



CONTENTS

	Page
Membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (<i>continued</i>)	25
Annual reports of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 433 (V)) (<i>continued</i>)	27
Technical assistance for Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 439 (V))	29
Abolition of corporal punishment in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 440 (V))	29
Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 443 (V))	30
Development of a 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 494 (V))	31
Recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State (General Assembly resolution 396 (V))	31

President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (*continued*)

1. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) felt that the Council should settle a question of principle in connexion with the item under consideration: it should decide whether States which were members of the Council and also of one of its subsidiary organs should withdraw from the latter when their term of membership of the Council ended. He did not think that the Trusteeship Council should follow the example of the Economic and Social Council in that respect.
2. The Philippines had unquestionably made an extremely useful contribution to the work of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions. That, however, was beside the point. It was incumbent upon the Council, for reasons of principle, to lay down a general rule and to decide that when a State ceased to be a member of the Trusteeship Council, its membership of the Council's subsidiary organs should automatically lapse.
3. It was in that spirit that the Belgian delegation proposed that Thailand should replace the Philippines on the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.
4. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) had no objection to the Belgian proposal that Thailand should take the place of

the Philippines on the Committee. A wider question was, however, involved: the Council was called upon to decide whether a State which was no longer a member of the Council could continue as a member of its subsidiary organs. The Argentine delegation disagreed with the views expressed in that connexion by the Belgian delegation. It was advisable to give Member States of the United Nations which were not members of the Trusteeship Council every opportunity to take part in the latter's work.

5. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) shared the view that if the Philippines were to leave the Committee, its place should be taken by Thailand. There was considerable weight, however, in the Argentine representative's argument. The Committee might continue to benefit from the Philippines' long experience in the matter, but that need not constitute a precedent.

6. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) considered that the Council might well decide that the Philippines should remain a member of the Committee on Administrative Unions for a fixed period, say a year, or even the duration of a session of the Council.

7. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) observed that, as the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions was a subsidiary organ of the Trusteeship Council, a State which had completed its term of membership of the Council should automatically cease to be a member of the Committee. The United Kingdom delegation objected strongly to any departure from the general rule so far observed by the Trusteeship Council.

8. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) did not consider that rule 66 of the rules of procedure necessarily restricted membership of the Council's committees to members of the Council itself. Any Member State of the United Nations could become a member of a subsidiary organ of the Trusteeship Council.
9. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) would not question the interpretation of rule 66 of the rules of procedure given by the representative of the Dominican Republic; in principle nothing precluded the Trusteeship Council from inviting States which were not members of the Council to participate in the work of one of its committees. It was nevertheless logical that the members of a subsidiary organ should be selected from among the members of the principal organ. A departure from that course could only give rise to difficulties.
10. For instance, a useful contribution to the consideration of the question of administrative unions could hardly be made without previous participation in the daily work of the Council, particularly the consideration of the annual reports on Trust Territories. Member States of the United Nations which were not members of the Council did not take part in its daily work and therefore lacked the necessary background. It was true that States which were not members of the Council could, as an exceptional measure, be invited to take part in a visiting mission, particularly where no member of the Council was available; but it appeared inadvisable to depart from the general rule in the case of one of the committees of the Council.
11. Mr. HAY (Australia) considered that, for practical reasons, the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions would be unable to do useful work unless its members were selected from the States represented on the Trusteeship Council. He failed to see how members of the Committee could do useful work if they were not present during the consideration of the annual reports. If the Council adopted that course of action, it should logically invite the members of the Committee who were not represented on the Council to take part in the latter's work, which would obviously be absurd.
12. Furthermore, at a subsequent session of the Council the precedent established might be invoked in favour of another State whose term of office had expired, with the possible result that, after some years, not one of the non-administering States represented on the Committee would be a member of the Council.
13. Moreover, it had been upon the insistence of the Philippines itself that the General Assembly had decided that membership of visiting missions should be restricted to the members of the Trusteeship Council.
14. For those reasons, the Australian delegation proposed that the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions should consist of four members, all of whom should be members of the Trusteeship Council; at the expiry of the term of office of a member of the Council, it would be for the President to nominate another member to replace that State on the Committee.
15. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) did not think the Australian proposal sufficiently comprehensive; it did not take into account the position of the outgoing State in the interval between the expiry of its membership of the Trusteeship Council and the following session of the Council. It was to remedy that omission that Argentina suggested that the Philippines' membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions should be prolonged for a fixed period, either one year or one session. The Council could decide, as a general rule, to review the question of the membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions either every session or every other session.
16. Mr. HAY (Australia) pointed out that the application of the general rule by the Trusteeship Council would not hinder the Committee's work. There would be but a very short interval between the expiry of the membership of a member of the Council and the date of the Council's following session, at which the seat left vacant in the Committee would have to be filled. The last objection raised by the Argentine representative was therefore not conclusive.
17. Mr. Y. W. LIU (China) paid a tribute to the work of the Philippines on the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions and would have been happy to see that country remain on the Committee if it had been possible. In accordance with the provisions of the rules of procedure, however, States which were not members of the Trusteeship Council or representatives of a specialized agency could participate in the work of the Council or of its subsidiary organs only within the limits expressly provided in the rules of procedure. In that connexion he cited rules 12 and 13 of the rules of procedure.
18. Moreover, the General Assembly had recommended in resolution 434 (V) that members of visiting missions should be selected as much as possible from among representatives who sat on the Trusteeship Council.
19. Except in case of absolute necessity, the Council should therefore refrain from taking a step which would constitute an undesirable, if not dangerous, precedent.
20. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) also noted that the matter involved a question of principle which was particularly important because the decision the Council was being asked to take in favour of the Philippines would inevitably create a precedent. Thus far, no States which were not members of the Council had served on any of its subsidiary organs.
21. The French delegation was aware of the important part played by the Philippines in the Council's work, and especially in the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions. For the reasons of principle which he had just explained, however, his delegation could not agree that the Council should create a precedent, the serious consequences of which should be carefully weighed.
22. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) also thought that the only issue involved was one of principle.
23. He pointed out that Thailand had not asked to be nominated, but that, as a member of the Council, it would perform any tasks entrusted to it to the best of its ability. If, however, the Council should decide to prolong the membership of the Philippines, Thailand would be happy to see the Philippines continue on the Committee.

24. The Thailand delegation did not wish to express an opinion on the substance of the question in view of the fact that, as a new member, it lacked experience of the Council's work. Hence it would abstain from voting on the various proposals before the Council.

25. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) thought that a compromise could be reached. He proposed that, whenever a change in the membership of the Council affected the membership of any of its subsidiary organs, the President should propose a new membership for that body at the following regular session of the Council.

26. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) accepted the compromise proposal made by the Argentine representative. The procedure it suggested, however, was precisely that previously followed by the President of the Council in connexion with the other committees of the Council.

27. Mr. HAY (Australia) pointed out that the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions had been set up at the seventh session in accordance with a recommendation of the President (30th meeting). He was therefore fully prepared to accept the Argentine proposal.

The Argentine proposal was adopted.

Annual reports of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 433 (V)) (continued)

28. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) congratulated the Secretariat on the admirable work it had done in preparing working papers T/L.118 and T/L.119.

29. The delegations to the General Assembly had experienced some difficulty in examining the Trusteeship Council's reports. Hence it was essential that the Council should simplify the form of its reports as much as possible. The work done in that connexion by the Secretariat was exactly in accordance with the wish expressed by the General Assembly.

30. He thought, however, that for the time being the Council should confine itself to approving the general plan laid down in the working papers without taking any decision on the details. In that way, the members of the Council would be free to make concrete suggestions when the Council examined the various reports.

31. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he found working paper T/L.119 entirely satisfactory, but after a careful study of the sample report (T/L.118) prepared by the Secretariat, he wished to express some reservations with regard to that document.

32. In the first place, although that draft report concerned one of the smallest Trust Territories, it was relatively long; the draft reports on the other Trust Territories might therefore be expected to be even longer. The General Assembly, however, had complained particularly about the excessive length of the reports. True, the document was excellent from the point of view of the reader who wished to obtain a complete picture of the situation in Western Samoa. But what the General Assembly wanted was to be able rapidly to form an idea of the Council's work, the observations of the visiting mission and the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council and of individual members regarding the Territory in question.

