

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

INDEX UNIT

13 FEB 1952



FOURTH COMMITTEE 246th

MEETING

Monday, 14 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Information on the implementation of Trusteeship Council and General Assembly resolutions relating to Trust Territories : report of the Secretary-General (A/1903 and Add. 1 and 2, A/C.4/L.188/Rev. 1) <i>(continued)</i> .	303
Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories : report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)	303
Question of South West Africa <i>(continued)</i>	311

Chairman: Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Information of the implementation of Trusteeship Council and General Assembly resolutions relating to Trust Territories : report of the Secretary-General (A/1903 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.4/L.188/Rev.1) *(continued)*

[Item 32] *

1. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) explained that he had accepted the new text (A/C.4/L.204) suggested by the United States representative for paragraph 5 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.188 Rev.1) in a spirit of compromise. He hoped that the Committee would not consider it as weakening the draft.

2. He suggested some drafting amendments to the Spanish text.

3. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Cuban draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.188/Rev.1, subject to the United States amendment to paragraph 4 which had been accepted by the sponsor at the 245th meeting, and the amendment to paragraph 5 contained in document A/C.4/L.204.

The draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 48 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

4. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) explained that he had voted for the draft resolution because paragraph 3 clearly affirmed that the Trusteeship Council had not complied with the recommendation contained in subparagraph 1 (d) of General Assembly resolution 433 (V).

Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories : report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)

[Item 35] *

5. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that the draft resolution submitted by India and the Philippines (A/C.4/L.196) recapitulated the principal stages in the

General Assembly's treatment of the problem of administrative unions. For the first time, the General Assembly was called upon to assess the action taken by the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authorities to implement its recommendations. The Trusteeship Council had not undertaken as complete an analysis of the problem in its report to the sixth session of the General Assembly (A/1856) as it had done in its report the previous year (A/1306). The relevant facts were scattered throughout the latest report and a good deal of work was required to pick them out. The study the Trusteeship Council had made of the question referred to the criteria laid down in its resolution 293 (VII) and not to those laid down in General Assembly resolution 326 (IV). Consequently, the sponsors of the draft resolution felt that the only possible course was that outlined in the text contained in document A/C.4/L.196, unless, indeed, the Committee were to decide itself to undertake a detailed analysis of the situation.

6. The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions did not appear to have analysed the statements of the Administering Authorities as exhaustively as might have been expected in order to give due weight to the different views expressed by various petitioners and by the visiting missions. Mr. Ingles considered that the Standing Committee should reconsider its conclusions and that, in particular, the situation of the Territories under French administration should again be thoroughly examined. There was some doubt whether the status of those Territories was in accordance with the Trusteeship System and whether it would in practice be possible for them to obtain independence or self-government and to withdraw from the French Union should they desire to do so.

7. The Trusteeship Council had not yet been able to perform the task assigned to it by the General

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

Assembly, but before the seventh session of the Assembly it would have time to carry out a comprehensive and detailed analysis covering all aspects of administrative unions in all the Trust Territories where the problem existed.

8. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reviewed the past history of the question and referred to General Assembly resolution 326 (IV) and to the Trusteeship Council's report to the fifth session of the Assembly (A/1306). He stated that the reports of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions¹ passed in silence over the fact that it was the policy of the Administering Authorities to deprive the Trust Territories of their special status and to bring about their annexation by joining them with neighbouring colonies under the pretext of establishing administrative unions, thus violating the Trusteeship Agreements and General Assembly resolution 224 (III). The USSR delegation had already drawn the Fourth Committee's attention to that fact at the third and fourth sessions of the General Assembly. At the third session it had proposed that the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authorities that they should abandon their policy of disguised annexation and had suggested the establishment in each Territory of a separate administrative system, independent of the administration and law of the neighbouring colonies or protectorates, and the immediate enactment of the necessary legislation to make possible the development of organs of self-government based on an electoral system including representation of the indigenous inhabitants. Those proposals had, however, been rejected and the General Assembly had merely adopted resolution 224 (III) recommending the Trusteeship Council to study the question and report to the fourth session of the General Assembly.

