effort. Operative paragraph 3, however, as the United States delegation had pointed out at the 794th meeting, appeared somewhat ill-advised, because it was impossible to lay down final dates until the results of the measures contemplated in operative paragraph 2 were known. In spite of the explanations given by the Haitian representative at the 793rd meeting, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of that paragraph. It would, however, vote for the other paragraphs of the draft resolution.

16. With regard to the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories, it seemed likely that the signatories to the Treaty establishing the Community had already examined the question and the United Nations was entitled to be informed of the results of any discussions on the subject. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.543 and Add.1.

17. His delegation would also support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.545, on the understanding that the financial implications would be taken into account. The Fifth Committee was at present considering the possibility of reorganizing United Nations public information activities. The Fourth Committee should express its views on the subject of the development of activities of that type in the Trust Territories, where the need for them was greatest. He hoped that the situation could be improved without substantially increasing the information budget of the United Nations.

18. His delegation would support the other draft resolutions in their original form and reserved its position with regard to amendments which had been or might be proposed in the course of the discussion.

19. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) said, with regard to the draft resolution on target dates (A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1), that his delegation attached the greatest importance to the views of the Administering Authorities, who must in the final analysis bear the responsibilities for the Trust Territories. No valid arguments had been advanced to refute the objections raised by the Administering Authorities, which had in any event demonstrated their good faith. His delegation could not support any resolution against the valid objection of the Administering Authorities, particularly when such a resolution tended to make their task more difficult.

20. It would also vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.543 and Add.1, which was perplexing. One puzzling feature was that it referred to "Trust Territories" even though, as the Belgian representative had pointed out at the 792nd meeting, the problem concerned only a single Trust Territory.

21. The draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.545 raised a question of procedure. It did not seem desirable for the Fourth Committee to take a decision concerning the dissemination of information in Trust Territories at a time when the Fifth Committee was considering the entire question of United Nations information activities following on the report of the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public Information (A/3928). His delegation had always advocated co-ordinated action among the various bodies of the United Nations, which in the present instance would be a simple matter. The amendments proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.4/L.551) represented an acceptable compromise, although the South African delegation would have preferred to wait, before coming to a decision, until the Fifth Committee had concluded its discussion. It also had some reservations about substantive questions raised in the draft such as the geographical location of information centres and the personnel by whom it was proposed that they should be directed. It was important not to infringe the prerogatives of the Secretary-General in the matter of personnel policy.

22. Lastly, the South African delegation would gladly support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1. In doing so it paid a tribute to the outstanding efforts of Italy as Administering Authority in Somaliland.

23. Mr. CAMILION (Argentina) said that he was in general agreement with the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. The revision of operative paragraph 1 agreed to orally by the sponsors following a suggestion made at the 793rd meeting by the representative of the United Arab Republic had improved that text. He noted in particular that in operative paragraph 2 the sponsors referred to a matter of legitimate concern. His delegation agreed with the views expressed in the Committee regarding the Soviet amendments (A/C.4/L.552). The desire to set time-limits was commendable, but it was not the Committee's responsibility to do so since it did not possess any of the data required to form an opinion on the matter. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendments.

24. With regard to the draft resolution on the effects of the European Economic Community (A/C.4/L.543 and Add.1), he pointed out that his delegation had joined in sponsoring a similar draft resolution during the twelfth session (A/C.4/L.519) and was therefore prepared to support the draft before the Committee. The suggestion regarding the second preambular paragraph put forward by the Chilean representative at the 794th meeting seemed to him particularly pertinent, and, if it was submitted as a formal proposal, his delegation would support it.

