



## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-third Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 18 March 1959,  
at 2.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration:	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957;	
(ii) Petitions raising general questions . . . . .	129
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration:	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957;	
(ii) Petitions raising general questions . . . . .	129
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957 . .	130
Examination of petitions ( <i>continued</i> )	
Two hundred and twenty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Tanganyika. . . . .	131
Two hundred and twenty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Somaliland under Italian administration . . . . .	132
Two hundred and twenty-eighth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions circulated under rule 85, and communications circulated under rule 24, of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council. . . . .	133
Revision of the Questionnaire relating to Trust Territories: sixth progress report of the Sub-Committee on the Questionnaire . . . . .	133
Control and limitation of documentation (General Assembly resolution 1272 (XIII)) . . . . .	134
Reports of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories . . . . .	134
Adoption of the part of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly covering conditions in the Trust Territories under examination during the twenty-third session. . . . .	135

President: Mr. Max H. DORSINVILLE (Haiti).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization.

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration (T/L.892):**

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957 (T/1407, T/1433, T/1435);

- (ii) Petitions raising general questions (T/PET.4/L.7-11, T/PET.4 and 5/L.18-26, T/PET.4 and 5/L.27 and Add.1-6, T/PET.4 and 5/L.28, 29)

[Agenda items 4 (b) and 5]

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration (T/L.894):**

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957 (T/1436);
- (ii) Petitions raising general questions (T/PET.5/L.452-460, T/PET.4 and 5/L.18-26, T/PET.4 and 5/L.27 and Add.1-6, T/PET.4 and 5/L.28, 29)

[Agenda items 4 (c) and 5]

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that, before the Trusteeship Council had interrupted its work on 18 February 1959, it had examined the question of the future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration and the reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, on those Territories. No decision had then been reached with regard to the examination of the annual reports of the Administering Authorities on those Territories for the year 1957. In view of the resolutions recently adopted by the General Assembly at its resumed thirteenth session concerning the future of the two Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII) and 1350 (XIII)), he doubted whether the Council should follow its normal procedure and examine the annual reports on those Territories. He would like to hear the views of members of the Council on that subject.

2. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said he would not press for an examination of the annual reports for 1957; nevertheless, since the two Cameroons would remain Trust Territories until they had attained independence, the Administering Authorities should keep the Council and the General Assembly informed of the developments there.

3. He pointed out that the report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions relating to the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration would shortly be transmitted to the Council.<sup>1/</sup> His delegation considered that that report should be examined by the Council at its current session.

4. The PRESIDENT replied that it was hoped that the report would be available for examination at the following meeting.

5. He suggested that the most logical procedure would be for the Council first to take note of the annual reports and the petitions raising general questions which were submitted to the Council and secondly to take note of the working documents prepared by the Secretariat with regard to the situation in the two Cameroons (T/L.892, 894) and to request the Secretariat to complete the sections relating to the future

<sup>1/</sup> Subsequently distributed as document T/L.907.

of the two Territories in the light of the resolutions recently adopted by the General Assembly. The two working documents could then be included in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957**

[Agenda item 4 (d)]

6. The PRESIDENT asked whether the French delegation could give the Council and information with regard to the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957 on the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration.

7. Mr. DOISE (France) regretted that he could not say when the report would be submitted to the Council.

8. In the view of his delegation, the situation regarding Togoland under French administration was very similar to that regarding the Cameroons under French administration. The General Assembly had, by adopting resolution 1253 (XIII), taken a final decision with regard to the future of the Territory. Togoland would become independent in 1960 and it would appear that the Assembly's decision rounded off the question of Togoland and that no further action was required. Moreover, since Togoland already possessed internal autonomy, most of the relevant information was within the competence of the Togolese authorities.

9. In view of those facts, his delegation considered that, although Togoland would remain a Trust Territory until its attainment of independence, an examination of the annual report would be somewhat academic. The French delegation would naturally keep the United Nations informed of any new factors that might arise in connexion with Togoland.

10. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) regretted that the report on Togoland under French administration had not been submitted to the Council, since the question of Togoland remained on the agenda. It was true, however, that the French delegation had consistently made every effort to keep the Council informed of developments in the Territory.

11. He did not dispute that the annual report for 1957 would be largely out of date, but he could not agree that to examine it would be a purely academic exercise; in any event, it was for the Council itself to decide whether such an examination was necessary. He welcomed the assurance given by the French representative that the Council would be kept informed of all developments in the Territory as long as it remained under trusteeship.

12. He would like to know whether a date had yet been fixed for the attainment of independence by Togoland under French administration and whether the Togoland Government had submitted any requests for technical or economic assistance to the Administering Authority for transmission to the United Nations and, if so, what the result had been.

13. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), too, regretted that no report had been received on Togoland. The Council ought to be kept informed of any difficulties which the Togoland Government might be encountering. His delegation would be interested to know what assistance the Administering Au-

thority was giving the Government of Togoland, what it was doing to strengthen the country's economic situation and to what extent French officials were being replaced by Africans. At the present critical stage, the Administering Authority should show more concern for the needs of the new Government than it had in the past. It was therefore most unfortunate that the Council was prevented from examining all the important factors affecting the life of the Trust Territory.

14. Mr. DOISE (France), replying to the representative of the United Arab Republic, said that as far as the French delegation was aware the exact date for the attainment of independence by Togoland had not yet been fixed. The French Government was waiting to hear the views of the Head of the Togoland Government on the subject.

15. In reply to the second question asked by the representative of the United Arab Republic, requests for technical assistance had been submitted by the Togoland Government to the French Government, which had transmitted them to the competent Department of the United Nations. The United Nations Technical Assistance Board would be better able to provide information on the subject, but he could say that some experts had been appointed.

16. In reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, he said he did not know to what difficulties that representative had alluded. France was continuing to grant assistance to Togoland and there continued to be fruitful and effective co-operation between the French and Togoland Governments.

17. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) maintained that the Council should have more ample information on the subject of Togoland. Naturally the report for 1957 could not provide information on the present situation in Togoland, but it had been customary for the Administering Authorities to submit supplementary information each year. The few particulars given by the French representative in the course of his remarks could not be regarded as sufficient to enable the Council to examine the situation in the Trust Territory. The resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirteenth session did not preclude the Council from discussing the situation in Togoland so long as the Trusteeship Agreement remained in effect.

18. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked the French representative whether the conventions between France and Togoland were still in force.

19. Mr. DOISE (France) replied that the conventions remained in force.

20. The PRESIDENT proposed that consideration of the item should be postponed to the Council's twenty-fourth session.

21. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked whether, if the item were placed on the agenda of the twenty-fourth session, an additional report by the Administering Authority would be forthcoming to supplement the information contained in the annual report.

22. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said he was prepared to support the President's proposal. At the same time he shared the misgivings voiced by the representative of the United Arab Republic. In the particular circumstances of the case, his delegation felt that the Admin-

istering Authority should submit a brief report on the latest developments in the Territory. Until Togoland achieved independence, the trusteeship remained in force and the Council should continue to carry out its functions. The annual report for 1957 must undoubtedly be largely out of date, but he could see no reason why the Administering Authority, with the co-operation of the Togoland Government, could not have submitted to the Council a comprehensive statement covering the latest developments in the Territory. His delegation would have been interested to hear more about the requests of the Government of Togoland for technical assistance. He was sure, too, that the Council would like to know what legislative measures had been adopted by the Togoland Legislative Assembly during the past year.

23. He wished to emphasize that, until such time as the Trusteeship Agreement was terminated, the Administering Authority should submit to the Council all relevant information about the latest developments in the Territory, since that information would have to be considered by the General Assembly in connexion with the admission of Togoland to the United Nations.