9. All the material gathered by the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions and the visiting missions, as well as the reports of the Administering Authorities, contained clear evidence that the Administering Authorities continued to follow their policy of annexation, which threatened the status of the Trust Territories as political entities. Moreover, many facts adduced by the USSR and other delegations made it plain that the indigenous inhabitants played no real part in the administration of the Trust Territories. The administering Authorities deliberately encouraged the preservation of the tribal system as a means of keeping the people in a state of backwardness. It was obvious that until legislative bodies had been set up in the Trust Territories and the indigenous inhabitants had begun to participate in the work of those organs, there could be no question of independence or self-government.

10. The Trust Territory of Tanganyika had been incorporated in the so-called East Africa Inter-Territorial Organization, which brought it into political, adminis-

trative and economic union with Kenya and Uganda. The administrative organ was the High Commission, made up of the Governors of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika and other high officials, which had very wide powers. The East African Central Legislative Assembly legislated for the three territories. None of its twenty-four members was a representative of the indigenous population. Tanganyika was represented on that body on the same footing as Kenya and Uganda; it had thus lost its independent status and been reduced to the level of a colony.

11. The Cameroons under British administration was administered by the Governor of Nigeria, whose headquarters were at Lagos. The Nigerian Legislative Council had authority over the Cameroons as well, but the Trust Territory was not represented on that body. The Trust Territory was not administered as a whole. It was divided into four parts which were joined to various areas and provinces of the neighbouring British protectorate of Nigeria. According to the report of the Administering Authority for 1948², the Trust Territory was administered as an integral part of Nigeria. That interpretation of the Trusteeship Agreement would lead to the logical conclusion that the Administering Authority was not the United Kingdom but Nigeria. The United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, which had visited the Territory in 1949, had received a number of petitions expressing concern regarding the slow progress being made in the country, which many of them attributed to the too close association between the Territory and Nigeria. There was dissatisfaction because taxes and other income were paid into the Nigerian Treasury and the budget was drawn up without consulting the population. The report of the Committee on Administrative Unions and the report of the Visiting Mission³ confirmed those facts.

12. The Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi was administered as a province of the Belgian Congo; it had the status of a Vice-Government-General of the colony. The Governor of Ruanda-Urundi had only executive powers and was completely subordinated to the Governor-General of the Congo. The United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, which had visited the Territory in 1948, had reported⁴ that the powers of the local authority were extremely limited and did not include questions of general administration. At its third session, the Trusteeship Council had taken note of the Belgian Government's declaration that the independent status of the Trust Territory would be maintained (A/603, p. 6), but that had not in fact been done.

13. Under the Papua and New Guinea Act, 1949, the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the neighbouring

¹ The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions prepared separate reports concerning each of following Trust Territories: Tanganyika (T/915); New Guinea (T/916); Togoland under British administration (T/917); Cameroons under British administration (T/918); and Ruanda-Urundi (T/919).

² See *Report by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Cameroons under United Kingdom Trusteeship for the Year 1948*: London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949, Colonial No. 244.

³ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 2, Report on the Cameroons under British Administration*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Fourth Session, Supplement No. 2, document T/217 and Add. 1.

territory of Papua were governed as a single administrative unit by an administrator appointed by the Governor-General. The arrangement was not an administrative union but a closely knit political and economic union of the two territories.

14. The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions had stated that Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration had been incorporated in the French Union without consulting the local population and that, indeed, there had been clear opposition to that action, particularly in Togoland. The centralization of administration was obviously an obstacle to the achievement of independence or self-government. The United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, which had visited the Territory in 1949, had stated in its report⁵ that the powers of the Representative Assembly were very limited and did not extend to matters of policy or legislation. The indigenous population complained that the central authorities treated the Trust Territory in exactly the same manner as a colony. Ninety per cent of the laws relating to the Trust Territory, passed by the French National Assembly, failed to take its real needs into consideration.

15. The question of administrative union was of great significance for the International Trusteeship System. In the opinion of the USSR delegation it was imperative that the General Assembly should take steps to prevent Administering Authorities from pursuing their policy of annexing the Trust Territories.

16. The draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation (A/C.4/L.174) was consistent with the Charter and was directed towards promoting the political, social and economic advancement of the Trust Territories; its adoption would go far towards satisfying the aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants.

17. Mr. PIGNON (France) observed that the French delegation had already on a number of occasions explained the position of the Trust Territories in relation to the French Union. He would therefore merely repeat that France had always scrupulously respected its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements and maintained the special status of Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration, which were completely distinct from the neighbouring colonies. He would vote for the joint draft resolution submitted by India and the Philippines (A/C.4/L.196) although he considered it superfluous, because he recognized the good intentions which had inspired its sponsors.