33. Furthermore, he thought that the observations and recommendations of the Council, the Administering Authority or the individual members should not appear at the end of each sub-section, but only at the end of each section or chapter, and then in a summarized form.

34. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) considered the work done by the Secretariat of great value. Unlike the representative of Belgium, he was of the opinion that the delegations to the General Assembly would readily acquaint themselves with reports that were so accurate and complete; it was precisely that kind of report that the General Assembly wanted. To ease the task of delegations further, a table of contents might be added to each report.

35. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) likewise congratulated the Secretariat on the admirable work it had done. Referring more particularly to document T/L.119, he did not think it advisable to put questions dealing with the setting up of visiting missions and the observations of those missions in different parts of the report, as proposed in the Secretariat draft. Such an arrangement would, however, seem to accord with the views expressed in General Assembly resolution 433 (V), and he would not oppose it. He felt that the Secretariat's suggestions should be adopted by the Council.

36. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) reiterated that the Council should adopt the general outline of the suggestions of the Secretariat so that the latter might be guided by it in drafting reports.

37. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) also thought that the working document prepared by the Secretariat was an excellent one. He agreed with the representative of the United States that the Council should approve the general outline of the document. It would be preferable, however, as the representative of Belgium had said, to incorporate the observations of the visiting mission and of the Council not after each sub-section but at the end of each section. It was clear from sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 1 of the operative part of General Assembly resolution 433 (V) that that was the method contemplated by the Assembly. Moreover, by presenting the observations of the Council and of the visiting missions in that way the reports on the various Trust Territories could be given the uniformity of presentation which the Assembly desired.

38. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) was of the opinion that the Secretariat had done a notable piece of work. Nevertheless, it did not seem to him that the document it had prepared corresponded entirely to what the General Assembly had had in mind. Actually, the General Assembly had recommended, as the representative of Thailand had said, that the Council's report should present in separate sections all the relevant data in the various fields — political, economic, social and educational — including, for example, an account of the situation in the Territory studied, a statement of the observations of the visiting mission and the comments of the Trusteeship Council, as well as the opinions of individual members of the Council should that seem necessary. The Council must therefore give the Secretariat all the guidance it needed to carry out its work along those lines and must also express an opinion on the length of the document prepared by the Secretariat.

39. It could not be denied that the document had the merit of giving a very complete picture of the situation in the Territory studied and of taking into account all the information available. Nevertheless, the length of the Secretariat's working paper was already approximately forty pages, which was very considerable if it were borne in mind that it included neither the observations of the Council as a whole nor the comments of its individual members.

40. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) also thought that the Secretariat paper was too long. It should be noted that, in the case of Western Samoa, only one petition had been incorporated in the report; yet for certain other Territories the number of petitions could run up to one hundred. There was a danger that the general report of the Council would be too long.

41. He had, moreover, some doubt as to the meaning which the General Assembly had intended to give to the word "section". His own interpretation had been the same as that of the Secretariat but, owing to the diversity of views, he thought the Secretariat should check again the exact meaning which the Fourth Committee had intended to give that term. It could consult the verbatim and summary records of the meetings of the Fourth Committee for that purpose.

42. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) recalled that the representative of Cuba, who had presented to the Fourth Committee the proposal¹ contained in sub-paragraph (a) and (b) of paragraph 1 of the General Assembly resolution had not defined what he meant by the word "section" and had added that in Spanish the term could refer either to a paragraph or to a chapter. The Secretariat's interpretation seemed acceptable.

43. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that criticism in the General Assembly had been directed against the fact that the various data on a given aspect of a Territory were given in different chapters of the report; for example, in the Council's report to the fifth session of the General Assembly,² the Ewe problem was mentioned on page 80, in chapter II, section 6, concerning the annual report on Togoland under French administration; and again on page 92, where a reference was made to chapter III, section 11, concerning petitions; and finally, on page 179. The General Assembly had asked in its resolution that, in the political field for example, the Council's report should describe conditions in a given Territory in the light of all available information: the Administering Authority's annual report, the petitions, the observations of the visiting mission, etc. The same section of the report should also include the Council's recommendations and any observations by individual members. With regard to the latter, the resolution provided that the report should include such relevant observations of its members as the Council might consider useful, thus avoiding lengthy and repetitive observations in cases where the Council's decision differed only slightly from a member's original proposal. It therefore appeared that the sample draft report prepared by the Secretariat was in conformity with the General Assembly's instructions except for the fact that the observations and comments appeared at the end

of each sub-section instead of at the end of each chapter or section.

44. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) said that if observations and comments were grouped at the end of each section, a comprehensive view and general appreciation of the whole subject could be submitted to the General Assembly, instead of fragmentary comments dealing with special points in the report.

45. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the past the Council's report had consisted of three parts: a description of the situation in the Territory, observations and suggestions of individual members of the Council and recommendations adopted by the Council as a whole. That procedure had proved very satisfactory and had considerably facilitated the work of the General Assembly; the latter had been able to note all the suggestions presented to the Council both by the Administering Authorities and the non-administering Powers. The USSR delegation felt that that procedure should be maintained, and that the Council's report should give not only the decisions adopted by the Council as a whole, but also the suggestions, views or reservations of individual members. The Secretariat working paper did not adhere sufficiently to that formula. Yet it was essential that it should be preserved so as to bring out any points of criticism against the Administering Authorities and to avoid the necessity of applying rule 64 of the rules of procedure.

46. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) thanked the members of the Council for their constructive suggestions. The discussion which had just taken place would greatly facilitate the Secretariat's task.

47. In reply to the Belgian representative's remarks, he emphasized that, as regards the length of the document, it should be remembered that four mimeographed pages corresponded to approximately one printed page; the preceding year the Council's report on Western Samoa³ had, in the printed text, been some twelve pages long, approximately the same length as the draft report which the Secretariat had prepared as an example. Furthermore, the Fourth Committee had not criticized the length of the documents, but rather the manner in which the information had been presented.

48. He asked the Council to indicate where it wished the comments and observations of the visiting missions and of the Council to appear. He noted, in that regard, that a section could be divided into a number of separate sub-sections, as, for example, in the case of the section entitled "Political advancement" (T/L.118), which consisted of eight sub-sections. If the comments and observations on each of those separate sub-sections were all grouped together at the end of the general section, anyone reading them would have to refer back to each of the individual sub-sections, which would greatly complicate study of the document.

49. The Secretariat had anticipated the need for some general conclusions in each section. Thus, in the section on "Political advancement", at the end of the sub-section dealing with general considerations, two headings had been included under which would be given

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 13.

² *Ibid.*, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 4.

³ *Ibid.*

the observations of the Administering Authority and those of the Council.

50. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) proposed that the Council should take note of General Assembly resolution 433 (V) and invite the Secretariat to comply with the wishes expressed therein when preparing the Council's draft reports. When the General Assembly received the Council's report it would see that the Council had endeavoured to meet its wishes.

51. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) supported the Belgian representative's proposal. At the same time, he agreed with the USSR representative that the report should include the views of individual members when their suggestions had not been accepted by the Council as a whole. Argentina, which was not an Administering Authority, had always urged that such reservations should be included in the report. It might be possible to include, after the headings for the observations of the Administering Authority and for the Council's recommendations, a third heading under which would be given the views and suggestions of individual members, subject to what was stated in paragraph 1 (b) of the General Assembly resolution.

52. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Council's report on the examination of the annual reports of the Administering Authorities should be drafted as in the past and reflect the views of individual members of the Council, a method which had always been found satisfactory by the General Assembly. As regards the other parts of the Council's report, the Council could examine the proposals for improving their presentation when the text of the draft report was considered in detail. It was difficult to reach abstract decisions on the matter. He therefore supported the Belgian proposal, subject to the statements he had just made, which merely repeated the Argentine proposal.

53. The PRESIDENT said the consensus of opinion seemed to be that the Council should take note of General Assembly resolution 433 (V). The report which it would subsequently draw up should be a sufficient indication to the General Assembly that its wishes had been taken into consideration.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and was resumed at 4.50 p.m.