25. His delegation endorsed the objectives referred to in the draft resolution on the dissemination of information on the United Nations in Trust Territories (A/C.4/L.545) but felt that the language of the text could be improved. It supported the amendments pro-

posed by the United Kingdom to the third preambular paragraph (A/C.4/L.551, para. 1) but could not agree to the phrase which the United Kingdom delegation proposed should be added at the end of operative paragraph 1 (A/C.4/L.551, para. 2), since the purpose of the draft resolution was precisely that of setting up information centres in the Trust Territories themselves. With regard to operative paragraph 2, while not wishing to prejudge the decision as to whether the centres were to be placed under the direction of persons indigenous to the Trust Territories, he felt that the word "representatives", which gave the text a political connotation which the sponsors had surely not intended to convey, could be replaced by a word such as "nationals". Perhaps a compromise text which was acceptable to the sponsors and would not impose any obligations on the Secretary-General could be worked out for that paragraph. He suggested that the latter part of the paragraph, following the word "centres," should be amended to read: "... and on the feasibility of placing the centres under the direction of nationals of the Trust Territories."

26. He had no criticism to offer concerning the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.4/L.547) or the draft resolution on study and training facilities (A/C.4/L.548).

27. His delegation approved of the objectives of the draft resolution on economic aid for Somalia (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) and would vote for it. With regard to the proposed amendments (A/C.4/L.553), his delegation felt that the International Bank was a competent body to judge the matter and that the sponsors of the amendments were right in proposing that its opinion should be cited in the preamble of the draft resolution. That was not true of the opinion of the Prime Minister of the Government of Somalia, which did not contribute anything new to the draft resolution, and it was not advisable to mention a private individual, however important he might be, in a resolution. With regard to the new wording proposed for operative paragraph 4, he found the idea of setting up a special fund for Somalia acceptable but thought that the creation of such a fund might set a precedent and give rise to administrative and financial problems which should be weighed carefully before a decision was reached. He proposed that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should be altered by the insertion of the words "in particular the International Bank, as well as the most effective means of channelling such assistance" after the words "the specialized agencies". In short, his delegation did not wish to prejudge the question whether a fund should be set up for Somalia. The Trusteeship Council would be able to decide, in the light of the consultations which it was to undertake and of Somalia's needs, whether it would be useful to establish such a fund. His delegation therefore could not support the second amendment (A/C.4/L.553, para. 2).

28. Mr. KIANG (China) pointed out, with respect to the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, that none of the General Assembly's previous resolutions on the attainment of self-government or independence by Trust Territories which were mentioned in the draft resolution referred to Italy as the Administering Authority for Somaliland. Consequently, Somaliland under Italian administration should not be mentioned in the draft resolution under consideration. Moreover, as the General Assembly had

noted with disappointment in resolution 1207 (XII) that the Administering Authorities had not yet submitted estimates of the periods of time required by the Trust Territories for the attainment of self-government or independence, he deplored the fact that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution, in acknowledging that some Administering Authorities had submitted target dates for the attainment of the objective of the Trusteeship System by certain Trust Territories, had not seen fit to include an expression of satisfaction on the part of the General Assembly. He would have preferred to see operative paragraph 1 of the original text (A/C.4/L.542) retained in the revised draft resolution, for the draft resolution as a whole would then have been better balanced, as it would then also have contained a reference to the intermediate targets and dates adopted by certain Administering Authorities in the various fields of development. It would not be possible to harmonize operative paragraph 3 with paragraph 1, particularly in view of the reference in paragraph 3 to resolution 1207 (XII), unless the expression "Administering Authorities" was made more specific. In spite of those shortcomings, however, his delegation was in general agreement with the principles underlying the draft resolution and would therefore vote for it, but it would abstain if a separate vote was taken on paragraph 3. It felt that the Soviet amendments (A/C.4/L.552) served no useful purpose, and it would therefore vote against them.

29. He regretted that the Committee had not received a unified text of the draft resolution on the dissemination of information on the United Nations (A/C.4/L.545). However, he felt that the amendment proposed by the Iranian representative at the 793rd meeting would improve its wording, and he endorsed the United Kingdom representative's amendments (A/C.4/L.551).