24. Mr. DOISE (France) felt that there was no real difference of opinion. The annual report for 1957 was being drawn up, although circumstances had prevented its being submitted on the prescribed date. The question of the submission of supplementary information would be examined by the French and Togoland Governments, which would undoubtedly take the necessary steps with regard to such a request.

25. The PRESIDENT explained that in making his proposal he had taken it for granted that supplementary information would be supplied by the Administering Authority.

26. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that on that understanding his delegation was ready to support the President's proposal to postpone consideration of the item to the Council's twenty-fourth session.

The proposal was adopted.

#### Examination of petitions (T/L.893, T/L.899, T/L.902) (continued)\*

[Agenda item 5]

#### TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PE- TITIONS CONCERNING TANGANYIKA (T/L.893)

27. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote on the draft resolutions in the annex to the two hundred and twenty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.893).

Draft resolution I was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

28. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for separate vote on the words "continue to" in paragraph 2 of draft resolution II.

The words were adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

\*Resumed from the 943rd meeting.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

29. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to draft resolution VI, observed that it had been clear from the debate in the Standing Committee on Petitions that the Administering Authority was introducing the unpopular multiracial district councils despite the protests of the population and had not hesitated to use force to break up demonstrations opposing those measures.

30. He asked for a separate vote on the words "continue to" in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and suggested the addition of a new operative paragraph 4 reading:

"Expresses regret at the use of force by the Administering Authority to disperse an assembly gathered for the purpose of protesting against the establishment of multiracial district councils."

31. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) suggested the following alternative text for that paragraph:

"Regrets that it should have been considered necessary to use force to disperse an assembly of unarmed persons gathered together to voice their protest against the establishment of a multiracial council in Geita District."

32. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) withdrew his text in favour of that suggested by the Indian representative.

33. Miss TENZER (Belgium) recalled that almost identical texts had been proposed in the Standing Committee on Petitions and discussed at length. She herself had proposed that the question should be settled by the rejection of both texts and the Committee had then approved the draft resolution which was submitted to the Council.

34. Her delegation would be unable to vote in favour of either the USSR amendment or the Indian amendment, for reasons she had already explained in the Standing Committee.

35. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the special representative of the Administering Authority had been asked many questions by members of the Standing Committee and his answers had shown that force had in fact been used to disperse a peaceable assembly. The special representative had informed the Committee that some of the crowd, which was estimated at between 1,000 and 1,500 persons, had carried sticks, but he had added that that was the custom in that part of Africa. He had categorically stated that none of the demonstrators had at any time threatened to use the sticks for violent purposes. It was therefore difficult to see why force should have been used to disperse the crowd. Neither the Trusteeship Council nor any other organ of the United Nations could give its approval to the use of force where it was not strictly necessary. An expression of regret over such an event did not constitute a condemnation of the policy of the Administering Authority. The district councils should be established in a manner which would receive the sup-

port of the people and any protest should be listened to and the policy changed or revised accordingly.

36. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) supported the Indian amendment. Any use of force was regrettable and it was proper for the Council to express regret that such action had been taken.

37. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that protests made through the proper democratic channels had been listened to by the Administering Authority, which, as was clear from the document under discussion, was reconsidering its policy in the matter. As recorded in the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions, the Administering Authority had stated that the degree of force used had been the minimum necessary for the maintenance of law and order. It might have an adverse effect on the maintenance of good order in the Territory if the Administering Authority's judgments in such matters were in effect to be rejected by the Council some considerable time after the situation in the district concerned had returned to normal; yet that was what the Indian amendment clearly implied.

38. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) observed that all that the Administering Authority had done had been to maintain law and order in accordance with its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. It was bound to uphold the rights of all citizens; in the case in question it had been seeking to protect the Indian minority. He would vote against the Indian amendment.

39. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that, while the Council was dealing with the conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, he wanted to make it quite clear that the interests of any minority community, whether European or Asian, were not the primary concern of the Indian delegation. He pointed out that no such narrow interests motivated his delegation, either in the Standing Committee on Petitions or in the Council. The basic question was whether there was any threat to peace and to law and order in the Territory.

