



**Thursday, 18 November 1954,
at 10.47 a.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Agenda item 13: | |
| Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)..... | 259 |

Chairman: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2680, A/C.4/277, A/C.4/L.332, A/C.4/L.364, A/C.4/L.365, A/C.4/L.366, A/C.4/L.367, A/C.4/L.368) (*continued*)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it the following draft resolutions: the Syrian draft resolution on the participation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories in the work of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.332); the Canadian draft resolution on the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.364); the joint Belgian, Indian, Syrian and United States draft resolution on the annual reports of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.365); the Haitian draft resolution on the question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia (A/C.4/L.366); and the joint Salvadorian and Mexican draft resolution on the financing of the economic development plans of the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration (A/C.4/L.367).
2. In accordance with the normal practice, the draft resolution on the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.364) would be discussed and put to the vote when the discussion of the report had been concluded.
3. The Syrian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.332) was being revised and a new text would be distributed at the following meeting.
4. He therefore asked the Committee to turn to the four-Power draft resolution on the annual report of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.365).
5. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Pakistan) proposed that the draft resolution should be amended to allow for an exception being made in the case of the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration. The Territory was to attain independence in 1960. Since that date was drawing near, he felt it was essential that the Committee should have complete information on the Territory every year.
6. Mr. PIGNON (France) supported the four-Power draft resolution. It was based on two General Assembly resolutions and the Secretary-General's suggestions to the Trusteeship Council (T/1120); and its purpose was to limit the volume and improve the quality of the docu-

mentation submitted to the General Assembly. Its main effect would be to reduce the volume of the Trusteeship Council's report, which was rather heavy reading.

7. With regard to the Pakistan amendment, he was not convinced that there was any need to make an exception in the case of Somaliland under Italian administration; but if the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the amendment, he would vote in favour of it.

8. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) reminded the Committee that at the previous meeting he had proposed that the draft resolution should specify that the General Assembly was approving the proposals on a trial basis.

9. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) supported the Pakistan amendment; perhaps the draft resolution might lay down that a comprehensive annual report should be submitted for the Trust Territory of Somaliland.

10. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not see just what purpose the Pakistan amendment would serve. He would like to see the amendment in writing.

11. Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) appreciated the Pakistan representative's praiseworthy intentions but thought that his amendment was unnecessary. The draft resolution provided that, in addition to the comprehensive report which the Council would submit on each Trust Territory after examining the visiting mission's report on that Territory, the Council should also submit a report each year containing the general information necessary to enable the Assembly to appreciate the significance of any important developments in the Trust Territories. In that connexion, he drew attention to the Trusteeship Council's comments on page 35 of its report (A/2680) under the heading "Control and limitation of documentation".

12. He was not opposed to the Yugoslav representative's proposal, but he pointed out that it was customary to modify a procedure if it did not prove satisfactory. That would obviously apply to the procedure suggested in the draft resolution if it were adopted.

13. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that in that case he would withdraw his proposal.

14. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Pakistan) thought that it was for the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly to decide what were the important points in the information transmitted, not the Trusteeship Council.

15. Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) replied that it was not a question of deciding what was or was not important, but of eliminating repetition. If the draft resolution was adopted, the Members of the United Nations would be spared the task of reading every year, on every Territory, information very similar to that furnished the previous year.

16. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) pointed out that the General Assembly was not interested only in political information about Somaliland. Economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory were also of the utmost importance, and the Committee should be

able to observe developments in those fields since the Territory was soon to attain independence. It therefore seemed advisable that the General Assembly should receive a comprehensive report on Somaliland each year, as suggested in the Pakistan amendment. His delegation would vote in favour of that amendment.

17. Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) pointed out that any important progress in the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration would be noted in the Trusteeship Council's report each year, regardless of the field in which it occurred. The Pakistan amendment was therefore unnecessary. If it was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

18. Mr. PIGNON (France) thought that the Yugoslav representative's proposal would offer a compromise solution. In 1955 the Trusteeship Council's report to the General Assembly would include detailed information on Somaliland, since a visiting mission had gone to that Territory in 1954. Accordingly, the Committee need not fear any lack of information in 1955; it could defer judgment on the new procedure to the tenth session and review the question then, if necessary. The Yugoslav representative's proposal should meet all points of view; if it were accepted, the Pakistan representative might be able to withdraw his amendment.

19. Mr. VERGARA (Chile) said that he would vote in favour of the Pakistan amendment. It might not be essential, but it was nevertheless useful, and its intentions were praiseworthy.

20. The United States representative had said that the reports on each Territory varied little from one year to the next. In his delegation's opinion that was one reason more for anxiety about the rate of progress in the Trust Territories.

21. After a suggestion by Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) and an observation by Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories), the CHAIRMAN read the text of the Pakistan amendment (A/C.4/L.368), consisting of the following additional paragraph to be added, as paragraph 2, at the end of the draft resolution:

"Requests, however, that in view of the time limit for the attainment of independence by Somaliland under Italian administration in 1960, the Trusteeship Council annually submit a comprehensive report on that Trust Territory."

22. Replying to a question by Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General), drew attention to the section entitled "General" on page 37 of the Trusteeship Council's report. The information it contained on land and people would not be reproduced each year, as it remained virtually unchanged. Similarly, if there was no change in the political situation from one year to the next the information included in the section entitled "Political advancement" would not figure in the next report. The adoption of the four-Power draft resolution would mean that each year the Council would submit conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly, together with the general information necessary for the Assembly to appreciate the significance of important developments in each Trust Territory on which a comprehensive report had not been submitted.

23. If the members of the Trusteeship Council had made any comments sufficiently important to be mentioned in the Council's report, particularly on the new developments during the year, they would appear. In brief, only the repetitions would be eliminated.

24. Mrs. MENON (India) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General for his explanation and emphasized that the draft resolution referred only to the Trusteeship Council's reports to the General Assembly. The fuller reports submitted to the Trusteeship Council would always be at the disposal of all Members of the United Nations who were interested in the Trusteeship System and related questions. The repetitions in the annual report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly could therefore be eliminated so as to reduce the cost of publishing that document. That was the purpose for which the Indian delegation, with the delegations of Belgium, Syria and the United States had proposed the draft resolution.

25. Her delegation would abstain from the vote on the amendment proposed by Pakistan, which it considered unnecessary.

26. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that his delegation had voted against the Secretary-General's proposal at the fourteenth session of the Trusteeship Council, since it felt that the documentary material was never sufficient. It was difficult to see, on careful examination, how the length of the Trusteeship Council's report could be reduced. It would be impossible to leave out the few lines relating to population, since the population increased every year. The information on political progress in the Territories could not be abridged, still less that on the system of land tenure. The observations of the Administering Authorities could not be cut down further without diminishing the interest of the report. The observations made by the members of the Council represented the views of their Governments and could not possibly be condensed more.

27. Moreover, if the Council were to submit a comprehensive report on each Territory only every three years, when it examined the visiting mission's report on that Territory, he wondered what would happen if the mission, for reasons beyond its control, had been unable to visit a Territory. The object of the proposal seemed to be to enable Administering Authorities to submit as little information as possible. He would like to have the opinion of the Secretary-General's representative on the extent to which resolution 789 (VIII) applied to the present case. The Committee should not adopt the draft resolution without going further into the question, and he would vote against it.

28. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the purpose of the draft resolution was, first, to reduce expenditure and, secondly, to improve the documentation. He agreed that the proposal would save money, but he could not see how the documentation would be improved by leaving out the passages on which Member States which were not members of the Trusteeship Council based their observations. It was true, as the Indian representative had pointed out, that delegations could consult previous reports, but they might not always be able to obtain the copies they needed. In any event, the procedure would be inconvenient and might prevent some members of the Committee from fully understanding the debates.

