



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Arrangements for the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa (<i>continued</i>)	13
Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V))	15
Statement by the Prime Minister of New Zealand	16
Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (<i>continued</i>)	16
Report of the Trusteeship Council covering its first special session, its second special session, and its sixth and seventh sessions (General Assembly resolution 431 (V))	17
General procedure of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 432 (V))	17
Annual reports of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 433 (V))	17
Educational advancement in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 437 (V))	18

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.

Arrangements for the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of item 5 of its agenda. Members of the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa could be appointed either by agreement among the members of the Council or by a vote.

2. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) observed that, if the usual procedure were followed, the visiting mission should consist of representatives of four countries. The countries to be represented should be decided upon first, and the nominations of governments approved later. He suggested that the mission should consist of the representatives of the United States of America, New Zealand, Thailand and either Argentina or the Dominican Republic, in other words, of two Administering Authorities and two non-administering States. One of the Administering Authorities, New Zealand, had not as yet been represented on a visiting mission, and its representative on the Council, Sir Carl Berendsen, was particularly qualified in that respect. The other Administering Authority, the United States, had

already participated in a visiting mission and had thereby acquired very useful experience. Of the non-administering States, Thailand, whose representative on the Council had a broad knowledge of trusteeship problems, was in a position to contribute usefully to the visiting mission's work. The Dominican Republic had been a member of the Council for a year and a half and Argentina for a year. The representatives of both States had thus acquired considerable experience in matters affecting Trust Territories. The Council might be asked to choose between the two countries; the choice would be difficult.

3. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) thanked the representative of Iraq for his kind statement about Sir Carl Berendsen, who was absent from the Council chamber because the Prime Minister of New Zealand was visiting Lake Success. The New Zealand delegation would be glad to be represented on the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa and would submit the name of its representative to the Council for approval later.

4. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) thanked the representative of Iraq for the kind references to himself and to his country. It would be an honour for Thailand to be represented on the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa. He himself would probably not have the privilege of representing his country on the visiting mission, as the mission would probably not complete its work before the following session of the General Assembly. The

Government of Thailand would, however, in due course submit the name of its representative for the Council's approval.

5. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) also thanked the representative of Iraq for his statement with regard to the participation of the United States in a previous visiting mission. The United States was not actively seeking the honour of serving on the visiting mission, but would gladly place itself at the Council's disposal.

6. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) thanked the representative of Iraq for having suggested that Argentina should be represented on the mission. Argentina would certainly appreciate such an honour and would do its best to fulfil its duties well. However, of the three non-administering States suggested, Thailand had already agreed to take part in the visiting mission and the Council would no doubt derive great benefit from Thailand's participation; moreover, it would probably be useful for the Dominican Republic to take part in the visiting mission.

7. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) thanked the representative of Iraq for proposing that the Dominican Republic should be represented on the visiting mission, and the representative of Argentina for urging that proposal. It appeared desirable, however, that the group of South American States should be represented on the visiting mission, and the nomination of Argentina therefore seemed clearly indicated.

8. The PRESIDENT observed that the representative of Iraq had not submitted a formal proposal, and the question should be decided by the Council. In accordance with the decision taken by the Trusteeship Council on 20 July 1950,¹ the visiting mission should consist of only four members.

9. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) pointed out that his previous statement was to be interpreted as a withdrawal. There therefore remained only four countries, of which two were Administering Authorities, the United States of America and New Zealand, and two non-administering States, Thailand and the Dominican Republic.

10. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said that, in the circumstances, it did not seem necessary to proceed to a vote, as the Council appeared to be agreed as to the four countries to be represented on the mission. France approved of that choice, and it only remained for the countries concerned to nominate their representatives.

11. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no objection to the appointment of the two non-administering States proposed as members of the visiting mission. He objected, however, to the proposal that Administering Authorities should be appointed to the mission; his country was opposed to that practice. The USSR would therefore vote against representation of an Administering Authority on a visiting mission, irrespective of the countries nominated.