18. He would be unable to vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/C.4/L.174), which brought confusion into what had hitherto been clear, and disregarded facts.

19. Mr. ZABLOCKI (Poland) considered the measures taken by the Administering Authorities to link the Trust Territories and the Non-Self-Governing Territories to be inconsistent with the Charter. If it was true that closer association would confer benefits on the

Territories, the whole area concerned should be given the more advanced status and brought into the Trusteeship System. The status of a Trust Territory was the last stage before the attainment of self-government or independence, and no Trust Territory should be compelled to take the retrograde step to the status of a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

20. At the third session of the General Assembly the Polish delegation had submitted a draft resolution (A/C.4/152) calling upon the Administering Authorities to bear that fact in mind, but the General Assembly had not adopted it and had surrendered to the *fait accompli*. At the fourth session the Polish delegation had again raised the question.

21. The situation continued to be unsatisfactory. The existence of a common administrator and Executive and Legislative Council for Papua and New Guinea compromised the preservation of the Trust Territory as a separate entity. In East Africa the Crown colony of Kenya, the protectorate of Uganda and the Trust Territory of Tanganyika were linked together in a manner which was bound to have an unfavourable effect on the status of the Trust Territory. The Cameroons under British administration had for all practical purposes been incorporated in Nigeria. The 1949 Visiting Mission had gained the impression that the development of the Trust Territory was being retarded by its administration as a number of integral parts of Nigeria.

22. The report of the Committee on Administrative Unions included in the Trusteeship Council's report to the fifth session of the General Assembly contained numerous examples of the way in which the colonial Powers were failing to carry out their obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements. In several instances administrative unions had been used to cloak the real designs of the Administering Authorities. The Fourth Committee should take a firm stand in defence of the Charter and the paramount interests of the peoples, whose faith in the United Nations must not be betrayed.

23. The adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the USSR would put an end to the harmful practice of subordinating Trust Territories to colonies and would enable the Trust Territories to develop political, economic and cultural institutions and rapidly to achieve self-government and independence. He would vote in favour of that resolution.

24. Mr. VEJVODA (Yugoslavia) said that in every decision affecting the Trust Territories, Yugoslavia had voted in favour of any measure that it considered would hasten the development of the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. Therefore, for reasons of principle, he would vote for the USSR draft resolution. If that draft resolution were rejected, he would vote for the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of India and the Philippines.

25. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that the question of administrative unions was one of the

⁵ *Ibid.*, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 2, Report on Togoland under French administration.

most complex that faced the Committee. Administrative unions in the customs, fiscal and administrative field were expressly allowed under the Trusteeship Agreements and although they might be subject to abuse, they might also prove highly beneficial where a Trust Territory was so small that it could not successfully operate alone all the necessary functions of government. From the outset, the United States had been anxious to prevent the abuse of administrative unions. It had insisted that although administrative unions were allowable where they proved beneficial, the status and identity of the Trust Territory concerned must be maintained and administrative unions must not be used as a disguise for practical annexation. Moreover, the political, social, educational and cultural advancement of the people of the Trust Territories must not be subordinated to the interests of any other territory with which an administrative union was established. It had also insisted that separate financial and statistical records must be supplied for each of the Trust Territories.

26. The opening remarks of the Philippine representative in introducing the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.196) gave the impression that the Trusteeship Council had done nothing of consequence in respect of administrative unions since the issue of its 1950 report. On the contrary, the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions had worked hard in 1951 and issued a most careful and detailed report on each Trust Territory. The information and recommendations in that report had been included in the report of the Trusteeship Council in the separate sections on conditions in each Trust Territory.

27. He felt that the question of specific arrangements or practices with regard to each of the administrative unions was a matter for the Trusteeship Council rather than the Fourth Committee. However, if the joint draft resolution could prove helpful in any way, the United States delegation would not oppose it. He pointed out that paragraph 3 of the operative part could be interpreted to mean that the Trusteeship Council should terminate the work of its Committee on Administrative Unions. Since the problem was necessarily a continuing one, any such action would seem most unfortunate. He therefore asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to omit the words "complete its investigation and to" from paragraph 3. The United States would still regard the resolution as unnecessary, but it would not oppose the desires of the Committee.

28. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) said that the question of administrative unions had been postponed from the fifth session of the Assembly and had again been opened at too late a stage in the discussion to allow of its proper treatment. The Brazilian delegation's position in regard to administrative unions was well known: they should not in any circumstances be allowed to affect the separate and full development of the Trust Territories towards their ultimate goal of self-government or independence. The Brazilian delegation was therefore in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.196). It regarded the reference in paragraph 3 of the operative part of that text to the

completion of the Trusteeship Council's investigation as an important point. Administrative unions had permanent consequences on the development of the Trust Territories. It was true that, in examining the annual reports on Trust Territories, the Trusteeship Council must continue to examine the effects of administrative unions, but the question referred specifically to the Trusteeship Council in 1948 had been one of principle, and the Trusteeship Council had been asked to state its conclusions to the General Assembly. That preliminary investigation should be completed before the seventh session of the General Assembly. In order to ensure that the question of administrative unions would be dealt with fully at the next session of the General Assembly, the Brazilian delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.4/L.208) to the draft resolution, to the effect that a committee on administrative unions should be established to meet three weeks before the seventh session of the Assembly and to make a preliminary examination of the special reports prepared by the Trusteeship Council and comment thereon to the General Assembly. Such a committee would be composed of an equal number of Administering Authorities and non-administering Powers.

29. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) pointed out that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union asked the Administering Authorities to set up in the Trust Territories legislative and Administrative organs not subordinate to any organs established on the basis of union between the Trust Territories and neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was true that the relations of Togoland under British administration and the Cameroons under British administration with the Gold Coast and Nigeria respectively went beyond a purely administrative union; but those relations derived from specific provisions in the Trusteeship Agreements for those two Territories, and the effect of the USSR resolution would be to direct the United Kingdom to depart from those Agreements. It had long been clear that the only practical way of promoting the objectives of the Charter in those two small Territories was by administering them as integral parts of the larger neighbouring territories. They derived advantages from their association with their neighbours which they could not otherwise enjoy.

30. The case of Tanganyika was different. The legislative and administrative organs of Tanganyika were not subordinate to any organs established on the basis of the administrative union with Kenya and Uganda. The powers of the East African Central Legislative Assembly over Tanganyika were granted it voluntarily by the Tanganyika Legislative Council. The report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1951, contained in document T/946, said that the inter-territorial arrangements were an advantage to Tanganyika and as such were to be commended, provided that they were confined to the existing limits. The United Kingdom had no intention at present of expanding those limits. The USSR draft resolution did not, therefore, apply to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

31. The Soviet Union draft resolution also recommended the Administering Authorities to take their legislative and other action "through the Trusteeship Council". However, the Trust Territories were administered by the Administering Authorities and not by the Trusteeship Council, and if the Trusteeship Council was to act as an intermediary it would mean amending the Charter. For all those reasons, the United Kingdom delegation would oppose the USSR draft resolution.

32. The joint draft resolution submitted by India and the Philippines presented fewer disadvantages and the United Kingdom delegation would vote for it, subject to the Committee's acceptance of the amendment suggested by the United States representative and its rejection of the Brazilian amendment.

33. With regard to the Philippine representative's remarks introducing the joint draft resolution and his regret that it was necessary to read the entire report of the Trusteeship Council in order to obtain an intelligible picture of the position with regard to administrative unions, Mr. Mathieson felt that the only way to achieve a clear understanding of the matter was in the context and against the background of general conditions in the Trust Territories.

34. The Brazilian representative had feared that the question of administrative unions would be placed once more at the end of the Fourth Committee's agenda. That could be avoided by a decision to discuss it earlier. If it was felt that the matter was too complicated for the Fourth Committee, a sub-committee could be appointed to consider the question on the basis of the Trusteeship Council's report. The Brazilian amendment also suggested that the special committee to be set up would have as its members an equal number of Administering Authorities and non-administering Powers. He regretted that the United Kingdom delegation would be unable to serve on any such committee or to provide it with additional information. At the time of the year at which the proposed committee would meet, his delegation would be fully engaged with the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73e of the Charter. It was therefore obliged to oppose the Brazilian amendment.

35. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that the position of Iraq on the question of administrative unions closely resembled that set forth by the United States representative.