29. Mrs. MENON (India) said that the object of the draft resolution was to facilitate discussion in the General Assembly on any given Territory. The Fourth Committee's debates on the Trusteeship Council's report had always ranged very widely and it had never tried to concentrate on any Territory in particular. If the draft resolution were adopted, the Committee would have full information, since it would have the Administering Authority's annual report, the information furnished by

petitioners, and the visiting mission's report. It would be for the Committee and the Council to decide each year which Territory they wished to discuss. Instead of preventing the Committee and the General Assembly from performing their duty, as the Philippine representative feared, that method would enable them to perform it more adequately.

30. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General), in reply to the USSR representative, pointed out that the resolution would in no way affect the obligation of the Administering Authorities to submit annual reports on the administration of the Trust Territories. Those reports would continue to be distributed to all Member States.

31. In his opinion resolution 789 (VIII) perfectly fitted the present case, since paragraph 2 of the operative part referred to inviting all organs of the United Nations to effect such reduction in their existing documentation as might be feasible and to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his efforts to reduce the volume of the documentation of the United Nations.

32. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) emphasized that the reasons for the draft resolution were practical. It was a fact that the Council's report did not deal with one subject only but with a number of subjects simultaneously; hence the difficulties experienced every year by the Fourth Committee at the outset of its general debate. The sponsors of the draft resolution proposed that the Council should concentrate particularly each year on the Territories visited by the visiting mission. The question was quite clear and any further discussion could only lead to confusion; he therefore moved the closure of the debate in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

33. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) felt that delegations should be allowed to express their opinions on so important a matter as the annual reports of the Trusteeship Council; but a proposal had been laid before the Committee which might have the effect of excluding some Member States from its deliberations. The Philippine delegation would not abandon its independent attitude; in matters of principle it would not brook hesitation, delay or compromise. For that reason it opposed the closure of the debate.

34. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) opposed the Venezuelan representative's proposal. Members of the Committee might sometimes have made up their minds on a subject; but often they formed their opinions during the discussion, when they heard such pertinent remarks as those of the Philippine representative concerning the individual observations made by members of the Trusteeship Council.

35. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for closure of the debate to the vote.

The motion was not adopted, 13 votes being cast in favour and 13 against, with 20 abstentions.

36. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) outlined the manner in which the resolution might apply to the Trusteeship Council's report. There could be no reduction of the space given to special questions referred to the Trusteeship Council, such as administrative unions, the achievement of self-government or independence by Trust Territories, or other questions. Nor could the amount of information supplied by the Administering Authorities be reduced. With regard to Council members' observations which expressed only their own opinions, the Committee set up by the Council to study the Secretary-General's proposal had suggested in its report (T/L.477) that those observations should be summarized and made

available to every delegation so that it might supplement them if it so desired.

37. Since, therefore, the draft resolution would place no restriction on the observations made by the members of the Council, the Yugoslav delegation would vote in its favour. At the same time it formally re-submitted the proposal he had made at the previous meeting, which would enable a number of delegations to vote for the draft resolution in the certain knowledge that the question would be reconsidered in the following year.

38. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) sympathized with the misgivings of the Pakistan representative but drew his attention to resolution 755 (VIII), in which the General Assembly had requested the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration to give, in its annual report, precise information on the situation in Somaliland. Since there was a United Nations body in that Territory which submitted full annual reports to the United Nations, he saw no point in making an exception in the draft resolution for the case of Somaliland. He therefore suggested that the representative of Pakistan should withdraw his amendment. If the amendment were put to the vote, he would vote against it; if it were adopted, he would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

39. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) said she would vote for the draft resolution, since she was always in favour of trying new methods in the hope of improving the Committee's work. Furthermore, in accordance with the amendment proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia, the new procedure would be on a trial basis only; the United States representative had agreed that it would be merely an experiment. She would therefore vote for the Yugoslav amendment, and also for that proposed by the delegation of Pakistan, since it was essential for the General Assembly to receive a report on Somaliland every year.

