



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fourth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 4 August 1959,
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories [General Assembly resolution 1275 (XIII)] (<i>concluded</i>)	467
Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories: report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (<i>concluded</i>)	471

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: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; World Health Organization.

Effects of the European Economic Community on the development of Certain Trust Territories [General Assembly resolution 1275 (XIII)] (*concluded*)*

[Agenda item 12]

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 968th meeting the Council had decided to consider the effects of the European Economic Community on certain Trust Territories after its discussion of the annual reports on the conditions in the Territories concerned. He invited the Council to resume its examination of the question, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1275 (XIII).

2. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that at the meeting in question the French delegation had stated the position of the French Government on the question of the association of Togoland under French administration and the Cameroons under French administration with the European Economic Community and had pointed out that the forthcoming accession of those two countries to independence made any discussion of the effects of that association purely academic. His delegation had stated that a very detailed study of the question had been made and would continue to be made within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and that it failed to see what could be added to the work done by that body. His delegation had on that occasion repeated that the association of the Trust Territories with the European Economic Community made it easier for them to sell their products on certain markets and that that was all to the advantage of the people of those Territories, the more so in that it involved no change in their international obligations.

3. In addition, the association of certain Trust Territories with the European Common Market meant that

*Resumed from the 968th meeting.

they would receive very considerable financial assistance from the Development Fund for the overseas countries and territories. The Governments of the new States had made no mistake about that, for they had recently applied for funds to enable them to start work forthwith on economic and social projects. For the financial year 1958 the Commission of the European Economic Community had approved the financing by the Development Fund for the overseas countries and territories of social investment projects of a total cost of the equivalent of approximately \$282,040 for the Republic of Togoland and \$331,000 for the State of the Cameroons, as also of economic investment projects of a total cost of approximately \$458,000 for Togoland and \$3,568,000 for the Cameroons, or a grand total of \$4,639,040. He gave a detailed list of the projects for Togoland and the Cameroons which had been approved by the Commission and which corresponded to the total number of applications submitted by the two countries for the financial year 1958. The French delegation was convinced that the Trusteeship Council would be pleased to learn that the Republic of Togoland and the State of the Cameroons were already, on the threshold of independence, receiving such a great amount of additional foreign aid, which would enable them to continue their efforts towards a constant improvement of living conditions and standards of employment and thus to ensure growing prosperity.

4. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) thanked the representative of France for the information he had just given the Council. He would, however, like to know whether the French Government intended to make a statement of intentions for Togoland and the Cameroons, similar to that which had been embodied in a protocol of the Treaty of Rome and under which Somaliland under Italian administration would be free after independence to maintain or to cease its association with the European Economic Community.

5. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that he did not know whether the French Government intended to make such a statement. He repeated that Togoland and the Cameroons were to accede to independence in the very near future; although it was true that an independent State inherited the legal obligations contracted in its name, all the States which had signed the Treaty of Rome would certainly wish Togoland and the Cameroons freely to confirm their adherence to the Community, which would be all to their advantage, as was obvious from the information which the French delegation had just given the Council.

6. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he did not wish to discuss the substance of the matter or to seek to determine the advantages or disadvantages to the Trust Territories of their association with the European Economic Community, but he would ask the representative of France to inform the French Government of the comments of the delegation of the United Arab Republic.

7. He was anxious to know what would happen to the long-term projects financed by the Development Fund

for the overseas countries and territories if the new independent States were to decide to withdraw from the European Economic Community.

8. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that the credits granted for the 1958 financial year were being used to finance current projects and would be paid in full.

9. The French delegation would not fail to bring the suggestion of the delegation of the United Arab Republic to the attention of the French Government.

10. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what action the Council proposed to take on the request addressed to it by the General Assembly in resolution 1275 (XIII). He asked whether the Secretariat had prepared a draft of the report which the Trusteeship Council, under that resolution, was to present to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session.

11. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said that, in the absence of any indication by the Council, no specific draft had been prepared by the Secretariat. However, he drew attention to the fact that, at its 1030th meeting, the Council had adopted, for its report on Ruanda-Urundi, a section dealing with the European Economic Community which had been proposed by the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi (T/L.928, annex I, paras. 9-11). He understood that the Drafting Committee on Somaliland under Italian Administration would include a similar section in the report it would present to the Council shortly.

12. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered whether the Secretariat could not assemble in a single document all the information available on the question; that would enable the Council to submit to the General Assembly the report the latter had requested on the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories.

13. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) suggested that the Council should devote a special chapter of its report to the question. It would certainly be useful for the General Assembly to have the information that the Administering Authorities concerned had given in their statements to the Council included in the report.

