

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Friday, 14 November 1958,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .	307

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

## AGENDA ITEM 13

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

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.547, A/C.4/L.548/REV.1, A/C.4/L.549/REV.1) (continued)

Draft resolution on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories (A/C.4/L.548/Rev.1) (concluded)

1. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that he was in sympathy with the purposes of the draft resolution under consideration (A/C.4/L.548/Rev.1), but thought that the text as it stood raised practical difficulties. In Western Samoa, for instance, the people were concerned not so much with being able to take advantage of the scholarships offered as to make sure that scholarships were granted to those who needed them in certain subjects. Moreover, the Territory, which had only a small population, did not need a large number of doctors, for instance, but it was important that there should be a certain uniformity in the training of the doctors who were to practise there. It was accordingly necessary for the Government of the Territory to be able to exercise some control over the granting of fellowships to the indigenous inhabitants. That being so, operative paragraph 2 might be improved, as the representative of the United Kingdom had suggested at the 795th meeting, by the insertion of the phrase "consistent with the interests of the Territories and their peoples", between "necessary measures" and "to ensure".

2. His delegation saw no need for operative paragraph 7, but would not vote against it.

3. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that his delegation was in agreement with the ideas contained in the draft resolution, particularly in its present revised form. But he would point out that, although there must be no compromise in the matter of principles where the Trust Territories were concerned, the practical difficulties facing the Administering Authorities in the application of those principles must not be forgotten. He agreed with the New Zealand representative's comment and would formally propose the inclusion of the words "consistent with the interests of the Territories and their peoples" in operative paragraph 2.

4. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) thought that the practical difficulties mentioned by the New Zealand representative, and also by the Australian representative (800th meeting), should not prevent delegations from voting for the draft resolution, as an opportunity had been provided to put those difficulties on record and they would be taken into account at the next session. Moreover, the Administering Authority for Western Samoa might inform the Governments concerned of the subjects in which the students from the Territory needed training. He would abstain from voting on the amendment proposed by the Iranian representative.

5. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he would vote for operative paragraph 3, which had been inserted in the revised text as the result of an amendment proposed at the previous meeting by the United States delegation.

6. He saw no objection to the Iranian amendment to operative paragraph 2, but thought it obvious that the Administering Authorities would not take any measures which were not in the interests of the Territories and their peoples.

7. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) agreed with the New Zealand representative that offers of scholarships should be adapted to the needs of the Trust Territories. It would accordingly be desirable for the Administering Authorities to prepare plans for the development of education and then to apply, either direct or through the United Nations, for any scholarships which might be necessary, particularly in scientific subjects.

8. He had no objection in principle to the new operative paragraph 3, but feared that the obligation to pay travel expenses in connexion with scholarships might lead Governments to reduce the number of scholarships offered to the inhabitants of the Trust Territories.

9. In connexion with the Chilean representative's observation of the previous meeting to the effect that Asian and African students should not be taken out of their own environment, he pointed out that in Asia and Africa educational facilities were not adequate to provide students with advanced training.

10. Mr. MELINESCU (Romania) thought that in view of the need for experts in the Trust Territories, it was reprehensible that only one-quarter of the scholarships offered to inhabitants of those Territories had been used. It was for political motives rather than on account of practical difficulties that the Administering Authorities had prevented students from those Territories from taking advantage of the scholarships offered. That was true in particular of the scholarships offered by the Romanian Government to enable students from the Trust Territories to study medicine, oil engineering or other technical subjects. As far as Romania was concerned, there was no need to fear, as the Chilean representative seemed to do,

that students would not return to their countries on completion of their studies, as Romania had no dearth of specialists in the subjects in which it was offering scholarships; the ratio of doctors to the total population, for example, was one of the highest in the world. He saw no objection to the new paragraph 3, which was based on the United States amendment and according to which scholarships should include travel expenses, as such expenses were in fact included in scholarships offered by the Romanian Government.

11. He was convinced that the draft resolution would make it possible to improve the extent to which the inhabitants of the Trust Territories profited by the facilities for study and training offered by States Members of the United Nations.

12. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the amendment proposed by the Iranian representative left unanswered the question of who was to decide whether the proposed measures were in the interests of the Territories and their populations. He would accordingly suggest that the word "interests" should be replaced by the word "needs". If the amendment was thus modified, he would vote for it.

13. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) supported the Yugoslav representative's proposal, and the new text of operative paragraph 3. On the other hand, he did not think there was any need to include paragraph 7, as it would be premature at the present stage to place an additional item on the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly.

14. Mr. COHEN (Chile) explained that he had merely mentioned, without endorsing, the views of certain Administering Authorities concerning the tendency of students from Trust Territories to remain abroad on the completion of their studies.

15. He drew attention to the fact that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) published regularly a handbook entitled *Study Abroad* which contained information on all scholarships offered for such study; it might be useful to request that agency's opinion on the question before the Committee.

16. In reply to a question from Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that his amendment did in fact concern the practical needs of the Trust Territories for doctors, engineers and other experts. He would accordingly agree to amend it to read: "consistent with the interests and needs of the Territories and their peoples".

17. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no objection to the draft resolution as it stood, but could not approve the Iranian amendment, which, on the one hand, implied a certain mistrust of the Administering Authorities and, on the other, failed to take into account the wishes of inhabitants of the Territories who wished to obtain advanced education by means of scholarships offered by States Members of the United Nations. Moreover, as experience had shown, a formula of that nature could be exploited by the Administering Authorities against the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories.

18. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said, with regard to the difficulties mentioned by the New Zealand representative, that he appreciated that they were genuine practical difficulties and he agreed with the repre-

sentative of New Zealand. Those were questions of a practical nature which could easily be settled between the Powers offering the scholarships and the Administering Authority accepting them on behalf of the Territory concerned. In that connexion, the observations made earlier by the representative of Chile were pertinent; UNESCO was the body best qualified to provide assistance on that subject, and he was certain that, with such good offices, the difficulties could be surmounted.

19. He hoped that the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Iranian delegations would accept the revised draft resolution, and he requested the Iranian representative to withdraw his amendment in order to prevent a reopening of the debate on the substantive issue of what were the "interests" of the indigenous inhabitants and who was the best judge of such interests—the United Nations or the Administering Authority. Further, the suggested amendment implied that the measures usually taken by the Administering Authorities were not "consistent with the interests" of the indigenous inhabitants. The amendment was superfluous.

20. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) thought the Iranian amendment both useful and necessary; the draft resolution was in fact attributing too much importance to the interests of individuals and too little to the interests of the peoples and the Territories as a whole. He accordingly hoped that the Iranian representative would maintain his amendment, the rejection of which would make a difference to the United Kingdom's attitude.

21. With regard to operative paragraph 7, he asked for a separate vote, and explained that his delegation would abstain in that vote because it saw no point in placing an additional item on the agenda of the fourteenth session.

22. It was his understanding that the Yugoslav representative might have a similar resolution in mind regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. The two things were different and his delegation reserved its position on any draft resolution of that kind.

23. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that he would maintain his amendment in the hope that the United Kingdom delegation and others holding the same views would be able to vote for the draft resolution.

24. He asked for a separate vote on his amendment.

25. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) thought that the word "interests" in the Iranian amendment raised the question of deciding who should be the judge of those interests. The Administering Authorities had always considered themselves the sole judges of the interests of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. His delegation would accordingly vote against the amendment.

26. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) proposed the closure of the debate.

That proposal was adopted.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Iranian oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.548/Rev.1.

The Iranian amendment was adopted by 34 votes to 11, with 21 abstentions.

28. Mr. CLAEYS-BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that in view of the adoption of the Iranian amendment to

operative paragraph 2, he would withdraw the request for a separate vote on that paragraph that he had made at the 792nd meeting.

Paragraph 7 of the operative part of the draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of India, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.548/Rev.1/ as a whole, as amended.

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

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay.

Abstentions: Portugal, Australia, Belgium, France.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

29. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on the Iranian amendment to operative paragraph 2 because he felt that the additional phrase was somewhat out of place. The new wording tended to emphasize the "necessary" measures, whereas the stress should have been placed on the interests and needs of the Trust Territories and their peoples.

30. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) explained that he had abstained on the amendment to operative paragraph 2 for the reasons stated by the Haitian representative. He had also abstained on operative paragraph 7 because he considered it unnecessary, as the question could have been dealt with in connexion with the Committee's consideration of the report of the Trusteeship Council.