40. In the standing Committee, the special representative had stated in reply to questions put by the representative of India, that no member of the crowd had been breaking the law or threatening to use force. There had therefore been no breach of law and order. The special representative had also confirmed that an assembly of persons was not prohibited under the law, but he had contended that, if the gathering had continued for more than two or three days, problems of health and sanitation would have been created. That, however, was quite a different matter. The fact remained that it had been a peaceful assembly of persons met together to voice their protest at the establishment of a certain kind of district council. It was for that reason that his delegation objected to force having been used.

41. He said that his delegation would not support multiracial district councils if the inhabitants of the Territory did not want councils of that kind. The interests the Council had to keep in view were the interests of the Africans and of those other communities which had made Tanganyika their home.

42. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that the Administering Authority's observations, as reproduced in paragraph 7 of section VI, made it quite clear that intimidation had been used to prevent members of the

crowd from returning home, and that dispersal was necessary in the interests of law and order and of public health; it had only been with the greatest reluctance that the Administering Authority had resorted to force.

43. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to vote on the Indian amendment to add an additional paragraph to draft resolution VI.

A vote was taken on the amendment.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. The amendment was not adopted.

44. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to vote on the words "continue to" in paragraph 3 of draft resolution VI, in accordance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union.

The words in question were adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

45. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that Mr. Kadyanjih, the petitioner referred to in draft resolution VIII, had proved convincingly that the inhuman practice of corporal punishment continued to exist in the Territory; indeed, that was not denied by the Administering Authority. The petitioner had also made it clear that in the Tanganyika prisons racial discrimination was practised and health services were entirely inadequate.

46. His delegation therefore proposed that the following additional paragraph should be inserted as operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution:

"Recommends to the Administering Authority that it abolish corporal punishment and racial discrimination in Tanganyika prisons and further that it take steps to improve the health and medical facilities in those prisons."

The paragraph was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation in paragraph 3 of the introduction to the report (T/L.893) was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

#### **TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS CONCERNING SOMALILAND UNDER ITALIAN ADMINISTRATION (T/L.899)**

47. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), speaking as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, introduced the two hundred and twenty-seventh report of the Standing Committee, dealing with petitions concerning Somaliland under Italian administration. The subject of the petitions in question was the general election to be held on 5 March 1959; if the normal procedure had

been followed, they would not have been considered before the Council's twenty-fourth session, by which time the election would have been over. Accordingly, the Standing Committee had felt it desirable to take cognizance of them in February. Certain other communications concerning the elections, which were listed in document T/C.2/L.370, had subsequently been circulated. The representative of the Administering Authority had made a statement in the Standing Committee which was referred to in paragraph 3 of the report, and the Committee had agreed that it should be brought to the attention of the Council.

48. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) proposed that, in the absence of any recommendations from the Standing Committee, the petitions and communications referred to should be brought to the attention of the Council at its twenty-fourth session, when the question of Somaliland would be under consideration.

49. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the petitions contained requests from various organizations of the indigenous population that the general elections should be held under United Nations supervision and complained of various abuses on the part of the Administering Authority. His delegation felt that the petitions should have been considered before the elections, thus enabling the United Nations to take the necessary steps in accordance with the wishes of the people. The refusal of the Administering Authority to consider the petitions earlier than the date originally fixed suggested that it was endeavouring to prevent the real state of affairs from being brought to light.

50. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that he would reserve his delegation's position with regard to some of the remarks made by the Soviet representative. He would nevertheless say at once that the elections, which had taken place between 4 and 8 March 1959, had been conducted in an atmosphere of complete freedom and public order. The available information showed that eighty-two of the ninety seats in the Legislative Assembly had been won by the Somali Youth League; six seats had been won by the Independent Constitutional Party and two by the Liberal Somali Youth Party. His delegation agreed that the whole matter should be considered at the twenty-fourth session of the Council, when his delegation would be able to provide all the necessary information concerning the elections.

51. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the point he had been trying to make was that the petitions in question had been brought to the notice of the Standing Committee on Petitions two weeks before the date of the elections. The Soviet Union representative in that Committee had asked the Italian representative whether the Administering Authority would agree to consider the petitions before the elections and had received what had appeared to his delegation to be a negative reply.

52. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report, on the understanding that the petitions in question would be laid before the Council at its twenty-fourth session.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.5 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

## **TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS CIRCULATED UNDER RULE 85, AND COMMUNICATIONS CIRCULATED UNDER RULE 24, OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL (T/L.902)**

53. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the petitions in document T/PET.5/1389, said that the way in which those petitions had been published constituted a violation of the Council's rules of procedure and of paragraph 5 of the annex to Trusteeship Council resolution 1713 (XX). That paragraph provided that in cases of an unusually large number of petitions relating to the same grievance those petitions could be published in summarized form; in the case in question, the number of petitions was small and they referred to several different incidents and grievances.

54. His delegation accordingly proposed that the twenty-four petitions in question should be published in full.

55. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) supported the USSR proposal. The representative of the United Arab Republic in the Committee on Classification of Communications had already expressed reservations about the form of document T/PET.5/1389.

The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

56. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the seventeen petitions in T/PET.5/1390 should be reproduced in full for the same reasons that he had given with regard to the petitions in document T/PET.5/1389.

57. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic), supporting that proposal, said that, in that case also, the representative of the United Arab Republic had expressed reservations in the Committee on Classification of Communications. The incidents referred to in the petitions had affected individuals and had occurred in different regions; they were not therefore covered by paragraph 5 of the annex to Trusteeship Council resolution 1713 (XX).

The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation in paragraph 6 of the report (T/L.902) was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

### **Revision of the Questionnaire relating to Trust Territories: sixth progress report of the Sub-Committee on the Questionnaire (T/1430)**

[Agenda item 19]

58. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) introduced the sixth progress report of the Sub-Committee on the Questionnaire (T/1430) and said that, since its establishment in 1953, the Sub-Committee had completed the revision of the Questionnaire in respect of only one Trust Territory, Nauru. In order to expedite its work, it had now decided to meet three times a year, i.e. before the winter and summer sessions of the Trusteeship Council and before the regular session of the General Assembly, instead of twice a year as in the past.

59. In reaching the conclusions presented in its report, the Sub-Committee had been guided by the desire to recommend revision only in the case of questions which were of permanent interest to the Trusteeship Council and to the Trust Territory of Nauru in order to avoid burdening the Administering Authority with unnecessary work in submitting information and to take into account the requirements indicated by members of the Council during consideration of the Trust Territory concerned.

60. It had been a matter of satisfaction to the Sub-Committee that an observer for the Administering Authority had been present at its meetings. The Sub-Committee hoped that the Administering Authority would present its comments in time to allow the Council to consider the revised Questionnaire at its twenty-fourth session.

61. In paragraph 4 of its report, the Sub-Committee raised the question of revising the Questionnaire's statistical appendices, including the tables, and the terminology relating to public health and statistical matters. The Sub-Committee had considered that some sort of revision was necessary, but had not felt technically competent to undertake the task itself; it had therefore referred the matter to the Council, which might be able to suggest revisions that would bring the appendices and tables more into line with the latest statistical practices and methods.

62. Mr. KELLY (Australia) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the work the Sub-Committee had done with respect to the Questionnaire on Nauru. He would be glad to transmit the Sub-Committee's report, together with the observations made by the Indian representative, to his Government; he had no reason to believe that the comments of the Administering Authority for Nauru would not be made available to the Council in time for consideration at its summer session.

63. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that it was important that some means of revising the Questionnaire's statistical appendices and terminology should be found, since the Sub-Committee did not feel competent to undertake that task. He reserved the right to raise the question at the General Assembly.