14. Miss TENZER (Belgium) endorsed that suggestion. She recalled that during the examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi the Belgian delegation had given the Council specific information on the effects of the association of that Territory with the European Economic Community. That information, together with the data provided by the Italian delegation during the examination of conditions in Somaliland under Italian administration and the data submitted by the French delegation at the present meeting, would provide material for a detailed chapter.

15. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) associated himself with the comments of the French and Belgian representatives.

16. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) pointed out that the General Assembly had asked for a separate report on the question. In his view that report should not only give the information communicated by the Administering Authorities concerned but also reflect all the views expressed during the discussion.

17. In addition, he recalled that the French representative had stated at the 968th meeting that it would be

useful for the Secretariat to acquaint itself with the very thorough studies GATT had made on the effects which the entry into force of the Treaty of Rome would have on the trade of the territories associated with the European Economic Community. He asked if it would be possible to request the Secretary-General to prepare a report containing information taken from GATT documents and from sources other than those available to the Trusteeship Council.

18. The PRESIDENT stated that the Council could request the Secretary-General to prepare a report for itself but not for the General Assembly.

19. Miss TENZER (Belgium) wondered what the Secretary-General could actually add to the very complete information already communicated to the Trusteeship Council.

20. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think that his proposal and the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic were mutually exclusive. The Trusteeship Council would present direct to the General Assembly the report which it had requested. The Secretary-General, for his part, could assemble all the other information on the question that he could obtain from official sources in a report which would contain neither conclusions nor recommendations. It would be a simple statement of facts, which could be of assistance to the General Assembly in its consideration of a question to which it clearly attached great importance, since it had seen fit to devote a special resolution to it.

21. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) emphasized that, if the Council entrusted that task to the Secretary-General, it would not have complied with the request made by the General Assembly in resolution 1275 (XIII) that it should examine the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories and report on the matter to the Assembly at its fourteenth session. The Council's deliberations on the subject could be accurately summarized, as was done with its discussions of all other matters that came before it.

22. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) pointed out that two proposals had been put to the Council. The first concerned the report it would submit to the General Assembly: in that connexion, it would have to decide whether to prepare a separate report or to devote a special chapter of its regular report to the subject. The second proposal was that the Secretary-General should submit to the Council for transmission to the General Assembly—that would overcome the difficulty to which the President had drawn attention—a report which would include any other information he could assemble.

23. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council's regular report to the General Assembly should include a special chapter on the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories, containing the information transmitted by the Administering Authorities concerned and a summary of the various statements and comments made during the debate on the subject.

It was so decided.

24. The PRESIDENT asked the Secretary of the Council how much time would be required to prepare a separate report on the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories.

25. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said it was hard to say, since it had not been made clear what the contents of that report were to be. As it would have to be prepared in consultation with the Bureau of Economic Affairs, it could not be submitted to the Council before the end of September or the beginning of October.

26. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) pointed out that, in that case, the Council would be unable to study the report, since its session was drawing to a close.

27. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) thought that the document in question could be submitted direct to the Assembly, since it would be of a purely descriptive nature; it need only be circulated to States members of the Council for their perusal.

28. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, in the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, certain documents prepared by the Secretariat had been considered approved in the absence of any objections from members. He asked whether the Council could not adopt a similar procedure.

29. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that the European Economic Community was not on the point of dissolution and that the General Assembly could always ask the Secretary-General to make a fresh survey if it considered the information furnished in the relevant chapter of the Council's report inadequate.

30. Miss TENZER (Belgium) felt that the Council should not adopt a decision that would give the impression that it had not made a proper study of the subject.

31. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) supported the views expressed by the representatives of France and Belgium.

32. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) recalled that, when the Council had first discussed the question, at the 968th meeting, the French representative himself had said that the Secretariat might obtain useful material from sources other than the information furnished by the Administering Authorities.

33. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) felt that, at the present stage, a request for a special report on the subject might be regarded as a criticism of the detailed information that had been furnished.

34. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) put the following proposal to the Council: "The Trusteeship Council requests the Secretary-General to prepare for the Council a report on the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of Trust Territories, which would be submitted to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session."

35. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said he would vote against that proposal, since it served no purpose and implied a lack of confidence in the Trusteeship Council.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call.

India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Burma.

Against: Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: China, Haiti.

The proposal of the United Arab Republic was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

36. Mr. YANG (China) said he had abstained because he felt that the Council should be able to study documents it requested the Secretary-General to prepare. He would have voted in favour of the proposal of the United Arab Republic if it had been submitted at the twenty-third session, for the Council would then have been able to study the report in question at its present session.

37. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the convention associating the overseas territories, among which were Trust Territories, with the European Economic Community had been concluded without the cognizance of the United Nations and specifically of the Trusteeship Council. Furthermore, it had been concluded not by the Governments of the Trust Territories concerned but by the Administering Authorities. The indigenous people had not participated in the conclusion of the convention, nor in the creation of the special fund for the development of overseas territories, and they had no voice in its administration. There were no grounds for believing that the association of those Territories with the European Economic Community would promote their development. A study of the figures was sufficient to show that; Ruanda-Urundi, for instance, was to receive \$30 million in credits from the Community's Development Fund, whereas Belgium's share of the Fund amounted to \$70 million. If Belgium made the credits directly available to the Territory, the latter would have much greater resources at its disposal. He felt that the association of the Trust Territories with the European Common Market was an action designed to bind the Territories politically and economically for a long time to the unions instituted by the Administering Authorities. He noted that the General Assembly had every reason to express concern that the association of Trust Territories with the European Economic Community might considerably hinder the development of those Territories toward the attainment of self-government or independence.

38. The States members of the European Economic Community, by including the Trust Territories in the economic agreements, were basing their activities on their own interests and seeking to strengthen the existing economic dependence of those Territories on the metropolitan countries even after their accession to independence. Although the Trust Territories of Somaliland under Italian administration and of Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration were on the threshold of independence, long-term conventions had been entered into and plans were being implemented which would bind the future independent States in advance to the European Common Market. The declaration by the Italian delegation to the effect that Somaliland under Italian administration, when it attained independence, would be able to secede from the conventions was just a statement which would be very difficult and perhaps impossible to implement. Mr. Oberemko noted that even such declarations had not been made in respect of Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration.

39. The inclusion of the Trust Territories in the European Common Market endangered their future develop-

ment and national self-determination. That was why many organizations and groups in the Trust Territories evidenced so much concern. The indigenous inhabitants indicated they had not been consulted when the conventions were concluded and that there were no guarantees that the funds would be used in the interests of the Trust Territory and not for financing its economic exploitation for the benefit of the metropolitan country and the other participants in the Common Market.

40. Trust Territories, especially those on the threshold of independence, should not be burdened by conventions of a political, economic or other character which had been originally concluded not by their own Governments but by their Administering Authorities and which would bind the Governments of the future independent States. Trust Territories, having once attained independence, must have a full and unrestricted right to decide what conventions they wished to enter into and with whom such conventions should be concluded. That was a sovereign and inalienable right of the future independent States which were at present Trust Territories.

41. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) held, as he had stated previously, that the Administering Authorities should have consulted the Trust Territories before binding them with the obligations of the Treaty of Rome.

42. As far as Ruanda-Urundi was concerned, instead of his arguments being refuted they had been declared invalid on the grounds that the Territory was not really a member of the Community and did not contribute to the Development Fund. It was nevertheless a fact that the Treaty would have serious effects on the economy of the Territory, for it was clear from article 132 that the States members of the Community would in their commercial exchanges with the countries and territories—including Trust Territories—apply the same rules which they applied among themselves.

43. It had been claimed that the Trust Territories could only benefit by an association which helped to finance their development programmes. That did not take account of the fact that those programmes had formerly been the concern of the Administering Authority, which was responsible to the Trusteeship Council, that the Administering Authority did not have a decisive voice in the governing bodies of the Community, and that those bodies included States which were not responsible to the Trusteeship Council. The financing of development programmes was, moreover, directed by the Community, which placed the interests of the Common Market above those of the Territory concerned.

44. Recalling that a statement concerning Somaliland appeared in a protocol of the Treaty of Rome, he urged that similar statements should be made with regard to the Cameroons, Togoland and Ruanda-Urundi. He asked that his comments should be included in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

45. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) expressed the belief that the association of the Trust Territories with the Common Market could not but redound to their benefit. He referred to the statement made by President de Gaulle at Rome to the effect that the members of the European Economic Community would give consideration to all measures that might promote the development of the overseas territories. He also referred to a letter from Mr. William Clayton, formerly Under-Secretary of

State for Economic Affairs in the United States Government, published in The New York Times, which stated that the new and dynamic idea of the Common Market, which constituted a veritable economic revolution, opened up extraordinary possibilities for the development of the under-developed countries. He further drew the attention of the Council to a statement which he himself had made in that connexion on 16 July 1959, at the 1015th meeting of the Council.

46. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) regretted that the Soviet representative had thought it necessary to make a propaganda speech. The Soviet delegation's method was well known; it consisted of the repetition of the same false assertions in the hope that they would one day be accepted as the truth. Happily, as Mr. Kosciuszko-Morizet had once said, the peoples of the world, and particularly those of Africa, did not have the conditioned reflexes of Pavlov's dog. As a matter of fact, the crucial problem of the modern world, the need to raise levels of living, had been the basis of the Treaty of Rome. The Soviet representative had no doubt forgotten that Togoland had already become self-governing when the Treaty of Rome had been signed and that the Cameroons was soon to attain independence. The association of those Territories with the Community had therefore not delayed their attainment of independence but had obtained for them a credit of \$4,636,000, which would certainly help to improve the level of living of their inhabitants.