12. The PRESIDENT pointed out that visiting missions had always consisted of representatives of Administering Authorities and representatives of non-administering States.

13. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) stated that the Administering Authorities would not only agree to the representation of non-administering States on the visiting mission, but would welcome such representation.

14. The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the USSR representative's statement, it seemed necessary to put the composition of the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa to the vote. Following the Argentine representative's courteous gesture, the names of only four countries remained.

15. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) did not consider a vote necessary. A proposal had been submitted and it did not seem to have met with any objection. If the representative of Iraq had not submitted a formal proposal, the United Kingdom would submit one to the effect that the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa should be composed of the representatives of the Dominican Republic, New Zealand, Thailand and the United States of America.

16. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as no objection had been raised to the participation of the two non-administering States in the visiting mission, there was no need to take a vote on that point. A vote should, however, be taken on the candidatures of the Administering Authorities. If the President intended to put the nominations of the four States to the vote as a whole, he would request two separate votes, one on the candidatures of the non-administering States and the other on those of the Administering Authorities.

17. The PRESIDENT said the USSR request was in accordance with the provisions of rule 60 of the Council's rules of procedure. The Council should therefore vote first on the candidatures of the Administering Authorities, then on the candidatures of the non-administering States, and finally on the proposal as a whole.

18. He put to the vote the proposal that New Zealand and the United States of America should be members of the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

19. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal that the Dominican Republic and Thailand should be members of the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

20. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal that the visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa should be composed of representatives of the Dominican Republic, New Zealand, Thailand and the United States of America.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

21. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that the date of the mission's departure must be decided as soon as possible; its duration had already been

¹ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, 29th meeting.*

fixed by the Council. The sooner that was done, the better.

22. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) observed that the representatives of the countries on the visiting mission and the head of the mission had yet to be appointed. He shared the United Kingdom representative's opinion that the date of the visit should be decided as soon as possible. The United Kingdom representative, in agreement with the Secretariat, might fix the time when the visiting mission could usefully begin its work, in the light of the experience gained in the matter.

23. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Belgian representative and the representative of Italy should be consulted about the dates of the mission's visits to the Territories under their administration.

24. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the best time for the Trust Territories of Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi would be July, August and September. The Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration should therefore be visited before or after that time.

25. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) thought, from the information at his disposal and from past experience, that the most favourable time to visit the Territory of Tanganyika was the middle of September. The visiting mission could therefore go to Ruanda-Urundi about 15 August, to the Territory of Tanganyika about 15 September and to Somaliland in October.

26. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) accepted the United Kingdom representative's suggestion.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, so far as Somaliland was concerned, the time of the visit would probably depend on transport facilities.

28. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) thought that, from the information available, October would suit the Italian Government for the visit to the Territory of Somaliland.

29. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought the Council should confine itself to making the financial provisions necessary to enable missions to carry out their duties. It was not for the Council to tell missions how long they should remain in each Territory visited. They should be free to organize their programme of work themselves.

30. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought it was not sufficient to make financial provisions. The Council should also give missions the necessary instructions. His delegation therefore thought that the Council should consider at once General Assembly resolution 434 (V) on the organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions.

31. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that the arrangements that had to be made before the departure of a visiting mission took some time. The Council should therefore decide provisionally on the dates just given for the visiting mission to East Africa, subject to the Italian Government's agreement. In that way, all other necessary arrangements for the mission could be made without further delay.

32. The PRESIDENT said that, as there were no objections, the dates suggested for the visiting mission to East Africa would be considered provisionally

approved, subject to any information which the Italian Government might subsequently give the Council.

It was so agreed.

Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V))

33. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) recalled that that question had given rise to interesting discussions in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.² As a result of those deliberations, the General Assembly had expressed the wish that the Council should reach conclusions in sufficient time to enable the next visiting missions to take them into account.

34. Turning to paragraph 1 of the operative part of General Assembly resolution 434 (V), Mr. de Marchena thought that, if sub-paragraph (e) of that paragraph were applied in every case, visiting missions might achieve excellent results in the fields studied.

