



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fourth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 23 June 1959,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Report of the Secretary-General on credentials ( <u>concluded</u> ) . . . . .	131
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi ( <u>continued</u> ):	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957;	
(ii) Petitions and communications raising general questions	
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority ( <u>continued</u> ) . .	133

**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.

**Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1468) (concluded)**

[Agenda item 2]

1. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that it had before it a motion for closure of the debate submitted by the representative of Italy at the previous meeting.
2. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he was not in a position to vote on a motion which directly affected a vote on another proposal concerning the competence not only of the Trusteeship Council in certain matters but also of members to propose amendments to a report or proposal placed before the Council.
3. Since Members of the General Assembly could propose amendments to the reports of its Committee on Credentials, there was nothing to prevent members of the Trusteeship Council from taking similar action. In fact, it was an inherent right of the Council. The proposal before the Council was substantive and involved delicate questions which should be carefully studied.
4. The PRESIDENT said that under rule 56 of the rules of procedure there could be no further debate on the Italian motion.
5. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the Council actually had two matters before it: the

report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1468) and the question whether or not a delegation might introduce amendments to reports submitted to the Council by the Secretary-General. He took it that the Italian representative's motion for closure of the debate was related to the former. If that was not the case, he hoped that the representative of Italy would submit a formal proposal with regard to the right of members of the Council to introduce amendments; that proposal could then be dealt with at a subsequent meeting when members of the Council had had time to study it and to take a position.

6. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that his motion for closure of the debate related to a proposal which he thought the President and formally put before the Council. He asked the President whether that proposal had been a formal one.

7. The PRESIDENT said he had made a suggestion, not a formal proposal.

8. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that he had understood that the President had made a formal proposal to the Council at the previous meeting. Since it now appeared that he had been mistaken, he formally moved that a vote should be taken on the admissibility of the Soviet Union amendment to the report of the Secretary-General.

9. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the motion should be submitted in writing under rule 57 of the rules of procedure, since it concerned a very important matter of substance.

10. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that that was unnecessary, since rule 57 did not apply to procedural motions.

11. Mr. KELLY (Australia) moved, under rule 56, paragraph 1 (d), that the debate on the Italian motion should be closed.

12. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) pointed out that under rule 56, paragraph 3, a motion for closure of debate on a motion should not be considered by the Council until each representative had had an opportunity to speak on the motion in question.

13. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that, in his view, the Italian motion was not procedural and was therefore subject to the provisions of rule 57.

14. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the statement of the Indian representative. A motion for closure of debate on a proposal which had not been submitted in writing should not be entertained by the Council. If it did so, it would be doing violence to its own rules of procedure. The question of introducing amendments was a serious matter which should not be dealt with in a hasty manner.

15. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) supported the procedural motion made by the representative of Italy. Reviewing the situation, he said that the Council had

already rejected a Soviet Union proposal on the Secretary-General's report on credentials. The representative of the Soviet Union had subsequently attempted to reintroduce his proposal in the form of an amendment to the Secretary-General's report. In view of the Council's earlier action the present Soviet amendment was not admissible.

16. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the motion of the representative of Australia for closure of the debate on the motion of the representative of Italy.

The motion was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

17. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because the motion for closure related to another motion which had not been formally presented to the Council.

18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not participated in the vote, like the representatives of the United Arab Republic, India and Burma, because the vote had been taken in obvious violation of the Council's rules of procedure.

19. U THANT (Burma) said that he had not voted because, in his delegation's view, adoption of the Italian motion would be tantamount to denying the right of the Council and its members to submit amendments to the Secretary-General's reports. Moreover, he agreed with those representatives who had felt that the matter should not be disposed of with undue haste.

20. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked under what rule of procedure the Italian motion had been submitted.

21. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as he did not consider the Italian motion to be procedural he wished to have the exact text.

22. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that the motion read as follows: "The Trusteeship Council decides that the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union to the report of the Secretary-General on credentials is not admissible."

23. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) proposed the following addition: "on the express condition that the result of the vote on this motion shall not constitute a valid precedent which would in future deny to members of the Council the right to submit amendments to the reports of the Secretary-General."

24. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) asked the President to suspend the meeting for a brief interval so that he could consider the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

25. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that as his motion was related to the specific report of the Secretary-General now before the Council he would amend it to read as follows: "The Trusteeship Council decides that the amendment submitted by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the report of the Secretary-General on credentials contained in document T/1468 is not admissible."

26. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that in view of the explanation given by the representative of Italy he would not press his amendment. He would not, however, vote on the Italian motion.

27. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not participate in the vote on the Italian motion because it was quite inconsistent with the rules of procedure of the Council or any other body of the United Nations. The Council should vote on the Soviet Union amendment, since it was the only procedure which the Council's rules of procedure envisaged.

28. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) felt that, under the weight of a majority, the Council was being forced to a decision which was fraught with dangerous consequences. The right of members to propose amendments under the procedures adopted by the Council was being challenged. The vote about to be held was therefore likely to violate the rules of procedure. Hence, the only course open to the Indian delegation was to refrain from participating in the vote.

29. U THANT (Burma) said that he could not take part in the vote because of the fact that the competence of the Council was involved.

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

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

In favour: France, Haiti, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, China.

Present and not voting: India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Burma.

The Italian motion was adopted by 10 votes to none.

30. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been prompted entirely by procedural considerations; its vote could not be interpreted as implying any change in the position taken by the United Kingdom on the substance of the question. His delegation had voted in favour of the Italian proposal because, in its view, the USSR amendment ran contrary to a procedural decision already taken by the Council, at its previous meeting, that it should not vote on the report in parts. His delegation did not take the view that serious consequences were likely to ensue from the vote just taken.

31. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) said that the matter had in fact raised important questions of principle. His delegation had voted against the admissibility of the Soviet Union proposal because it had had serious doubts about the possibility of amending a report which merely set out the views of the author.

32. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the discussion had not been merely procedural in nature. His delegation had raised the question of the non-recognition of the credentials of persons who did not represent China but who unlawfully occupied the seat of China in the Trusteeship Council. That was a matter of substance, a fundamental question of principle. On that important question—not on the question of procedure—the Council would like to have had an expression of opinion by the representative of the United Kingdom. Then it would not have been necessary for the United Kingdom representative to say that he had been deprived of an opportunity to indicate his fundamental position as a result of some procedural discussions.

33. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his remarks had referred specifically to the procedural discussions which had taken place during that meeting.

34. Mr. KELLY (Australia) observed that he had supported the Italian motion, on procedural grounds and in particular on the ground that the second Soviet proposal was substantially identical with the proposal which had been rejected by the Council at its previous meeting.

35. He did not agree with the view that any proposal under rule 56 of the rules of procedure had to be circulated in writing twenty-four hours in advance.

The report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1468) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

36. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) explained that at the previous meeting his delegation had abstained on the question whether a separate vote should be taken on part of the Secretary-General's report, since it had no objection to such a vote under rule 60 of the rules of procedure if a delegation so desired. It had, however, voted in favour of the report, since it considered that the credentials of all the representatives present were in order.

37. U THANT (Burma) said that the fact that his delegation had voted in favour of the report did not imply that it approved of the credentials of the representatives of China in the Council. It was well known that his Government recognized only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

38. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his Government recognized only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. His delegation had hoped that an opportunity would be given to members of the Council to express their views on the representation of China, but the proposal to vote on the report in parts had unfortunately been rejected, while the USSR amendment had been shelved in a manner which did not seem to his delegation to be in conformity with the traditions or the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council. His delegation had therefore been forced to abstain in the vote on the report as a whole.

39. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the report as a whole because, under the heading "China", the report enumerated the names of private persons who did not possess credentials issued by the People's Republic of China and who did not therefore have the right to represent China.

40. The PRESIDENT reminded the USSR representative that the representatives in the Council were accredited representatives of Governments recognized by the United Nations.

41. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that that was indeed the view which was unfortunately upheld by the majority of the members of the Trusteeship Council. He was explaining, however, the position of the Soviet Union delegation, which held that the individuals concerned had no right to sit in the Council as representatives of China.