47. Miss TENZER (Belgium) explained the principles regulating the association of the territories with the Common Market. On the one hand, the territories derived nothing but benefits from a development fund to which they did not have to contribute. On the other hand, they had available, for the disposal of their products, a six-country market which did not impose on them any customs duties or quotas, whereas they themselves could establish and maintain any customs duties necessary to protect their economy and to obtain the necessary funds for their budgets. With regard to the Development Fund, the special representative for Ruanda-Urundi had given all the desired information on the projects submitted to the Community by that Territory. Association with the Common Market did not entail any subjection, nor was it unalterable. As the associated territories attained self-government or independence, they would be free to continue to benefit from the Treaty or to denounce it.

48. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that his impression was that the Treaty of Rome attached greater importance to the interests of the Community than to the interests of any associated territory. That was apparent, for example, from article 4 of the Implementing Convention relating to the association with the Community of the overseas countries and territories. Although it was true that some projects were submitted by the territories, the final decision rested with the Council of the Community, where Belgium, for example, did not have a preponderant voice. As to customs tariffs, they were established by agencies outside the territories. Imports and exports were likewise entirely in the hands of Europeans, and the territories were not really able to dispose freely of the raw materials they produced.

49. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the French representative had indulged in a very unusual and nervous statement in which he

had used inappropriate expressions and, instead of producing arguments, had branded as propaganda all the facts and all the arguments put forward by other delegations with which he did not agree. In sharp contrast with the representatives of Italy and Belgium, he had spoken heatedly and used insulting language towards other delegations but he had explained nothing. The French representative had repeatedly referred to the dog of the Academician Pavlov. That was a sign of the expansion of his knowledge. It was to be hoped that he would go a step further and in the future would appeal to reason, would produce arguments and would not merely declare as propaganda any view which did not coincide with his own. It was to be regretted that the French representative had thought fit to forgo the usual manner of discussing matters that were brought before the Council and had failed to show elementary tact and respect for the point of view of other delegations.

50. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that he had no intention of replying to the representative of the Soviet Union, but that he wished to make an unequivocal statement concerning the association of Togoland and the Cameroons with the Common Market, namely that when the two Territories became independent, they would be able to denounce the Treaty of Rome or any other treaty as they saw fit. There had never been any question of imposing on them any commitments with regard to the European Economic Community from which they could not free themselves.

**Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories:
report of the Standing Committee on Administrative
Unions (T/L.925/Add.1) (concluded)****

[Agenda item 7]

51. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, presented the second part of the Committee's report (T/L.915/Add.1), which concerned the administrative union between New Guinea and Papua. The Standing Committee had made every effort to avoid duplicating the recommendations submitted by the Drafting Committee on New Guinea. Both the descriptive part of the report and the draft conclusions and recommendations had been adopted unanimously by the Standing Committee.

52. Mr. KELLY (Australia) listed a few drafting changes which he felt should be made in the factual part of the report.

53. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat had taken note of those changes and would keep them in mind in preparing the Council's report to the General Assembly.

54. He then invited the members of the Council to vote separately on each of the three sections setting forth the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted by the Standing Committee (T/L.925/Add.1, para.46).

**Resumed from the 1031st meeting.

55. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "continue to" in the third paragraph of section A should be deleted.

56. Mr. KELLY (Australia) stated that if the Soviet amendment were adopted, he would be unable to vote in favour of section A.

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Section A was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

57. Mr. KELLY (Australia) requested that the words "and thereby to ensure to the Territory greater administrative autonomy" appearing in the final paragraph of section B should be voted on separately. As a representative of a federal State, he was aware, as was the Administering Authority, of the advantages of decentralization, but he pointed out that the concept of administrative decentralization had no necessary connexion at all with that of administrative autonomy. The Administering Authority had to remain responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory, whether that administration was highly centralized or highly decentralized. The reference in the paragraph to the concept of autonomy merely confused the issue.

58. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) stated that the purpose of the phrase referred to by the Australian representative was to safeguard the autonomy of the Territory with regard to Papua rather than with regard to the Administering Authority.

It was decided to retain the words "and thereby to ensure to the Territory greater administrative autonomy" by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Section B was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

59. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that he had abstained from the vote on the words "and thereby to ensure to the Territory greater administrative autonomy" about which he had expressed reservations in the Standing Committee. He had, however, voted in favour of section B because, in his view, it merely invited the Administering Authority to decentralize the administration of the Territory as much as possible.

Section C was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

60. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that by the very reason of its composition, the Standing Committee could not work out adequate conclusions and recommendations. He thought, however, that certain useful recommendations had been made with regard to some partial questions. He had voted in favour of sections B and C in the hope that they represented a first step forward even though they did not go as far as his delegation would have wished.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.