30. With regard to the draft resolution on economic aid for Somalia (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) and particularly the amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.553), he pointed out that the Italian Government had promised in October 1958 to provide Somalia with financial assistance after 1960 and that Somalia had agreed to accept that assistance; the Visiting Mission mentioned in the amendments had visited Somalia in 1957, and the report of the International Bank (T/1296) had been published in 1956. In view of the offer made by Italy and its acceptance by Somalia, the recommendations of those two bodies were no longer relevant. In the second of the proposed amendments, the Trusteeship Council was requested to study the feasibility of establishing a fund for Somalia. The Council was far from competent to make a decision on establishing such a fund under United Nations auspices. It was also out of the question for it to study the machinery for administering such a fund. The United Nations would be making a serious mistake if it tried to tell Somalia what course it should follow after it attained independence. If the Italian Government or the Government of Somalia should submit further proposals to the Trusteeship Council, it would be the duty of the members of the Council to examine them, but for the time being it was best to comply with the wishes of the Government of Somalia as they had been stated by the Italian representative.

31. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), referring to certain comments on the amendments in document A/C.4/L.553, pointed out that the representative of the United Arab

Republic had never submitted a formal proposal to the Trusteeship Council but merely a suggestion which had not been put to the vote. The fact that the Trusteeship Council had not studied the question of a special fund for Somalia was indeed the very reason why it should deal with that problem. There was no cause to fear establishing a precedent, as the draft resolution requested merely that the Council should study a possibility. The case of Somaliland was somewhat special, as a date for the accession of that Territory to independence had been fixed at the outset and the United Nations had a special responsibility. It should not, therefore, overlook any possibility. The reference to the Mission of the International Bank was very important, as the Bank's idea had been that international assistance should be integrated and co-ordinated with plans for Somaliland's internal development. That assistance should therefore be centralized, so as to facilitate the desired co-ordination through the establishment of a single body operating, preferably, under United Nations auspices.

32. There was no question of prejudging the conclusions of the Trusteeship Council, the aim being simply to invite it to undertake a study which it should have made earlier. On Somalia's accession to independence, its government would thus be in possession of all the data which it might require.

33. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 had been orally revised by the Yugoslav representative speaking in the name of the sponsors: the words "or to be taken" had been inserted after the words "already taken".

34. He suggested that the members of the Committee should consider separately, and in their proper order, each of the draft resolutions before the Committee.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution on attainment of self-government or independence by Trust Territories (A/C.4/L.542/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1)

35. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation still believed that fixing final and intermediate target dates was useful and served the interests both of the Administering Authorities and of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. Many arguments had been adduced against the setting of such dates. Some delegations having already replied, however, he would confine himself to an analysis of certain arguments advanced by the representatives of Peru (794th meeting) and of the United Kingdom (795th meeting).

36. The Peruvian representative had said that it would be better not to fix stages for the development of the Trust Territories but to allow those Territories to develop in a natural and logical manner. He was convinced, however, that, at the present time, natural and logical development—which implied that the Trust Territories would have to pass through the same stages as the once backward countries which had succeeded in developing themselves—should be superseded by careful planning, based on experience and designed to speed up the development of the Territories.

37. The United Kingdom representative had said that the Administering Authorities often fixed dates by which certain Territories placed under their administration were to attain self-government or indepen-

dence. That statement was correct, but it should be remembered that those dates had often been set under pressure from the indigenous population and after many difficulties which could have been avoided if the measure had been taken sufficiently early.

38. The United Kingdom representative had also said that he was prepared to proceed with the formulation of intermediate dates, but had added that, before doing so, the wishes of the population on the subject should be known. In view of that statement, the Yugoslav delegation thought that it might be interesting to know the views of the population of Tanganyika on the fixing of a final date for ending the system of parity representation and for the institution of universal, direct and equal suffrage.

39. Finally, the United Kingdom representative had cited an extract from a speech by Mr. Nyerere, which in his opinion showed that some political progress had been made in Tanganyika. The Yugoslav delegation shared that opinion to some extent, but thought that the statement quoted also showed that the records of the debates of the legislative and executive bodies in the Trust Territories should be placed at the disposal of United Nations organs, which would find in them interesting information on the political, economic and social life in the Territories.