31. Mr. SPACIL (Czechoslovakia) said that he had voted against the Iranian amendment to operative paragraph 2 because the Administering Authorities rather than the peoples concerned decided what was in the interests of the Territory. Furthermore, the amendment gave the impression that certain countries granted scholarships for reasons other than the interests of the indigenous inhabitants, which was an obvious slur.

32. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he had abstained on the Iranian amendment, although he had previously stated that his delegation would vote against it. A negative vote from his delegation might have suggested that it was not concerned with the interests of the peoples of the Trust Territories. In announcing that he would vote against the amendment, he had hoped to induce the Iranian delegation to withdraw the amendment.

33. Mr. NAJJAR (Lebanon) explained that he had voted against the Iranian amendment because, in matters concerning education, it was not possible to act against the interests of any party.

34. Mr. PLANGPRAYOON (Thailand) said that he had voted against operative paragraph 7 because he believed that there would be no point in placing the question, as a separate item, on the agenda of the fourteenth session.

Draft resolution on economic aid for Somalia (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1)

35. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that he was gratified that his statement at the 782nd meeting had met with the approval of many delegations.

36. In considering the problem of providing financial assistance to Somalila, his delegation had constantly borne in mind the fact that the Territory was passing through one of the most critical phases of its evolution towards independence. Italy was directly concerned with the problem as Administering Authority, but it should not be forgotten that any decision in the matter would have to be taken by the independent and sovereign State of Somalia.

37. Some delegations had drawn attention to contradictions or inaccuracies in the amendments (A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1) which the Guatemalan, Indian, and Iraqi delegations had submitted to the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1. The report of the Mission sent to the Territory by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (T/1296), which was mentioned in those amendments, expressed the view that it would be desirable to co-ordinate the financial and technical assistance to be made available to the Territory, but did not envisage the establishment of a special fund for Somaliland to be administered by various Member States of the United Nations. The Mission had been sent to Somaliland in 1956, following discussions which had taken place in 1954 and 1955, and had been asked to study existing economic conditions and the economic and financial measures needed to put the economy of the Territory on a sound footing. The Mission had been asked to make a thorough study of local resources and their utilization, the necessary technical and financial measures, and ways and means of co-ordinating efforts, taking into account any assistance which might be furnished from outside the Territory, i.e., mainly by the Administering Authority. At that time the Italian Government had been carrying out an economic plan in Somaliland and the problem of co-ordination had been of some significance. At that initial stage of Somaliland's development, the Bank had been concerned with establishing a stable economy; it had not been concerned with the question of furnishing assistance to Somaliland after 1960. There had been no question of considering the establishment of a special fund, but merely of developing suitable machinery, such as the Agency for Economic Development of Somalia (ASES), which had been instituted by the Administering Authority. The Agency was responsible for co-ordinating technical and financial assistance with Government policies. It had been in operation for over two years and was mentioned by the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957, in its report on Somaliland (T/1344).

38. The amendments in document A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1 also referred to certain suggestions made by the Prime Minister of the Government of Somalia in 1957. It would have been more appropriate to quote more recent statements by the Somali Government. On 16 July 1958 the Prime Minister had stated that his Government was engaged in consultations with the Administering Authority, the results of which he would make known. No decision had yet been taken, in particular concerning the establishment of a special fund, for Somaliland. On 25 July 1958, during the twenty-second session of the Trusteeship Council (931st meeting), the Somali Minister for Economic Affairs, in thanking the Indian and Guatemalan representatives for their recommendations concerning the establishment of a special fund, had said that his Government would inform the Trusteeship Council of the results of the consultations being held between the Government of Somalia and the Italian Government concerning the problem of furnishing assistance to Somaliland after 1960. That showed that he did not consider the idea of a special fund to be more than a suggestion. In October 1958, the Government of Somalia had indicated that a solution to the problem was in sight, in view of the measures taken by the Administering Authority and by other countries. No statement by the Government of Somalia could therefore be cited in support of the idea of a special fund.

