



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fifth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 4 February 1960,
at 2.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Procedural discussion concerning postponement of the consideration of the annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration (continued)</i>	
<i>Draft resolution submitted by China and France (continued)</i>	25
<i>Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1960 (continued).</i>	27

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, 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.

Procedural discussion concerning postponement of the consideration of the annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration (continued)*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CHINA AND FRANCE (A/L.958) (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution submitted by China and France (T/L.958) deferring the consideration of the annual reports on the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration until the Council's twenty-sixth session.

2. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished to make some comments with regard to conditions in Ruanda-Urundi and with regard to the terms of reference of the forthcoming Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in East Africa. He asked when it would be possible to do so.

3. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the draft resolution had precedence over any discussion of the reports.

If it were adopted the USSR representative's observations would have to be postponed until the Council examined the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission, in which case it should be understood that they would relate to the actual examination of the terms of reference.

4. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the President's reply to his question might be interpreted as meaning that there would be restrictions in respect of the discussion of the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission. The item relating to conditions in Ruanda-Urundi and that relating to conditions in the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration appeared on the agenda of the meeting and he was prepared to speak on them immediately. If, however, the President would prefer him to speak in connexion with the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission, he would be ready to do so, on the understanding that his remarks would not be subject to any limitation. He intended to comment on political conditions in Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika and Somaliland under Italian administration and to make some observations to be considered by the Visiting Mission.

5. The PRESIDENT assured the USSR representative that he would be given every opportunity to speak during the discussion of the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission.

6. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Uruguay) said that, while he had no intention of criticizing the Administering Authorities concerned, he could not but express his regret that the Council was unable to examine the items it had placed on its agenda. His delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution, but as it had no wish to appear to be criticizing the Administering Authorities concerned it would abstain in the vote.

7. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) expressed the view that the proposal embodied in the draft resolution constituted a dangerous precedent. His delegation would therefore vote against it.

8. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) maintained that, as he had already stated at the preceding meeting, the draft resolution was contrary to rule 72, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure.

9. Moreover, the two Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons had reached a stage of development at which the Council should take all possible measures to expedite the consideration of reports from those Territories. The Bolivian draft resolution (T/L.959) concerning the terms of reference of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa directed the Mission "to give attention, as may be appropriate in the light of discussions in the Trusteeship Council and in the General Assembly and of resolutions adopted by them,

* Resumed from the 1047th meeting.

to issues in connexion with the annual reports on the administration of the Trust Territories concerned". The fact was, however, that the latest reports on Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons had not been considered either by the Trusteeship Council or by the General Assembly. In view of those considerations, his delegation would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution submitted by China and France (T/L.958).

10. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said he was somewhat puzzled by the fears that had been expressed that the adoption of the draft resolution in question might establish a precedent. In his view, a precedent in the sense which no doubt was meant was created only when there was a departure from established practice or from the rules of procedure. He did not consider that that applied to the case in point, since under rule 10 the Council could revise its agenda and defer or delete items.

11. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) pointed out that, even if the delegations of China and France had not submitted their draft resolution (T/L.958), the Council would have been unable to examine the annual reports on the two Trust Territories in question in the absence of special representatives. The point at issue was one not of procedure but of fact. If no draft resolution had been submitted the President would have been obliged to adjourn the debate. The draft resolution merely recognized the existence of a situation which could be dealt with by the President. He therefore felt that there was no need to vote on it.

12. Mr. KIANG (China), replying to the representative of the United Arab Republic, contended that the draft resolution would not establish a precedent. The Council had more than once postponed consideration of an item, either under rule 10 or by suspending rule 72.

13. The items had been on the agenda for a number of days but no progress had been made because none of the members of the Council had been prepared to embark upon a detailed discussion. The French and Chinese delegations had merely desired to help the Council; if the general sentiment was that the items should be discussed, those delegations might consider withdrawing the draft resolution.

14. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that he was in general agreement with the representative of Bolivia. The question was essentially a practical one. The most important consideration was that the Trusteeship Council should present to the General Assembly at its fifteenth session the fullest and most comprehensive report that it could on conditions in the two Trust Territories concerned. His delegation felt that the best way to achieve that end would be to defer consideration until the twenty-sixth session.