35. It would also be very useful to apply the recommendation contained in sub-paragraph (f). Mr. Khalidy had pointed out that the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, over which he had presided, had endeavoured to examine on the spot the petitions submitted to it and that that procedure had proved very satisfactory.

36. In sub-paragraph (g) the General Assembly expressed its desire that visiting missions should benefit from the personal experience gained by members of the Trusteeship Council.

37. His delegation thought the importance of the question treated in the General Assembly resolution justified the setting up of a small committee to make a careful study of the various subjects as well as to make all the necessary recommendations to the Council.

38. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) had no objection in principle to the proposal just made by the representative of the Dominican Republic. But as the number of existing committees was already fairly large, the creation of an additional committee, even if its work did not last long, might inconvenience certain delegations which could not easily be represented simultaneously on all the various organs of the Council.

39. The fact remained, however, that the General Assembly had requested the Trusteeship Council to undertake a study of the question, and the Council must submit a report on the matter to the Assembly, or devote a chapter of its general report to observations on the Assembly's suggestions and on the practical means of applying those suggestions in respect of the visiting missions. In the circumstances, one of the members of the Council — for example, the representative of the Dominican Republic — might prepare a draft report for transmission to the General Assembly.

40. As regards sub-paragraph (a) of General Assembly resolution 434 (V), the previous visiting mis-

² See *Official Records on the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Fourth Committee*, 167th to 170th meetings, inclusive.

sions had fulfilled their task extremely well, regardless of the length of time at their disposal. Some slight censure of those missions would therefore seem to be implied in that sub-paragraph, a censure which the French delegation thought regrettable.

41. Sub-paragraph (b) had no practical value. For example, in the case of the visiting mission to be sent to East Africa, the Council had agreed that there was plainly no need to send a separate mission to each of the Trust Territories in that area. As regards sub-paragraph (c), he endorsed the observations of Mr. Khalidy, to the effect that the visiting missions should be given entire freedom to determine their own itinerary. Furthermore, by providing that the visiting mission to the Trust Territories of East Africa should remain in the area longer than had the preceding mission, the Council was acting in accordance with sub-paragraph (d) of the General Assembly resolution.

42. The suggestions given in sub-paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) were already being implemented by the Council and called for no particular comment.

43. Finally, with respect to sub-paragraph (h), Mr. Laurentie agreed that the indigenous inhabitants should be informed of the workings and operations of the International Trusteeship System, but he thought it would be sufficient to include a statement to that effect in the terms of reference of the visiting missions.

44. In the light of those considerations, it would appear that the proposed study could be completed fairly quickly.

Statement by the Prime Minister of New Zealand

45. The PRESIDENT announced that the Right Honourable Sidney George Holland, Prime Minister of New Zealand, was present at Lake Success. He suggested that the Council should invite him to address it.

It was so decided.

The Right Honourable Sidney George Holland, Prime Minister of New Zealand, was invited to address the Council.

46. Mr. HOLLAND expressed his pleasure at the opportunity afforded him of attending a meeting of the Trusteeship Council and conveyed to the members of the Council the sincere and cordial good wishes of the people and Government of New Zealand.

47. His country had administered the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for several years, and had always endeavoured to carry out that task to the best of its ability. If some members of the Council felt, nevertheless, that further progress could be achieved as regards the administration of Western Samoa, New Zealand would welcome any suggestions or proposals which might be put forward.

48. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Council would be successful in its work for the maintenance of international peace and security.

49. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) wished to express the pleasure of the members of the Council at the visit of the Prime Minister of New Zealand. He himself had been a member of the first visiting mission to Western Samoa, and he recalled the cordial and hospitable welcome which had been accorded to

that mission. Mr. Holland could rest assured that the Council had never doubted the goodwill and sincerity with which New Zealand was carrying out the task entrusted to it in Western Samoa.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and was resumed at 4 p.m.

Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (continued)

50. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) thought the suggestion of the representative of the Dominican Republic a most appropriate one; the question of visiting missions was of sufficient importance to warrant exhaustive study.