42. Mr. SEARS (United States of America), intervening on a point of order, drew attention to the fact

that the USSR representative was disregarding a ruling by the President.

43. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no intention of violating the President's rulings; it was merely expressing its views on the matter, which were that the lawful representatives of China in the Trusteeship Council were not now present. For that reason, his delegation had asked for a separate vote on the credentials of those who claimed to be the representatives of China, and it was in the light of those considerations that it had been compelled to abstain in the vote on the report as a whole.

44. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) recalled that his delegation had always expressed reservations with regard to the validity of the representation of China in the Council and elsewhere in the United Nations. It had accordingly abstained in the vote on the report.

45. Mr. KIANG (China) said that he felt it was beneath his dignity as representative of China to reply further to the slanderous remarks which had been made. Any attempt by a free country to confer prestige upon the Chinese Communists would only make the Communists more respectable in their own land.

46. The PRESIDENT pointed out that that was not the matter which was under discussion.

47. Mr. KIANG (China) said that he had the right to say a few words in reply to the remarks that had been made. Nevertheless, he would conclude his statement.

#### Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (continued):

(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1957 (T/1406, T/1442, T/1452, T/1461, T/L.909);

(ii) Petitions and communications raising general questions (T/COM.3/L.23 to 25, T/PET.GEN/L.2, T/PET.GEN/L.3, T/PET.3/L.9)

[Agenda items 3 (a) and 4]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Reisdorff, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, took a place at the Council table.

#### QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (continued)

##### Economic advancement (continued)

48. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative), replying to a question addressed to him at the 982nd meeting by the representative of China, said that the total amount of money provided for social work in the ordinary budget for 1958 had amounted to 39.23 per cent of total expenditure under that budget. The percentage he had given in his opening statement (979th meeting) was incorrect.

49. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that up to 1958 the public finances of the Territory had seemed to be in a sound position. His delegation had been somewhat concerned to note that since then there had been a steady increase in the total estimated expenditure.

Despite a rise in estimated revenue, it had been difficult to balance the ordinary budget for 1958. He asked the special representative whether there was any prospect that, in the near future, the revenue of the Territory would increase to an extent which would enable the Administration to overcome its financial difficulties.

50. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) replied that, generally speaking, exports and revenue were increasing; it was estimated that the revenue for 1959 would be 960 million francs. Revenue had admittedly been lower than the estimate, especially in 1958, but that had been due largely to the world recession. Expenditure was rising more rapidly than revenue, but, if the development of the Territory was not to be interrupted, it was necessary for its Government to act with daring and determination. Accordingly, with the assistance of the Belgian Treasury, the Government of Ruanda-Urundi had preferred to continue investments on the same scale and to carry out the ten-year plan in accordance with the programme, rather than to follow a policy which might hamper its efforts to develop the Territory so as to bring it prosperity and freedom and the opportunity at some date of deciding its own future. Obviously, a budget could be balanced if it was decided to keep expenditure below the level of revenue, but the policy of the Government of Ruanda-Urundi was rather to develop the country at all costs.

51. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) inquired whether, in the event of revenue not coming up to expectations, the Administering Authority proposed to curtail essential services in the Territory.

52. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) assured the representative of Burma that no such measures were contemplated in 1959 and 1960. The policy of Belgium had always been to develop all the services of the country so as to enable it to reach a stage at which the budget could be balanced.

53. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that he assumed that the advance of 125 million francs made by the Belgian Treasury had been free of interest. He asked how much time the Territory would need in order to refund that advance.

54. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) replied that, as in the case of all amounts made available to Ruanda-Urundi by Belgium, the loans had been made free of interest and no date had been specified for repayment.

55. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) noted that the sum allocated to administrative and judicial services in the 1957 ordinary budget had been roughly half the amount allocated either to social services or to economic services. He asked whether that item was likely to be increased in future budgets in view of the expanding need for administrative and judicial services.

56. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that, since the total budget increased from year to year, the various allocations also increased even when they remained the same in percentage terms. Money was allocated wherever the need was greatest. When new administrative bodies were formed, they would receive the necessary appropriations.

57. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) noted that since 1952 the Belgian Parliament had voted an annual interest-free advance of 400 million francs for the extraordinary budget, which financed the ten-year plan for economic and social development, and that an advance of 475 million francs had been proposed for 1958. He wondered whether the Administration would be able to obtain increased advances in subsequent years in view of the rise in prices and other costs.

58. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that the annual advance for 1959 and 1960 was to be 600 million francs, of which the ordinary budget would probably receive 450 million and the extraordinary budget the remainder. The contribution received for the ten-year plan would total 3,900 million francs by the end of 1959, an amount exceeding the 3,670 million francs originally estimated as the total cost of the plan. Furthermore, some 500 million francs had been provided to date by the Indigenous Welfare Fund and the allocation of a like amount by the Development Fund for the Overseas Countries and Territories was anticipated.

59. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) recalling that the \$4.8 million loan agreement concluded with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Bank) had been coolly received when first presented to the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi in July 1957, asked what views, if any, the Council's members had expressed before finally approving the agreement in October 1957.

60. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that, after a representative of the Ministry of Finance had explained that the loan was being extended on favourable terms, the agreement had been approved unanimously and unconditionally by the Council. There was every reason to believe that the Council would be receptive to any future loan proposals.

61. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) asked whether the Administration had had any difficulty in obtaining labour, materials and machinery for the construction of the new port at Usumbura and the new Usumbura-Astrida-Kigali road, which were being financed largely by the Bank loan.

62. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that there had been no such difficulties, since tenders had been invited for the work. The contract had been given to the firm submitting the lowest bid and work was proceeding satisfactorily.

63. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) recalled that at its twenty-first session the Trusteeship Council had expressed the hope that the Administering Authority would be able to continue to safeguard the outlines of the ten-year plan despite increased costs and technical difficulties (A/3822, vol II, p. 48). He asked whether the Administering Authority had been successful in doing so.

64. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that the plan did not follow a rigid time-table and that some changes had been made to conform to changing conditions in the Territory; nevertheless, the work was, if anything, proceeding ahead of schedule.

65. In the matter of water supply, 20,850 public fountains had already been completed, although the entire plan called for only 20,975; on the other hand, fewer water mains would be needed than the 256 provided

for in the plan, since the needs of most of the smaller centres could be met by fountains.

66. Although the ten-year housing plan had been based on a programme of government loans and construction, the Bureau for African Housing had completed an African housing development at Usumbura at a cost of 117 million francs.

67. The programme of social services had proceeded according to plan, except to the extent that it had been thought advisable to give priority to school construction. Although some social centres had been built, priority was being given at present to social work among the indigenous population and a school for social assistants not provided for in the plan had been established.

68. The education programme had outstripped the plan. By 1958, 6,033 primary classrooms and seventeen schools for monitors had been built, although the respective figures in the plan were 3,753 and ten. On the other hand, only thirteen of the twenty-four domestic economy schools provided for in the plan had been completed by the end of 1958.

69. Annual coffee production was about 20,000 tons, although the plan called for it to reach only 15,000 by the end of the ten-year period. Indigenous forest areas were roughly at the anticipated level, but the programme for the afforestation of areas situated near inhabited places covered only 2,316 hectares instead of the 3,204 originally envisaged.

70. Although the plan called for an annual catch of only 7,500 tons of fish, the total for small fish alone had already reached 9,000.

71. Only in road-building was work lagging behind the plan. The Territory was, however, already well provided with roads, of which there were 149 metres per square kilometre. The plan to build large cross-country highways had been seriously affected by the increase in construction costs. The Belgian Congo had, however, taken over the construction of the projected "D" highway under its ten-year plan. The available appropriations had made it possible to start work on a thirty-two-kilometre stretch of the "A" highway, and the first lateral connecting road was to be financed by the Development Fund for the countries and territories of Africa.