15. With reference to the wording of the draft resolution (T/L.958), he pointed out that his delegation had not "requested" such a deferment but had made a suggestion which it considered to be in the best interests of the Council. Subject to that reservation, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, since it seemed to offer the best way of reaching a conclusion in the matter.

16. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the opinions expressed by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and

India. In his view, the draft resolution was contrary to the rules of procedure and would create a most unfortunate precedent. The Trusteeship Council had been confronted with a "fait accompli" by the two Administering Authorities concerned. No special representative either from Ruanda-Urundi or from the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration was available and the delegations of the Administering Authorities had not given the Council any supplementary information concerning conditions in those Territories. The Belgian representative had made only a brief statement (1046th meeting) concerning one of the provisional decrees; the United Kingdom representative had made no statement whatever.

17. The request for postponement of the discussion would more properly have come from the Belgian and United Kingdom delegations. As it stood, the draft resolution was an attempt to disguise the fact that the difficult situation in which the Council was placed was entirely due to the attitude of the Administering Authorities.

18. For all those reasons, he would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution the provisions of which were quite contrary to the rules of procedure of the Council.

19. Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) emphasized that at the Council's twenty-fourth session, the special representative for Ruanda-Urundi had given the Council complete information about developments in the Territory in 1958 (979th meeting).

20. In not providing a special representative at the present session, his delegation had had no wish to create a precedent; its action had been based on the fact that it had not been the Council's practice to give full consideration to a report immediately before the dispatch of a Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory concerned.

21. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) stressed that whether or not the draft resolution (T/L.958) was adopted the consideration of the two items in question would have to be deferred for the simple reason that it would be impossible to deal with them satisfactorily in the absence of special representatives. He therefore formally proposed that there should be no vote on the draft resolution.

22. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether, if the Bolivian proposal were adopted, the examination of conditions in Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration would be maintained on the agenda. If that was the case, he was prepared to proceed immediately to putting questions concerning the reports on Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration.

23. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that it would be difficult to vote on the Bolivian proposal until it was clear what the consequences of adopting it would be. He asked whether the Bolivian representative would make a more explicit proposal to the effect that the Council should not vote on the draft resolution but should resume its consideration of the two items at its twenty-sixth session.

24. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) pointed out that if he were to accept that suggestion, his proposal would be substantially the same as that embodied in the draft

resolution submitted by China and France. That had not been his intention.

25. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) stated that his delegation and that of China had originally intended to refer in the draft resolution to rule 72, paragraph 2, but that the delegation of a non-Administering Member had pointed out to them that it would be more logical to refer to rule 10. The sponsors had fallen in with that suggestion.

26. He did not consider that the adoption of that text would establish a precedent. Experience had shown that it was impossible for the Trusteeship Council to give thorough examination to an annual report in the absence of a special representative from the Territory concerned.

27. The Visiting Mission's report would be available in May, perhaps even in April 1960, and the Council could then give full consideration to conditions in Ruanda-Urundi. Moreover a special representative from the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration would be present at that time. In the light of those facts there was no point in discussing conditions in those two Territories at the present session.

28. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his delegation was prepared to proceed immediately with the examination of the reports on Ruanda-Urundi and on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. He submitted that under rule 72 of the rules of procedure the Council was under an obligation to consider the reports without delay. He recalled that the decision to consider the reports on Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons at the twenty-fifth session had been taken in the presence of and with the concurrence of the Belgian and the United Kingdom representatives. Nevertheless those two delegations now informed the Council that special representatives from the Territories would not be available at the current session. That being so, the delegations in question should at least co-operate with the Council in the examination of the reports and his delegation deplored the fact that they were unwilling to do so.

29. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) entirely agreed with the Bolivian representative's assessment of the facts confronting the Council. Unfortunately there seemed to be a certain disagreement about the action called for in view of those facts. He thought the draft resolution under discussion (T/L.958) met the case adequately and suggested that a vote should be taken on it without further delay.