39. The Italian Government had always considered it of primary importance that the Somalis should develop a sense of their own responsibilities since, as the Trusteeship Council had stated on page 87 of its previous report (A/3595 and Corr.1), it was the responsibility of Somaliland to estimate its needs and to decide how they could best be met. For that reason, in announcing the economic and financial measures taken by Italy on behalf of Somaliland, his delegation had made it clear that the terms on which assistance would be furnished would be submitted for approval to the parliaments of the two countries. There was reason to fear that if the Committee endorsed the position of the sponsors of the amendments, the Somali people might feel that they had been deprived of their legitimate right to express their views on a matter concerning their future.

40. His delegation could not see how the amendments could facilitate the solution of the problem. They seemed to question the capacity of the Somalis to take decisions not only concerning the question at issue but on any question which might arise after 1960; the establishment of a special fund would be tantamount to keeping the Territory under a sort of trusteeship system for an indefinite period. It had always been the policy of the Italian Government not to prejudge the future of Somaliland. The Somali Government could not be committed on such an important problem while general elections still had to be held. His delegation could not accept any proposal that would bind the Somali Government, when the Italian Government's assistance was contingent on the approval of the Somali Parliament after the country's attainment of independence.

41. For all those reasons, his delegation would have to vote against the amendments, and, if they were adopted, would vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Rodzinski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

42. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) felt that the draft resolution was sufficiently comprehensive in its present form. Several delegations had approved both the substance and the form of the proposal. The amendments embodied a new idea, the establishment of a special United Nations fund for Somaliland for channelling financial assistance to the country.

43. In principle his delegation greatly preferred assistance through international bodies to bilateral assistance. However, in the case of Somaliland the proposed economic aid was to be furnished after the Territory attained independence and it would be better to wait until the independent Government of that country stated its views before undertaking the projected study. Moreover, some countries had announced their intention of assisting Somaliland on a bilateral basis and they might be led to reconsider their attitude if they had to act through a special fund, a development that would be to the disadvantage of the Somali people. Furthermore, if the idea of a special fund for an individual country was accepted, it seemed possible that there would eventually be as many special funds as Trust Territories, or even under-developed countries.

44. The draft resolution had the merit of not ruling out any possibility and the independent Government of Somalia could always take up the idea of a special fund if it so desired. His delegation therefore asked the sponsors of the amendments to withdraw them. If they were put to the vote, his delegation would not vote against them, as it was in sympathy with the intention underlying them, but would abstain because it doubted their expediency. If the amendments were adopted, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, of which it was a sponsor.

45. Miss ANDERSON (United States of America) said that the United States Government had considered the possibility of granting economic and financial aid to Somalia. The United States representative at Mogadiscio had again given assurances in that respect to the Government of Somalia. The United States delegation had taken note of the statement made by the Italian representative at the 782nd meeting, in which he had referred to a recent communication from the Prime Minister of Somalia to the effect that the Government of Somalia was sure that the assistance provided by Italy and promised by other countries would to a large extent ensure the economic and social development of the Somali people. The Government of Somalia felt that the problem of technical and financial assistance for the Territory after 1960 was now satisfactorily solved.

46. When dealing with questions of assistance, not only the requirement, but also the various possible forms of assistance should be very carefully defined; for example, assistance could take the form of a development fund, technical assistance or aid in carrying out special programmes. According to the amendments, a study would be made of the feasibility of establishing a special fund for Somalia to which Member States would make voluntary contributions. The suggestion raised a number of questions. Her delegation would in particular like to know if, in the improbable event of a special fund for Somalia being established, other newly independent countries would be able to benefit from it. It should be recalled in that connexion that the General Assembly had just unanimously adopted resolution 1254 (XIII) on as-



sistance to Togoland under French administration, and that resolution did not provide for special treatment of that nature. Furthermore, if it was considered, as many claimed, that the United Nations continued to have a moral obligation towards Trust Territories even after they had achieved independence, the contributions to the fund should be divided between Member States. It might also be useful to specify when it was intended that the fund should begin operations. If it was intended that such operations should begin after the attainment of independence by Somalia, there was reason to fear that it might impair the sovereignty of Somalia. As the Trusteeship Council had pointed out at its twentieth session, after 1960 it would be for Somalia itself to estimate its needs and to decide how they could best be met (A/3595 and Corr. 1, p. 87).