72. The airfield at Usumbura had been built with two runways instead of the single runway originally planned.

73. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that, while his delegation welcomed the establishment of the new industries referred to by the special representative in his opening statement, it would like to know the nationality of the people who had established them, the extent to which indigenous inhabitants participated in them, the amount of capital invested in each industry, and whether the Administration assisted in their establishment by offering technical advice and assistance and giving guarantees for their future success. It would be interesting to know what those industries were expected to contribute to the economic development of the Territory and whether the Administration expected more territorial revenue from them.

74. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that industrial development was still at an early stage in Ruanda-Urundi. The new enterprises, though they were not on a large scale, would certainly make their

contribution to the development of the Territory. Indeed, the increasing consumption of industrial current at Usumbura was proof of the steady growth of industry in that town. Circumstances were not such, however, as to encourage rapid industrial development.

75. There was nothing to prevent Africans from taking part in the industrial development of the country. It was, however, mainly in the small industries that they did best. The Government did not intend to set up industries but rather to provide the basis for them in the way of electric current, roads, inexpensive means of transport and so forth. The Government had had encouraged the establishment of indigenous co-operatives, which were developing successfully, particularly in trade and agriculture.

76. He had no information on the nationality of the owners of the new enterprises. They were not, however, Africans.

77. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) stressed the need to develop industrial fishing in the Urundi waters of Lake Tanganyika and commended the Administration for having initiated measures to replace the traditional individual method of fishing by small-scale organized fishing. He would like to know how many indigenous inhabitants were employed by non-indigenous professional fishing concerns, particularly in night fishing operations in the Urundi waters of Lake Tanganyika, and what the wage rates and hours of work were. The special representative might also be able to give some details about a new system of semi-commercial fishing which had apparently been initiated by the Administration: was it organized on a co-operative basis, and where was the training centre to be?

78. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that there had been no increase in industrial fishing, which was in the hands of Europeans, because the Administration had issued no further permits, its aim being to protect the rights of the indigenous fishermen. Indigenous fishing, on the other hand, had increased considerably, thanks mainly to the equipment provided by the fisheries mission. The traditional method of individual fishing was, however, unable to compete with industrial fishing. New motorized fishing units had therefore been introduced and were at present in the testing stage. It was hoped that they would result in a substantial increase in fishing production.

79. He did not know how many indigenous inhabitants were employed in industrial fishing or the extent to which they were regarded as skilled labour. Hours of work could not in any case exceed eight hours. If the representative of Burma wanted that information, it might be possible to obtain it from Ruanda-Urundi.

80. The fisheries training centres were to be set up at Usumbura and Nyanza.

81. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that his delegation would be interested to know how many people were employed in the fishing industry.

82. He recalled that at its twenty-first session the Trusteeship Council had recommended that steps should be taken to introduce a more comprehensive system of agricultural credit for small farmers with a view to encouraging the diversification of cash crops and the growth of industry (A/3822, vol II, p. 49). He

asked whether the Administering Authority had looked into that question.

83. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that Africans could apply to the High Councils of the States for loans. In addition, a special fund for loans to the indigenous inhabitants had recently been set up. It was designed to meet the requirements of those who could not provide the necessary security to obtain bank loans. The fund was to be open to tradesmen as well as progressive farmers.

84. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) noted that the number of trading centres in which only indigenous inhabitants were allowed to carry on retail trade had increased considerably and that many indigenous traders had established themselves not in the trading centres but well inside the tribal areas. It seemed that the Administering Authority was somewhat concerned about that development. He asked whether the problem could not be solved by persuading the people concerned to organize themselves into co-operatives.

85. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that the decision must be left to the traders themselves. They had plenty of examples in the co-operatives of various kinds that were already operating in Ruanda-Urundi. While every encouragement would be given to them, the initiative in forming a co-operative must come from the people themselves.

86. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) asked if the special representative could give him some idea of the number of traders of each race.

87. Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) said that in conditions of free competition the African retail trade always tended to exceed that of non-Africans. The number of non-African businesses in the commercial centres had declined by forty-three, while the number of African businesses had increased by ninety.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.