36. The principle of the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.4/L.174) was a good one, but he feared that it had not taken into account certain stipulations of the Trusteeship Agreements which authorized the Administering Authorities to effect administrative unions, subject to various conditions. The Iraqi delegation would therefore abstain from voting on that draft resolution.

37. His delegation would have no difficulty in supporting the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines (A/C.4/L.196). It would also vote for the Brazilian amendment, which would provide a meeting-point between the Fourth Committee and the Trusteeship Council on the question of administrative unions.

It was not in any way derogatory to the Council to have a committee of the General Assembly study the matter after the Trusteeship Council had submitted its report.

38. Mr. CHYLE (Czechoslovakia) said that no substantial progress had been made on the serious problem of administrative unions. There was a growing tendency on the part of the Administering Authorities to use the Trusteeship Agreements to amalgamate the Trust Territories with neighbouring colonies under their full sovereignty, and thus destroy the international status of those Territories. If that process was continued, Chapter XII of the Charter would lose all meaning. The reason for the integration of the Trust Territories in the colonial possessions of the Administering Authorities lay in the fact that it made possible their more intensive exploitation as suppliers of raw materials and, from the political point of view, their incorporation in military plans. General Assembly resolution 224 (III) had condemned such integration and confirmed that administrative unions should remain strictly administrative and not restrict the separate development of the Trust Territories. The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions had been meant to act as an auxiliary organ to study conditions in the Trust Territories and enable the Trusteeship Council to decide whether those Territories were being silently withdrawn from the International Trusteeship System. That Committee had not fulfilled its purpose.

39. The draft resolution of the Soviet Union recommended the creation of legislative and administrative organs in the Trust Territories not subordinate to any organs established on the basis of union between the Trust Territories and neighbouring colonies. Such action would safeguard the independent political, social and economic advancement of the Trust Territories. At a time when the principle of self-determination was receiving such emphasis, the United Nations should support the development of the indigenous populations of the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. The Czechoslovak delegation would therefore vote in favour of the USSR draft resolution.

40. The purpose of the draft resolution of India and the Philippines was also praiseworthy. He suggested that since that proposal and the USSR proposal were not mutually exclusive, they might be amalgamated in a single text. It would not, however, be sufficient to ask the Trusteeship Council merely to complete its investigation: the additional measures suggested in the Soviet Union draft resolution were essential.

41. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the long-standing administrative union between Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo had been of great benefit to the former. Ruanda-Urundi enjoyed all the services of the Belgian Congo and the problem of over-population there had been partly solved by settlement on land provided by the Belgian Congo.

42. He was sure that if the Trusteeship Council's preliminary investigation of the relation between

administrative unions and the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements was completed, it would be found that the legal texts were unassailable and that the only problem lay in the operation of administrative unions. If the Trusteeship Council found that the functioning of administrative unions was harmful to the Trust Territories or in any way compromised their future, it would be able to make the proper representations.

43. The representative of Poland had said that the effect of administrative unions was to reduce the status of the Trust Territories to that of colonies, and the Czechoslovak representative had said that they meant the end of Chapter XII of the Charter. If the Trusteeship Council supervised administrative unions effectively, however, they could have no such effect. Their effect was in fact, that neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territories received legislation in conformity with the International Trusteeship System.

44. In view of a certain lack of clarity in the wording of the draft resolution of the Soviet Union, in particular the phrase "through the Trusteeship Council", the Belgian delegation would be obliged to vote against it. It regarded the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines as superfluous, but would not vote against it unless the Brazilian amendment was adopted.

45. Mr. CHYLE (Czechoslovakia) said that he had not attacked the Trusteeship Agreements but was opposed to their being used to allow administrative unions to destroy the spirit of Chapter XII of the Charter.

46. Mr. PANT (India) felt that steps must be taken to ensure that the development of the Trust Territories was not retarded by administrative unions. There was no need in the modern age to fear that Administering Authorities would annex or absorb the Trust Territories; but a watchful eye must always be kept on all constitutional, economic or administrative arrangements affecting them. The proper growth of some of the Trust Territories could only take place in relation to their neighbours. If they were to grow to full stature as viable political units, they must do so as part of a larger whole. Developments in the Trust Territories should help neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territories to grow towards self-government or independence.

47. As a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.196), the Indian delegation had no objection to the Brazilian amendment. It would abstain from voting on the USSR draft resolution because it was not clear how that resolution could be put into effect in relation to existing administrative arrangements and the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements.

48. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the General Assembly should not try to force the pace of the Trusteeship Council's work. The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions had done good work and should be allowed to continue.

49. His delegation would abstain from voting on the Soviet Union draft resolution but would vote for the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines, which noted that the mass of detail involved had prevented the Trusteeship Council from examining fully, as yet,

all aspects of the question of administrative unions. It felt that it was not necessary to set up any further body to study the question and would therefore abstain from voting on the Brazilian amendment.

50. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) formally withdrew from the USSR draft resolution (A/C.4/L.174) the words "through the Trusteeship Council" to which the United Kingdom and Belgian delegations had objected. He assured the Belgian delegation that the Soviet Union realized that the existence of administrative unions was authorized by the Trusteeship Agreements and was not trying to liquidate them. Its purpose was to supervise the operation of administrative unions in order to ensure that the status of the Trust Territories was not changed. Resolution 224 (III) of the General Assembly had not been obeyed and the Trust Territories were in fact being absorbed by adjacent Non-Self-Governing Territories.

51. He could not agree to the suggestion that the Soviet Union proposal and the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines (A/C.4/L.196) should be amalgamated. The USSR draft resolution restated his delegation's firm conviction that the real interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories could only be served by allowing them to participate directly in their own legislative organs.

52. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) thought that the United States representative was under a misapprehension: the remark Mr. Ingles had made at the beginning of the meeting, that the facts had had to be gathered from the body of the Trusteeship Council's report (A/1856), was fully substantiated by the statement relating to administrative unions on page 22 of that report.

53. There was no objection to the Council's proposal to pursue its examination of the matter, but that should not serve as a pretext for undue delay or relaxation of the Assembly's vigilance. The dominant concern of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution was that the General Assembly should have at its disposal, at the seventh session, a comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of the position. Maintenance of the wording of the previous Assembly resolution was not of overriding importance, so he was prepared to accept the United States amendment to paragraph 3 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution, but on condition that the word "complete" was inserted before the word "analysis" in the same paragraph.

54. The objective of the Brazilian amendment was also acceptable and the Philippine delegation would accordingly support it. Under that proposal, the difficulties previously experienced could be overcome and at the same time the necessary preparatory work on behalf of the General Assembly could be done; more over, the proposal was in accordance with the precedent set in connexion with Non-Self-Governing Territories.

55. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) said that his delegation would be obliged to oppose the USSR draft resolution because the proposal it made was unacceptable. The Soviet Union representative had acknowledged that

the legality of administrative unions was not in question. But to set up independent legislative and administrative organs in the Trust Territories, in addition to those existing under the administrative unions, would either stultify the latter or be a wasteful duplication. The administrative union between New Guinea and Papua rested upon the firm conviction of the Administering Authority, reached after due consideration, that that was the form of administration best calculated to serve the interests of the Trust Territory. That judgment had since been borne out by experience, as a glance at document T/C.1/L.13, where some of the resulting advantages were enumerated, would show. The Australian Government's view had already been explained at considerable length in the Trusteeship Council; there was therefore nothing to be gained by elaborating it further.

56. The administrative union between New Guinea and Papua was in full accord with the Trusteeship Agreement for New Guinea; moreover, when that Trusteeship Agreement was being framed, the General Assembly had been aware of Australia's intention.

57. The same objections did not apply to the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines, although he agreed with the Belgian representative that the proposal was unnecessary. The Brazilian amendment, on the other had, was wholly unacceptable in principle. If adopted, it would result in proliferation in the worst sense, and might constitute an undesirable precedent for the future. He would be forced to vote against the joint draft resolution if that amendment was adopted.

58. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) accepted the Philippine representative's suggestion regarding paragraph 3 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

59. From a realistic standpoint, the Brazilian proposal was not acceptable. The proposed committee would merely duplicate work already done by the Standing Committee of the Trusteeship Council, which was composed of experts with special technical knowledge of the problem: there was nothing to prevent the General Assembly's considering, at its seventh session, the Trusteeship Council's report on their work. There was also the question of cost. Under rule 152 of the rules of procedure, any proposal having financial implications had to be accompanied by the Secretary-General's estimate of the expenditure involved. Perhaps the Secretariat could give some information on the point. Because of those considerations, he would be unable to vote for the joint draft resolution if the Brazilian amendment was adopted.

60. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General) replied that the proposal would not entail any new financial implications for the Secretariat. There might be costs for delegations but even that was doubtful, since there were permanent missions attached to Headquarters.

61. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that the question under consideration had been before the United Nations for a number of years. As long ago as the third session, the General Assembly had passed resolution 221 (III), requesting

the Trusteeship Council to investigate the matter in all its aspects, in the light of certain relevant considerations. However, a study of the reports of the Trusteeship Council and of Visiting Missions showed that certain Administering Authorities were violating that resolution and using the so-called administrative unions to further their policies of annexation. The actions of those governments were endangering the status of the Trust Territories concerned and hampering their free development towards self-government or independence. The facts, as elicited from the reports he had mentioned, did not support the Belgian contention that, on the contrary, administrative unions were instrumental in applying the benefits of the Trusteeship System to Non-Self-Governing Territories.

62. Specific examples of those so-called administrative unions were the union between New Guinea and Papua and that between Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo. In both cases, the result was complete political, economic and administrative absorption by the neighbouring colonial possessions. The Act of 21 August 1925 referred to by the Belgian representative had made of Ruanda-Urundi a dependency of the Belgian Congo. There were no independent legislative or administrative organs in the Territory; complete control was vested in the colonial bodies established in the Belgian Congo.

63. The United Kingdom had achieved the virtual annexation of the Cameroons under its administration by splitting it into administrative districts attached to different parts of Nigeria. The Territory's complete subordination was clearly borne out by the lack of autonomy in all fields: it was not even directly represented on either the Executive or Legislative Council of Nigeria. Furthermore, the highest judicial organ for the Territory was the Nigerian Supreme Court. As had already been shown by a previous speaker, the situation in Togoland under British administration was similar.

64. The Trust Territories under French administration had long since been integrated in the French Union, and were thus deprived of their fundamental rights. For instance, political and legislative power was now vested in the central organs of the French Union, leaving unheeded the special interests of the indigenous inhabitants.

65. The Administering Authorities were pursuing a deliberate policy in contradiction with the General Assembly's resolutions and the provisions of the Charter; the development of the Trust Territories as separate entities and the advancement of their peoples towards self-government and independence were seriously threatened. In such a situation, the General Assembly could not stand idly by. He therefore urged the Committee to adopt the USSR draft proposal as an appropriate means of safeguarding and achieving the objectives of the International Trusteeship System. The Ukrainian delegation would warmly support that proposal.

66. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that previous General Assembly resolutions had pointed out that administrative unions should not be allowed to cloak the annexation of Trust

Territories and the consequent loss of their international status. The actions of the Administering Authorities threatened to destroy the purpose of the International Trusteeship System. By resolution 326 (IV), the General Assembly had noted that the Trusteeship Agreements did not authorize any form of political association which would involve annexation of the Trust Territories in any sense or the loss of their international status, and had recommended the Trusteeship Council to complete its investigation of the question of administrative unions in all its aspects. The Trusteeship Council had not as yet fully implemented that resolution.

67. The arguments repeated year after year in support of those so-called administrative unions would not stand up to scrutiny. The Administering Authorities had distorted the true purposes of the Trusteeship Agreements. During the general discussion of the Trusteeship Council's report, several delegations had shown that the Administering Authorities, in violation of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements, had annexed the Trust Territories under their administration by joining them in administrative unions with imperial possessions. Their policy was thus directed towards strengthening the colonial régime. Power was centred in high commissioners and other colonial officers with headquarters outside the Territories and the Territories were deprived of their political and financial independence. All evidence pointed to the fact that the aims and purposes of the Trusteeship System were not implemented by the Administering Authorities. It was therefore imperative for the General Assembly to take a stand, and his delegation would support the USSR draft resolution.

68. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) observed that although the question of administrative unions affecting Trust Territories was admittedly an intricate one, that was hardly justification for the treatment the Fourth Committee accorded it year after year in relegating it to the bottom of its agenda. That procedure could not be perpetuated indefinitely, and he accordingly welcomed the Brazilian proposal as an appropriate means whereby the General Assembly might come to grips with the problem. The proposed committee would be able to make a constructive contribution to the Assembly's understanding of the technical matters involved. He would therefore support the Brazilian amendment in the hope that the General Assembly would be enabled to complete its examination of the matter at the seventh session.

69. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) found that the USSR draft resolution was based on the false premise that the Administering Authorities were endeavouring to annex the Trust Territories. As the Indian representative had acknowledged, that was an unfounded charge. Because of the false point of departure and the fact that it overlooked the authorization contained in the Trusteeship Agreements, the New Zealand delegation would vote against it.

70. With respect to the joint draft resolution, he was glad to note that the sponsors had accepted the United States amendment. It would have been inconsistent to ask the Trusteeship Council to complete its investigation

of the matter so long as administrative unions continued to exist. The New Zealand delegation would be prepared to support the joint draft resolution as thus amended. On the other hand, the Brazilian amendment was unacceptable and he would vote against it. It seemed to him an irresponsible suggestion, since there was already ample documentation available on the matter from the comprehensive and continued investigations of the past few years.

71. Mr. PIGNON (France) observed that his delegation's attitude to the joint draft resolution would have to be revised if the Brazilian amendment was accepted. The French delegation was opposed in principle to the proliferation of committees outside the General Assembly. In the present instance, the result might prove harmful to the General Assembly's work, and would moreover impose an excessive burden on the Administering Authorities. France would not be in a position to accept membership in any such committee.

72. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) could see nothing incompatible in the USSR draft resolution and the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines. Moreover, the argument that the USSR draft was inconsistent with the Trusteeship Agreements was unconvincing, since no General Assembly resolution could alter or modify the provisions of a contractual agreement. He would support both the USSR proposal and the joint draft resolution, as well as the Brazilian amendment; all were useful and constructive proposals.

73. Mr. CASELLAS (Mexico) endorsed the Guatemalan representative's observations; he too would vote for both draft resolutions and for the Brazilian amendment.

74. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) disagreed with the Belgian representative that the proposed committee would be a fifth body examining the question of administrative unions; in actual fact only two other bodies were involved, the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions and the Fourth Committee, since in the past the Trusteeship Council had contented itself with referring the Standing Committee's reports directly to the General Assembly. As an argument against the suggestion to defer the establishment of a committee until the General Assembly met for its seventh session, he recalled the difficulties attendant upon sub-committees sitting during Assembly sessions.

75. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) stated that his delegation would oppose the USSR proposal as contrary to the Trusteeship Agreements. It was favourably disposed towards the joint draft resolution of India and the Philippines but could not accept the Brazilian amendment thereto. The committee it proposed was totally unnecessary; moreover, two Administering Authorities had intimated that they would be unable to participate in view of their other commitments. Since no useful purpose could be served without a balanced membership of Administering Authorities and non-administering Powers, he would vote against the proposal.

The USSR draft resolution (A/C.4/L.174), as amended, was rejected by 12 votes to 11, with 24 abstentions.

76. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) stated that he would vote against the Brazilian amendment for the reasons he had already given and, if it was accepted, would be obliged to vote against the joint draft resolution.

77. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Brazilian amendment (A/C.4/L.208) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.196).

A vote was taken by roll call.

Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour : Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against : Denmark, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Abstaining : Dominican Republic, Greece, Israel, Norway, Thailand, Chile, China, Colombia.

The Brazilian amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.196), as amended by the United States and Brazil.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iraq, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour : Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Against : Netherlands, New Zealand, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining : Israel, Norway, Sweden, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark.

The joint draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 33 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the committee to be established under the joint draft resolution should consist of four members, and suggested the appointment of the delegations of Brazil, Denmark, India and the Netherlands.

80. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) and Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) stated that they would require to consult with their delegations before accepting the nomination.

81. The CHAIRMAN agreed that the matter should be deferred until the following meeting.

Question of South West Africa (*continued*)

[Item 38]*

82. In reply to Mr. ZIAUD-DIN (Pakistan), the CHAIRMAN stated that he had received a letter, which the Secretary would read out, from the Reverend Michael Scott, asking to be allowed to make a short statement to the Committee on a matter of conscience. As the Committee's consideration of the question of South West Africa had been finally closed for the present session, he had suggested that the Reverend Michael Scott might communicate his statement in writing directly to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on South West Africa.

83. A brief exchange of views followed, in which Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Mr. MANTILLA (Ecuador), Mr. PANT (India), Lord TWEEDSMUIR (United Kingdom), Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands), Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala), Mrs. COELHO LISBOA DE LARRAGOITI (Brazil) and Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) participated.

It was agreed that the Reverend Michael Scott should be heard at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.