51. With regard to the text of General Assembly resolution 434 (V), certain financial considerations might make it difficult to give practical effect to the recommendation for reduction of the number of Trust Territories to be visited by each mission. The effect of the recommendation would actually be to increase the number of visiting missions, with a resulting increase in the credits required.

52. The committee proposed by the representative of the Dominican Republic should study the recommendations of the General Assembly in the light of the experience gained by the several visiting missions, taking into consideration the financial resources available.

53. The United States delegation proposed that the Council should set up a special committee composed of Sir Alan Burns, Mr. Khalidy, Mr. Laurentie, each of whom had served in the past as a Chairman of a visiting mission, and a representative of Argentina, to study the General Assembly resolution and make any recommendations necessary concerning measures to be taken by the Council in the matter.

54. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that before proceeding further with a study of the substance of the General Assembly resolution, the Council should settle the procedural question which had just been raised. It was of little importance whether the resolution was examined in a committee or in the Council itself, provided that the review recommended by the General Assembly was undertaken.

55. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) was not in favour of instructing a committee to study questions which had already been the subject of long debates in the Council. If, however, the majority of the members of the Council favoured the setting up of such a committee, the Belgian delegation would not oppose it.

56. Unquestionably, careful consideration should be given to the suggestions set forth in the General Assembly resolution. In Mr. Ryckmans' opinion, however, the decision of the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly to make such suggestions was due to the fact that the majority of their members had not participated in the work of the Trusteeship Council and, unlike the Council, did not have an extensive knowledge of the problems of the visiting missions. In point of fact, the problem would resolve itself. The study of a particular Trust Territory made by the first visiting mission sent there would facilitate the task of the next mission to visit that Territory.

57. For that reason the recommendation given in paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a), of the operative part of the resolution appeared both unnecessary and incomplete. Obviously all visiting missions should remain long enough in each Trust Territory to be able adequately to fulfil their task; the problem, in present circumstances, was to determine just what that task was and what terms of reference should be given to the missions. Clearly, the second mission to a Territory should have a more limited task than the first. Thus, for example, in the case of Ruanda-Urundi, which had already been visited by one mission, the second mission should examine the reports of the first, note the points which had been the object of special attention in the Trusteeship Council, study those points and focus its attention on those aspects of the situation which the first mission had not considered entirely satisfactory, rather than undertake a general investigation which would also cover aspects of the administration or administrative services that had seemed satisfactory to the first mission.

58. Further, some of the General Assembly recommendations were contradictory: it recommended that the number of Territories to be visited by each mission should be reduced and that the length of the visits should be extended without diminishing their frequency, which implied that more missions would be dispatched; on the other hand it recommended that members of each visiting mission should as much as possible be selected from among representatives who sat on the Trusteeship Council. Experience, however, had shown the practical impossibility of sending out more than one visiting mission a year if that mission was to be composed of members of the Trusteeship Council.

59. Such were the facts which he thought should be noted by the Council. Subject to those reservations, the Belgian delegation would not object to the setting up of the committee proposed by the United States representative should the Council deem that advisable.

60. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) said that his delegation was always ready to assume any responsibility placed upon it by the Trusteeship Council.

61. Replying to a question by Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), who wished to know the date on which the proposed committee should submit its report to the Council, Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) pointed out that the committee would hold one or two meetings at the most.

62. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) agreed with the Iraqi representative.

63. The PRESIDENT proposed that the committee should be allowed one week in which to accomplish its work.

It was so decided.

The United States proposal (para. 53) was adopted.

64. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the tentative time-table drawn up by the Secretariat³ indicated that, on 7 February, the Council would study the organization of

visiting missions, which would include the question of terms of reference for missions. Before studying that question, the Council should, therefore, have the report submitted by the Committee just set up.

65. The PRESIDENT said that the Council's timetable was merely tentative and could be amended. Moreover, according to the decision which the Council had just reached regarding the time in which the Committee must finish its work, the Committee should present its report by 7 February at the latest.

66. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was fully satisfied with the President's explanations.