40. As to the USSR amendments (A/C.4/L.552) to the draft resolution, he endorsed the principle on which they were based, namely, the setting of final and intermediate target dates. The sponsor of those amendments had been right in drawing a distinction between Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi on the one hand and the remaining Trust Territories on the other, as the stage of development which those Territories had reached was not the same. But those amendments had the defect of making the same provisions for Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi, though the two Territories differed greatly in their political development. His delegation thought that different dates should be established for each Territory, after consultation between the Administering Authorities and the United Nations. Consequently, while approving the principle on which it was based, his delegation would be unable to support the first USSR amendment in its present form. The second USSR amendment was more flexible as it provided that the developed Trust Territories would attain independence as soon as possible and the other Territories not later than within a period of ten years. It thus referred to all the Trust Territories, including those where the pre-conditions for the attainment of independence still had to be created. The Yugoslav delegation would therefore vote in favour of that amendment.

41. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) welcomed the fact that the United Kingdom's position on the subject of intermediate targets and dates had moved substantially closer to India's and that the United Kingdom and Australia saw no objection to setting intermediate targets. The Australian representative having said that his country would continue to undertake projects designed to promote the development of the Trust Territories under its care, which seemed to be much the same as fixing intermediate dates and targets, the Indian delegation could not see why Australia felt unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

42. The majority of the Committee's members considered the fixing of dates and targets to be a neces-

sary means of assisting the development of the Trust Territories. That attitude was based on the Charter itself, as Article 76 b stipulated that one of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System was to promote the progressive development of the Trust Territories toward self-government or independence. The word "progressive" clearly implied successive stages; thus, in requesting the Administering Authorities to fix intermediate dates and targets, the Committee was only asking them to apply the provisions of the Charter.

43. The Indian delegation hoped that in future the Administering Authorities would take into account the opinion of the majority of the Committee's members and do their utmost to further in the Trust Territories a harmonious development, based on carefully considered plans, without which the future independent States would lack stability.

44. The Australian representative had said that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution gave the text an imperative tone. That was not the opinion of the Indian delegation; the draft resolution contained only recommendations, and the Trusteeship Council took decisions only after due study of the statements of the Administering Authorities.

45. He would vote for the draft resolution in the form in which it had been submitted to the Committee.

46. With reference to the amendments proposed by the USSR (A/C.4/L.552), his delegation was not opposed to the setting of time-limits in principle, provided they were likely to assist the development of the Territories. He believed, however, that the time-limits proposed might not correspond to the conditions prevailing in the various Territories. Moreover, the pace of development might become accelerated for unforeseen reasons and the target set at a given moment might rapidly become obsolete; that fact had been proved by the events in Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration. In those circumstances, he would be unable to vote for the USSR amendments.

47. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said he was glad that the words "or to be taken" had been inserted in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

48. With regard to the first amendment proposed by the USSR (A/C.4/L.552, para. 1), he recalled that the USSR delegation had submitted a similar proposal during the eleventh session of the General Assembly.^{1/} But even though the three- to five-year period requested at that time for attainment of independence by Togoland and by the Cameroons under French administration had been confirmed by subsequent events, the same was not true of Western Samoa, which the Committee now knew would probably not attain independence in 1960. His delegation considered that the fixing of time-limits did not give a true indication of the manner in which Trust Territories should develop towards self-government or independence. In addition, if the period of time provided for the attainment of independence by a Territory showed itself subsequently to be too long, the General Assembly might find its hands tied by its own resolution. Furthermore, he thought that it was unjust to link Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika in the same paragraph in view of the much more rapid progress made by the latter Territory. Lastly, there seemed to be a contradiction between the

^{1/} See A/C.4/L.472 and Rev.1

first USSR amendment, recommending that the Administering Authorities should fix a definite time-limit, and operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, reaffirming General Assembly resolutions 558 (VI), 1064 (XI) and 1207 (XII), which requested the Administering Authorities to estimate the period of time in which the Trust Territories would attain the objectives of the Trusteeship System. Operative paragraph 3 should therefore be deleted in the event that the first USSR amendment was adopted. He therefore requested the Soviet delegation to withdraw its amendment concerning Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi.

49. On the other hand, the second USSR amendment (A/C.4/L.552, para. 2) seemed reasonable to him and his delegation would be able to support it, as the period of time provided seemed to be sufficient to bring about the conditions needed for the attainment of independence.