Technical assistance for Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 439 (V))

54. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought the Council seemed to be in general agreement with General Assembly resolution 439 (V). He therefore proposed that the Council should take note of the resolution, bring its provisions to the attention of the Administering Authorities and ask them to submit annual reports on the technical assistance requested or obtained for Trust Territories administered by them.

55. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) noted that the resolution was addressed to the Administering Authorities, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies. It did not concern the Council, which therefore need not take note of it.

56. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) remarked that while it was true that the General Assembly had not asked the Trusteeship Council to deal with those questions, the fact remained that any reports which the Administering Authorities might draw up in the future would be submitted to the Trusteeship Council. The Council was the natural intermediary between the Administering Authorities and the General Assembly; consequently the resolution was bound to concern it.

57. The PRESIDENT proposed that, if the Belgian representative did not object, the Iraqi representative's proposal should be adopted.

It was so decided.

Abolition of corporal punishment in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 440 (V))

58. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider General Assembly resolution 440 (V). As in the case of the resolution on technical assistance for Trust Territories, resolution 440 (V) was addressed to the Administering Authorities of the Trust Territories; that being so, it would seem that all the Council could do would be to take note of it.

59. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) recalled that in the General Assembly⁴ his delegation had voted for the immediate abolition of corporal punishment in the Trust Territories. He hoped that the Administering Authorities would take steps to bring about the complete and final disappearance of that practice. Visiting missions had noted that, while legislation to abolish corporal punishment existed in some Territories, it remained a dead letter in practice. The Council's aim was to see such legislation carried into effect.

60. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that all members of the Council accepted the principle of the abolition of corporal punishment and had always voted for resolutions calling for its abolition. At the present stage, the Council could only take note of the General Assembly resolution. It was for the Administering Authorities to carry it into effect and, if they failed to do so, they would have to give their reasons. The Council's information on the subject was incomplete. Some Administering Authorities had stated that the practice of corporal punishment did not exist in the Territories under their administration while others had stated that it was applied only on a limited scale. The Council should have full and detailed information on the subject for consideration at its following session.

61. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that the Council should confine itself to taking note of the General Assembly resolution and nothing more. In the case of the Trust Territories under United Kingdom administration, the annual reports for 1950 would give a detailed account of the situation in that particular respect.

62. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the question of corporal punishment had been discussed by the Council ever since its establishment. The USSR had always adhered to the view that the practice of corporal punishment in the Trust Territories should be abolished immediately.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 316th meeting.

It was not applied to non-indigenous peoples and its application to the indigenous population was thus a glaring instance of racial discrimination.

63. The Council should accordingly reiterate its previous recommendations to the Administering Authorities and should again call upon them to abolish the practice of corporal punishment once and for all. The United Nations visiting mission to East Africa had noted in its report on Ruanda-Urundi⁵ that corporal punishment was still applied in that Territory, and in its report to the fifth session of the General Assembly the Council had recommended the Administering Authority for Ruanda-Urundi to take the necessary measures at the earliest possible date to abolish whipping and to replace it by other forms of penalties more in keeping with the Charter and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Corporal punishment also existed in other Trust Territories, for example in Togoland-under United Kingdom administration. Limitations had admittedly been imposed upon its use, but it had not yet been completely abolished.

64. The Council could not therefore confine itself to taking note of General Assembly resolution 440 (V), but must again recommend the Administering Authorities to abolish corporal punishment immediately in the Trust Territories, not only by including the necessary provisions in their legislation but by carrying those provisions into effect.

65. The PRESIDENT asked the USSR representative whether he intended to make a formal proposal to that effect.

66. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that he merely wished to associate himself with the statement made by the representative of the Dominican Republic.

67. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said he had merely proposed that the Council should take note of the General Assembly resolution.

It was so decided.

68. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he interpreted the Dominican Republic's proposal, which the Council had just adopted, to mean that the Administering Authorities must comply with General Assembly decisions. He supported the Iraqi representative's proposal that the Administering Authorities should be requested to report to the Council on the measures taken to implement the General Assembly resolution.

69. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the object of the proposal of the Dominican Republic had merely been to take note of the resolution. If anything was added to that proposal, he would oppose it.

70. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) did not agree with the USSR representative's interpretation of the proposal of the Dominican Republic. The Soviet Union representative had in effect interpreted that proposal to mean that the General Assembly's recommendation was binding on the Administering Authorities. If that was so, its resolutions would be binding on the six

Administering Authorities alone, a situation which raised a legal issue.

71. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) agreed with the representative of France.

72. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had never claimed that General Assembly resolutions were binding on Member States. The Charter was quite explicit on that point. In the present case, however, it was a question of respect for the provisions of Article 76 of the Charter on the part of the Administering Authorities. The proposal to abolish corporal punishment was in conformity with the spirit of the Charter, and for that reason the General Assembly resolution on the question was binding upon the Administering Authorities. It was not a question of legal niceties. If the Administering Authorities did not accept the principle of abolition of corporal punishment, they should say so at the following session of the Trusteeship Council. If they did accept it, they should report on the measures they had taken to apply it.

73. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) pointed out that, by accepting the recommendations previously adopted by the Trusteeship Council on the abolition of corporal punishment, the Administering Authorities, members of the Council, had tacitly accepted General Assembly resolution 440 (V).

74. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that his country was, and always had been, vigorously opposed to the practice of corporal punishment in the Trust Territories. It was not only a resolution of the General Assembly that was involved, but also a principle; and there was nothing to prevent the Trusteeship Council from asking the Administering Authorities to report on the measures they had taken to abolish the practice. If the representative of Iraq submitted a formal proposal to that effect, the Argentine delegation would support it.

Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 443 (V))

75. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider General Assembly resolution 443 (V), providing that the item relating to administrative unions affecting Trust Territories should be carried over for consideration at the following regular session of the General Assembly. In the President's opinion, the resolution had been communicated to the Council as an incentive to greater efforts on the part of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.

76. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) held the view that the General Assembly resolution did not concern the Council.

77. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) did not think that the purpose of the resolution was to provide a stimulus for the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions. The Assembly had simply decided to postpone consideration of the question until its following regular session, and the Council could do no more than take note of that decision.

78. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation in the Fourth

⁵ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Fourth Session, Supplement No. 2.*

Committee⁶ had opposed the proposal to defer consideration of the question until the following session of the Assembly. The question was of particular importance for the Trust Territories affected by administrative unions. The USSR delegation would submit proposals on the subject when the Council examined the reports of the Administering Authorities of Territories where administrative unions existed. Until that time, his delegation would reserve its position.

79. The USSR delegation protested against the proposal that the Council should merely take note of the General Assembly resolution, as it considered that proposal to be inopportune.

80. The PRESIDENT noted that there was general agreement among the members of the Council to take no action with respect to General Assembly resolution 443 (V) on the subject of administrative unions.

It was so decided.

Development of a 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 494 (V))

81. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider document T/807 transmitting to the Trusteeship Council the texts of General Assembly resolution 494 (V) and the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/1394) mentioned in that resolution.

82. The part of the Secretary-General's memorandum which particularly concerned the Trusteeship Council was point 9: "Use of the United Nations to promote, by peaceful means instead of by force, the advancement of dependent, colonial or semi-colonial peoples toward a place of equality in the world."

83. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) fully approved the statements of principle set forth in point 9 of the Secretary-General's note. But as certain members of the Council were already studying the question, it would seem advisable to postpone consideration of that item of the agenda until a later meeting.

84. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 56 of the rules of procedure, the Argentine proposal had priority; if there were no objections to that proposal, it would not be necessary to put it to the vote.

85. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) wished to know what aspects of the question would be discussed, in order that he might request instructions from his government.

86. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina), like the representative of Iraq, thought that if the question was eventually to be the subject of a draft resolution, the members of the Council should have an opportunity to study the matter carefully and request instructions from their governments. For the moment, he would not object to the Council's taking note of the Secretary-General's suggestions.

87. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) proposed that the Council should adopt a resolution taking note of the Secretary-General's memorandum, and drawing the attention of the Administering Authorities to that document, and

should at the same time inform the Secretary-General of the action taken and thank him for his communication.

88. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Argentina that consideration of the question should be deferred to a later meeting.

It was so decided.

Recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State (General Assembly resolution 396 (V))

89. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the following draft resolution (T/L.116) submitted by the Argentine delegation:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Having received the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950 on the recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State,

"Takes note of the above-mentioned resolution of the General Assembly."

90. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) supported the Argentine draft resolution (T/L.116). In his opinion, there was no need for the Council to open a prolonged debate on the question.

91. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, during the debate in the General Assembly on recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State, the USSR delegation had indicated that the question had been placed on the Assembly agenda as a result of manoeuvring by certain delegations which wished to prevent the representatives of the People's Republic of China from taking their seat in the United Nations.⁷ Everyone knew that the United States was determined to shut the door of the United Nations on the representatives of the People's Republic of China and that it was using every means of pressure at its disposal to achieve its aims.

92. General Assembly resolution 396 (V) created an anomalous situation which would enable any Member State of the United Nations to lay down special requirements whenever it was to be decided what government was entitled to represent a Member State. In the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, several delegations had demonstrated that the establishment of criteria for the representation of a Member State was liable to give rise to differences of interpretation, and to lead to intervention in the domestic affairs of States in violation of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and to arbitrary decisions which would prevent some States from becoming Members of the United Nations.

93. The General Assembly resolution on recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State was unacceptable to the USSR. According to the preamble of that resolution, there should be uniformity in the procedure for recognition, and the General Assembly was the most appropriate organ of the United Nations to settle the question. The Soviet Union, however, had indicated that it was quite point-

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Fourth Committee*, 198th meeting.

⁷ *Ibid.*, *Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 325th meeting.

less to provide a uniform procedure for cases which could occur only at very rare intervals. Each organ of the United Nations should decide the matter for itself on the basis of its rules of procedure alone. The question submitted to the Council was not a question of principle. It was, in fact, only the representation of China which was involved. The Trusteeship Council should therefore settle on its own authority the question of China's representation in the Council, and it was for that reason that his delegation had several times proposed that the Kuomintang representative should be excluded from the Council and that the representative of the People's Republic of China should be recognized in his stead. But, as a result of United States pressure, the Council had each time rejected the Soviet Union proposal and at the current session (315th meeting) it had decided to defer examination of the question. His delegation had voted against the General Assembly resolution and it would vote against the draft resolution to the effect that the Council should take note of that resolution.

94. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said the Council had once more heard the Soviet version of history, a version which he did not think it necessary to refute again. History was based on facts and laws and not on interpretations.

95. The Argentine draft resolution was in accordance with the procedure generally followed and his delegation gave it its full support.

96. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said the statement just made by the USSR representative went beyond the scope of the discussion. There was not the slightest need to bring up in the Council the opposing ideas which had been advanced in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The Trusteeship Council was not the General Assembly. It should avoid embroiling itself in a thorny question and should confine itself to taking note of the General Assembly resolution.

97. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) entirely shared the view of the representative of the Dominican Republic. The Council should not let itself be dragged into a discussion of the question.

98. Mr. Y. W. LIU (China) said General Assembly resolution 396 (V) dealt only with the general problem of the representation of a Member State and, in adopting it, the General Assembly had had no particular case in mind. The Council should not waste more time discussing the question and should adopt the Argentine draft resolution.

99. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said his draft resolution had been based mainly on paragraph 3 of the operative part of the General Assembly resolution. Its intention was that the Trusteeship Council should follow the procedure recommended by the General Assembly when it had to consider the question of the representation of a Member State.

100. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it seemed obvious that some members of the Council wished to avoid a full discussion of the question. It was not his delegation's intention to adopt the same attitude. Every time the opportunity arose, it would make any statements it deemed necessary on the substance of the questions submitted to the Council. The statement he had made a few moments previously was in no way outside the scope of the discussion, as the representative of the Dominican Republic had claimed.

101. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Argentine draft resolution (T/L.116).

The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

102. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said he had voted for the Argentine draft resolution because it seemed to him reasonable, but that in no way implied that he admitted that the General Assembly decision was binding upon the Council.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.