64. His delegation felt some concern over the Australian representative's inability to assure the Council that the Administering Authority's comments on the revised Questionnaire for Nauru would be made available in time for the Council's consideration of that Territory; it stressed that those comments should be transmitted as rapidly as possible.

65. He noted the statement in paragraph 5 of the report that the Sub-Committee had decided to study the special Questionnaires for Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in that order. He wondered if it would be possible for the Sub-Committee to consider the Ruanda-Urundi Questionnaire first, before the Council's twenty-fourth session, inasmuch as the question of Ruanda-Urundi was on the agenda for that session.

66. Mr. KELLY (Australia), replying to the representative of the United Arab Republic, said that he had every reason to expect that the observations of the Administering Authority would be transmitted in time for consideration at the Council's summer session.

67. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the decision on the order of priority had been a unanimous one and that the United Arab Republic had been represented on the Sub-Committee. Although the Indian delegation would normally have no objection to the Sub-Committee's considering the Ruanda-Urundi Questionnaire before the summer session, it feared that in the existing circumstances that might impose unnecessary strain on the capacity of the Sub-Committee and the Secretariat. In any case, it was doubtful whether the Sub-Committee would be able to complete its revision of the Questionnaire in time for it to be of assistance in the Council's examination of conditions in Ruanda-Urundi at the summer session. The Sub-Committee had decided on the order of the priority after considerable deliberation, in the belief that the present situation in Tanganyika claimed the Council's first consideration. He did not think that circumstances had altered sufficiently to justify any change in that order.

68. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that, in view of the apparent difficulty of revising the order of priority, his delegation would not press the point.

69. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Sub-Committee's report should be transmitted to the Australian Government for its observations and that the examination of the report and of the observations of the Australian Government should be postponed until the twenty-fourth session of the Council.

It was so decided.

#### **Control and limitation of documentation (General Assembly resolution 1272 (XIII))**

[Agenda item 18]

70. The PRESIDENT proposed that, in the absence of any comments on General Assembly resolution 1272 (XIII), the Council should take note of the resolution.

It was so decided.

#### **Reports of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories (T/1438)**

[Agenda item 8]

71. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should take note of the report submitted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning land tenure and land use problems in the Trust Territories of Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi (T/1438) and transmit it to the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories.

72. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was regrettable that the Committee's failure to submit a report to the present session—and in particular its failure to report on Tanganyika, which was one of the largest Trust Territories—prevented the Council from considering the substance of the question. In forwarding the report, therefore, the Council should draw the Committee's attention to the need to submit a report on Tanganyika in time for the Council's twenty-fourth session, so that effect could be given to General Assembly resolution 1208 (XII).

73. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his delegation, which was represented on the Committee, shared the Soviet delegation's concern over the Committee's delay in submitting its report. It would have been able to

do so had not the four-week resumed thirteenth session of the General Assembly prevented it from meeting. He was sure the Committee would be able to present a report on Tanganyika to the following session of the Council.

74. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that it was his delegation's understanding that the Committee had already prepared a report on Ruanda-Urundi. If so, the FAO report should be transmitted to it so that it could review its observations and conclusions on Ruanda-Urundi in the light of the FAO observations.

75. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the anxiety of the Soviet Union and Indian representatives that the Committee should proceed with its examination of the problem of land tenure in Tanganyika as rapidly as possible.

76. The PRESIDENT proposed that the FAO report (T/1438) should be transmitted to the Committee together with the observations that various members of the Councils had made on the subject.

It was so decided.

Adoption of the part of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly covering conditions in the Trust Territories under examination during the twenty-third session

[Agenda item 20]

77. The PRESIDENT recalled that in 1958, in order to save time, the Council's report to the General Assembly had been produced in two volumes, so that the chapters which related to Trust Territories considered during the twenty-first session could be printed as a separate volume at the end of that session. Since only the Trust Territory of Tanganyika had been examined in detail at the present session, he proposed that the Council's next report to the Assembly should be in one volume only.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.