47. Her delegation would also like to know for how long it was intended that the fund should function. The Iraqi representative had stated that the problem was one of assuring the continuity of the assistance that would be required by Somalia for many years, and had added that the period over which Somalia would require assistance might be much shorter than the Mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had foreseen, a statement which seemed somewhat contradictory.

48. The amendments quoted the report of the International Bank, but the quotation had no meaning when taken out of its context. The International Bank had merely recommended the establishment of a body in Somaliland to co-ordinate the assistance received from various sources. The amendments also quoted a suggestion made by the Prime Minister of Somalia without taking into account his more recent statements in October 1958. Finally, the procedure envisaged by the sponsors of the amendments in the text intended to replace operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was not in keeping with the practice hitherto followed by the United Nations. It was for the economic organs of the United Nations to express an opinion on the question, on the understanding that the Trusteeship Council had the power to examine the results obtained through existing funds. The Trusteeship Council would undoubtedly wish to follow closely the economic development of Somaliland until 2 December 1960, and to keep the General Assembly informed. The establishment of a new fund, however, raised problems which the amendments did not take into account.

49. Generally speaking, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was perfectly satisfactory and took sufficiently into account the Iraqi representative's suggestion that the question should be explored more thoroughly. The important thing was that the new and independent State of Somalia should from the beginning receive the assistance it required on terms which respected its sovereignty and which did not mortgage its future. The country must receive guarantees with regard to its economic future while it was devoting its efforts to internal political organization and the drafting of a new constitution, and while it was preparing for independence in December 1960.

50. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

51. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had supported all the General Assembly's

decisions requesting that studies should be made of the economic viability of Somaliland under Italian administration, such as resolution 1210 (XII). The studies had shown that the Territory's financial and economic position was difficult.

52. The draft resolution sought to remedy that situation by expressing the hope that the various organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies concerned would give sympathetic consideration to the requests for assistance made on behalf of the Government of Somalia, and by requesting the Trusteeship Council to consider the prospects of further assistance to Somalia. His delegation was glad to support the recommendation because it believed that international assistance to Somalia through the organs of the United Nations was one of the best ways to solve the Territory's problems, since such assistance was free of any political conditions. In accordance with those considerations, his delegation would vote for the amendments presented by Guatemala, India and Iraq. His delegation also noted with satisfaction that the Governments of Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States were planning to provide assistance to Somalia after it achieved independence in 1960, and expressed the hope that in no case would bilateral assistance impair the sovereign rights of the new State of Somalia and that it would not have any political conditions attached.

53. Ethiopia, which was ethnically, economically and culturally very near to Somalia and had already offered scholarships to Somali students, would itself consider extending assistance to Somalia, in keeping with those principles, to the extent permitted by its own plans for economic development. He reserved his Government's right to take a position on the question when the Trusteeship Council's report referred to in the draft resolution was discussed by the General Assembly.

54. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had noted with interest the encouraging trends in the economy of Somaliland and the offers of assistance to independent Somalia mentioned in the Trusteeship Council's report (A/3822) and in the statement of the Italian delegation. He also noted the efforts made by the Administering Authority, particularly during the past few years, to accelerate the economic development of the Territory.

55. The United Nations had a special responsibility with regard to Somalia and it was therefore difficult to see why certain delegations were reluctant to carry out their obligation in the manner most in keeping with the interests of an independent Somalia. That manner might be precisely the one envisaged in the amendments proposed by the delegations of Guatemala, India and Iraq.

56. The amendments constituted a constructive proposal aimed at finding effective ways of rendering assistance to Somalia through the United Nations, but the Organization had, however, only limited means at its disposal, such as the newly established Special Fund and the technical assistance programme. It was therefore proper to seek other ways of helping Somalia and the idea of establishing a special fund for Somalia or an agency to centralize and channel the financial and technical aid which the Member States might offer was by no means new.

57. Some delegations had referred to the possible

impairment of the independence of Somalia. According to the amendments, however, the Trusteeship Council would be requested merely to consider the feasibility of establishing a special fund, and the Government of Somalia would be able to express an opinion on the question in 1959. Furthermore, assistance furnished through the United Nations would have no political conditions attached. Finally, if the study in question produced positive results, Somalia would be certain

that there existed other means of assisting underdeveloped countries, particularly the Trust Territories, than those that had been offered to it up to now.

58. For those reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of both the draft resolution and the amendments.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.