50. In brief, his delegation would vote against the first Soviet amendment; it would be able to support the second, but it preferred to vote in favour of the draft resolution as proposed.

51. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) did not agree with the United Kingdom representative's statement that it was dangerous and inopportune to fix time-limits even for intermediate targets. The problems were complex and delicate and all aspects of the Territories' development had to be carefully examined before a decision was reached on the date of their attainment of independence; that was not a reason, however, for giving up any attempt to solve the question.

52. His delegation was not able to accept the first USSR amendment, which placed Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi on the same level. The proposal did not take into consideration the difficulties encountered by the Administering Authorities in the Territories they held in trust and showed an unrealistic attitude.

53. Nevertheless, his delegation did not believe that the setting of time-limits for the development of Territories towards independence or self-government should be given up. The example of Somaliland under Italian administration proved that success in that respect was possible. Ten years before, the United Nations had set a time-limit which seemed arbitrary at the time in view of the Territory's difficult situation as well as its lack of resources and administrators; none the less Somaliland was at the present time on the threshold of independence. Moreover, there was no harm in requesting the Administering Authorities themselves to fix intermediate dates; that was a political decision which might serve as a stimulus both for the Territories and for the Administering Authorities.

54. In the belief that the Administering Authorities should be requested to fix intermediate stages in the Trust Territories' development towards independence, his delegation would support the draft resolution. With regard to the USSR amendments, it would vote against the first and abstain on the second, but it would prefer that the Soviet delegation withdraw its proposal.

55. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) approved of the principle which had guided the sponsors in presenting the draft resolution as well as the revision of operative paragraph 1. However, operative paragraph 3, which recalled previous General Assembly resolutions on the

formulation of targets and dates concerning the attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System, still caused him some concern. His delegation was persuaded that the true solution lay in a systematic development of self-government and in the progressive transfer of powers to the people of the Territories concerned.

56. Hence, his delegation would not support the amendments proposed by the USSR (A/C.4/L.552), and would vote in favour of the draft resolution itself only if the Committee adopted the Chilean representative's amendments (A/C.4/L.554) modifying operative paragraph 2 and deleting operative paragraph 3.

57. Mr. RODZINSKI (Poland) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution, and would also vote in favour of the Soviet amendments (A/C.4/L.552), as they were its logical sequel. The fixing of time-limits, whether for intermediate stages in the Trust Territories' development or for their attainment of independence, would help the Committee to carry out its work and might accelerate matters. It held advantages for the people of the Territories concerned, who would know exactly where they stood, and for the Administering Authorities, who would know how much time they had available to fulfil their obligations.

58. He pointed out to the United Kingdom representative that the fixing of time-limits actually had a political significance; his delegation considered it a necessary action which would have a beneficial influence on the awakening of national consciousness in the Territories. It proceeded from the assumption that the peoples of the Trust Territories wanted their emancipation.

59. In conclusion, it was in the interests of both parties concerned to fix time-limits for the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories, and the basic duty of the Administering Authorities was to prepare the peoples of those Territories for that status as rapidly as possible.

60. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that, as his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he would merely state his position with regard to the USSR amendments and make a few other remarks.

61. General Assembly resolution 1064 (XI) was the amended text of a draft resolution originally submitted by the USSR delegation (A/C.4/L.472/Rev.1) according to which the General Assembly would fix definite time-limits. The USSR delegation had amended the text of that proposal in order to take into consideration the objections raised; such objections had been raised again during the present discussion.

62. His delegation had not been convinced by the United Kingdom representative's arguments against the draft resolution under consideration and it considered that the situation in Tanganyika would allow at least an approximate time-limit to be fixed; with regard to Ruanda-Urundi, his delegation was concerned about the lack of political progress in that Territory. The Committee had the right to express its views on the future of the Trust Territories, and in that respect the Soviet amendments were of interest. Nevertheless, in view of the rigorous time-limits provided by the USSR and the attitude of the Administering Authorities, he would abstain when the Soviet amendments were put to the vote.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.