Report of the Trusteeship Council covering its first special session, its second special session, and its sixth and seventh sessions (General Assembly resolution 431 (V))

67. Mr. HAY (Australia) suggested that the Council should take note of General Assembly resolution 431 (V).

68. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that, in deciding to take note of a General Assembly resolution, the Council would show that it intended to be guided by that resolution in its work.

69. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) supported the Australian delegation's proposal. In his opinion, in deciding to take note of General Assembly resolution 431 (V), the Council would show that it intended to take into consideration the comments and suggestions made during the Assembly's discussion of the matter, as recommended in that resolution.

The Australian proposal was adopted.

General procedure of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 432 (V))

70. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) suggested that the examination of General Assembly resolution 432 (V), which was of a very general nature, should be deferred until the Council had finished studying all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the various special aspects of the question.

71. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) shared the Belgian representative's view. He would have liked to draw the attention of the members of the Council to two or three special points, but as they would naturally come up for discussion when the Council studied the various General Assembly resolutions, he reserved his right to raise them at that time.

The Belgian proposal was adopted.

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

72. The PRESIDENT observed that the two documents mentioned in paragraph 2 of the operative part of General Assembly resolution 433 (V) contained the suggestions made in the Fourth Committee by the representatives of Belgium and the Dominican Republic.

73. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that it would be helpful if the Secretariat prepared a paper on the

³ Working paper distributed to members of the Council only.

question of annual reports, as that would assist the Council in its work.

74. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) wished to have the Secretariat's view on the practical questions which the application of the operative part of the General Assembly resolution might possibly raise.

75. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) said that the Secretariat had prepared a paper of the kind suggested by the Iraqi representative, which would be distributed on the following day. It would be preferable for the Council to study that particular item of its agenda after the document had been distributed.

76. The PRESIDENT considered that resolution 433 (V) needed very careful study. As the Secretariat document would be very useful, the Council should defer its discussion on that subject for the time being.

It was so decided.

Educational advancement in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 437 (V))

77. Mr. HAY (Australia) thought General Assembly resolution 437 (V) regarding educational advancement in Trust Territories called for no special study on the Council's part. In his opinion, the Council should take account of the operative part of the resolution when it took up the examination of reports on the administration of the various Territories. If that suggestion was satisfactory to members of the Council, he was ready to submit a proposal to that effect.

78. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) shared the view of the Australian representative. With regard to Territories under British administration, the reports on their administration contained detailed information on questions relating to educational advancement, and the special representatives would also give the Council full information on the subject.

79. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) stressed that paragraph 1 of the operative part of the resolution under consideration dealt with long-range programmes of educational development in the Trust Territories. What the General Assembly wished to know was whether the Administering Authorities were prepared to take action along

those lines and whether they were in a position to do so.

80. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) shared the view of the representative of Iraq as to the interpretation to be placed on General Assembly resolution 437 (V). The Assembly knew, however, that there were long-range educational programmes in all the Trust Territories; what it wished to know was the value of such programmes. The Council should therefore pass judgment on the existing programmes; but it would probably be in a better position to discuss those programmes when it came to study the reports on the administration of Trust Territories. It therefore seemed that the Council should, for the time being, merely note the General Assembly resolution, with the intention of being guided by it in its future work. He moved a formal proposal to that effect.

81. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) recalled that the question of educational programmes in the Trust Territories was not new and that the Trusteeship Council had already devoted much time to it. He, too, thought that the Council should, for the present, merely note the resolution, and should take into account the recommendations it contained when it examined the reports on the administration of the Trust Territories.

82. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought the General Assembly resolution did not call for any special action on the Council's part; it would be sufficient for the latter to give, in its annual reports, its observations on the various long-range educational programmes undertaken. There was no need for a resolution to that effect.

83. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) attached great importance to the operative part of the resolution. He considered the proposal that the Trusteeship Council should base its future work on that resolution a most appropriate one. He could not, therefore, share the opinion of the Belgian representative.

84. In reply to a question by the PRESIDENT, Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he did not oppose the French proposal.

The French proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.