40. Mr. PIGNON (France) said he would vote for the Yugoslav amendment. The text of the draft resolution would have required the Administering Authorities to make a sacrifice for the General Assembly in a spirit of loyalty to the Secretary-General, since it restricted their freedom of opinion.

41. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Pakistan) was willing to agree to the Yugoslav amendment, but maintained his own, since he felt that Somaliland was a special case in which United Nations prestige was at stake. The Organization could not break its word and delay the achievement of independence by the Territory. It must therefore make clear to world public opinion that it was doing everything possible to inform itself of the situation and the needs of the Territory.

42. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) intended to vote for the draft resolution with the amendments proposed by Pakistan and Yugoslavia, on the understanding that the Administering Authorities would continue to furnish the same information as before and that members of the Trusteeship Council who wished to express their opinion on any particular point should have every opportunity to do so, so that the General Assembly could take note of it.

43. Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) wished to reply to certain of the objections made to the draft resolution. In connexion with the argument advanced by the representative of the USSR, he emphasized, as the Secretary-General's representative had done, that the resolu-

tion in no way reduced the obligations of the Administering Authorities; unforeseen circumstances which might prevent a visiting mission from carrying out its duties could arise, but only in exceptional cases. With regard to the objection of the Philippine representative concerning the individual comments of members of the Council, that too was unfounded because it was clearly understood that the members of the Council would be able to decide which observations were sufficiently important to be included in the report. Lastly, other delegations had, unofficially, expressed the fear that the procedure contemplated might make the work of representatives who were new to the Committee more difficult. He noted that if the report was less voluminous, it would be easier for them to grasp the new elements in it. They could find the background information in previous reports.

44. He would like two points to be cleared up. First, he asked the Secretary-General's representative whether, in view of the draft resolution, the Council would still be able to go into the situation in the Trust Territories in detail every year. He would also like to know whether the Colombian representative had any reason other than the one he had given for not voting in favour of the Pakistan amendment or the draft resolution.

45. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) said that his only objection derived from the existence of a resolution containing a recommendation which was addressed not to the Administering Authority but to the Advisory Council, i.e., to a United Nations body in the Territory.

46. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) agreed with the arguments put forward by the United States and Indian delegations and would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution. He would also support the Pakistan amendment, in view of the fact that Somaliland was to become independent within a short time. Lastly, he would vote for the Yugoslav amendment, because it would remove any doubts which might still exist in the minds of representatives.

47. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) would support the Pakistan amendment. However, he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution, for the reasons which he had already put forward in the Trusteeship Council: a reduction in documentation might not perhaps present any disadvantage for delegations with long experience in the Organization or with large staffs but the situation would be different for a small delegation such as his own. He recalled in that connexion that he had needed some time to grasp all the problems involved and that a newcomer would be very glad to find in the documentation information which others might regard as superfluous. His experience in the Trusteeship Council had confirmed him in that opinion. Members of the Committee should all have the same opportunity of acquainting themselves with the facts, but those who were unable to attend the debates in the Trusteeship Council were in a less favourable position in that respect. He could not therefore support the draft resolution, because consideration should be given to difficulties such as he had himself encountered at the beginning of his work with the Organization. He would abstain from voting on the Yugoslav amendment, which altered the position very little: it was self-evident that a matter could always be reconsidered.

48. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution accepted the Yugoslav amendment.

49. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), recalling the terms of Article 87 of the Charter, said that the Trusteeship Council was fully authorized to take decisions in connexion with its report. In the circumstances, the General Assembly would be showing excessive zeal, to say the least, in adopting the draft resolution. Moreover, he did not see why the Committee should concentrate particularly on the Trusteeship Council's report to the General Assembly, when there were many other Council documents whose volume could be reduced. The report was particularly important, because it served as a guide to delegations.

50. The idea in the draft resolution was not new: he had already had occasion to argue against it in the Trusteeship Council, where a certain reactionary trend continuously opposed liberal opinion. It was important to consider all the consequences of the draft resolution: if it were accepted, one or two hundred pages of paper might be saved, but representatives would lose their opportunity of playing an active part in the discussion on the Trust Territories. The United Nations' important role in relation to the future of the peoples of the Trust Territories would be diminished, because the general debate was essential in forming public opinion. In the circumstances, it would be impossible for him to change his position on the draft resolution.

51. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General) said in reply to the Guatemalan representative, that when the Trusteeship Council had examined the question, it had never contemplated limiting its work. It had been solely concerned with reducing the volume of documentation. The step was in accordance with the wishes of the Fifth Committee.

52. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) was in favour of the draft resolution, which would have the twofold advantage of effecting a monetary saving and of saving the time of representatives by producing reports which would be easier to read. He was also in favour of the Yugoslav amendment and would support the Pakistan amendment unreservedly. In that connexion, he was rather surprised by the objections of the Colombian representative. He would like to know whether the Colombian representative had spoken as a representative of the United Nations Advisory Council, in which case his objections were regrettable. In his view, the Pakistan amendment could only assist Italy in completing the magnificent work which it was doing in Somaliland.

53. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) explained again why he was opposed to the Pakistan amendment and said that he spoke for his delegation only, and not for the Advisory Council.

54. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) observed that on many occasions more detailed information had been asked for on the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In view of the fact that the situation in the Trust Territories appeared very little better than it was in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would not be advisable to reduce documentation, as proposed in the draft resolution.

55. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had listened with attention to the explanations of the Assistant Secretary-General and of the representative of Guatemala. However, he would like to know how the Administering Authorities interpreted the draft resolution. The Yugoslav representative proposed that it should be regarded as an experiment, but experiments were not always justified and it was by no means certain that the experiment in question would

yield concrete results. Nevertheless, without changing its position on the draft resolution as a whole, the Soviet delegation would abstain from voting on the Yugoslav amendment if it was put to the vote separately.

56. The Philippine representative had asked just where the reduction in documentation would be made, but he had not received any specific answer. The question was important, however, since millions of peoples in the Trust Territories were affected.

57. He would vote in favour of the Pakistan amendment, if it was put to the vote separately, but the various amendments did not improve the text enough to allow him to change his position on the draft resolution as a whole.

58. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) agreed in principle with the draft resolution and with the amendments. However, he wished to point out that the Trusteeship Council had not, in his opinion, properly respected the provisions of General Assembly resolution 789 (VIII), which requested the organs of the United Nations to scrutinize their existing documentation and reduce it as far as was feasible. In point of fact, the Council had not made such a scrutiny, but had simply accepted the suggestions of the Secretary-General. He would have liked the Council's report to set forth the Council's own conclusions on the matter.

59. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that when he had moved the closure of the debate, his suggestion had not been aimed at the Philippine representative in particular. He had simply thought that the discussion was over; he had not foreseen that the Philippine representative would go on asking questions.

60. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) was in favour of speeding the debate, but felt that in the case in point the Committee's procedure was rather reprehensible. There was, of course, no objection to voting on a draft resolution like the one under discussion, because it had no relation to the substance of the general debate. However, when draft resolutions related to matters dealt with in the report of the Trusteeship Council, as did the draft resolution proposed by Haiti (A/C.4/L.366) for example, it was rather difficult to consider them and even more so to vote on them before delegations had made their views known in the general debate.

61. The CHAIRMAN thought that a preliminary examination of the draft resolutions might be of assistance to the Committee. He noted that no member of the Committee was ready to speak in the general debate for the time being. That being so, one or more meetings would have to be cancelled.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.