30. In reply to a question from Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that the intention of his proposal—that the draft resolution submitted by China and France should not be put to the vote—was that the entire question should be postponed to the twenty-sixth session of the Council.

31. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) observed that the fact that little progress was being made was an indication that the question involved important issues which should be carefully considered. He therefore proposed that a small committee should be set up to consider the question and advise the Council on the action it should take.

32. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said he did not feel that the setting up of a committee would serve any useful purpose. The views of all members of the

Council had been made clear and he thought a decision could now be taken whether the annual reports on Ruanda-Urundi and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration should be examined at the current session or postponed to the twenty-sixth session.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should be suspended for a short time in order to enable members to confer with a view to reaching a decision.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.

34. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) withdrew his proposal and said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by China and France (T/L.958).

35. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he too withdrew his proposal. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution in question, since that draft conflicted with the rules of procedure.

36. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by China and France (T/L.958).

At the request of the Indian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Burma, India.

Abstaining: Paraguay, Bolivia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

37. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) explained that his delegation's vote in favour of the resolution did not mean that it wished a precedent to be established. The United States delegation usually favoured the consideration of items as they arose and on the present occasion had been guided by the unusual circumstances.

Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1960 (T/L.959) (continued)*

[Agenda item 6]

38. The PRESIDENT read out the names of representatives designated by their governments as members of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1960.

The Council confirmed the nominations of Mr. P. K. Edmonds (New Zealand), Mr. Miguel Solano López (Paraguay), Mr. Omar Loutfi (United Arab Republic) and Mr. Mason Sears (United States of America) as members of the Visiting Mission.

39. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) nominated Mr. Sears (United States of America) for the office of Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. Sears (United States of America) was elected Chairman of the Visiting Missions by acclamation.

* Resumed from the 1047th meeting.

40. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), introducing his delegation's draft resolution (T/L.959) on the terms of reference of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, said that it followed the general pattern of similar resolutions adopted at previous sessions but included also a reference to two resolutions recently adopted by the General Assembly, one on the attainment of self-government or independence (resolution 1413 (XIV)) and the other on plans of political reforms for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (resolution 1419 (XIV)). After discussing the matter with other delegations, the Bolivian delegation had decided not to provide in its draft resolution for a visit to the Trust Territory of Somaliland because that Territory was soon to achieve independence. The visit would therefore be confined to the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika.

41. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that he appreciated the Bolivian delegation's reason for not including Somaliland among the Trust Territories to be visited by the Visiting Mission.

42. He wondered whether the Bolivian representative would be willing to include also, in the resolutions mentioned in paragraph 1 of his draft a reference to General Assembly resolution 1412 (XIV) on the preparation and training of indigenous civil cadres in the Trust Territories. That resolution was particularly relevant in the case of Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika which would attain their independence in the near future.

43. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) agreed to do so.

44. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) felt that the Visiting Mission should be instructed to visit Somaliland, since the Trust Territory would not achieve independence until 1 July 1960. A brief courtesy visit for the purpose of meeting Government leaders would give the Visiting Mission an opportunity to see how the Territory was preparing for independence.

45. With regard to the wording of the draft, he suggested that the words "and in the observations of the Administering Authorities on these reports" at the end of operative paragraph 2 should be deleted. The Trusteeship Council normally paid due heed to the observations of the Administering Authorities; it was therefore unnecessary to ask the Visiting Mission to do so.

46. He asked the Bolivian representative to explain the meaning of the phrase "to receive petitions without prejudice to its acting in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council" in paragraph 4. He thought it would be better if that phrase was deleted.

47. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that the phrase at the end of operative paragraph 2 was not intended to restrict the Visiting Mission's freedom of action. It was customary for visiting missions to take into account the historical background of conditions in the Trust Territories they visited, including the views of the Administering Authorities. He preferred therefore to retain the words in question.

48. The purpose of the phrase in operative paragraph 4 was to ensure that petitions received by the Visiting Mission might be submitted also to the Trusteeship Council. It was intended to reflect rule 84,

paragraph 2, of the Trusteeship Council's rules of procedure. If the sense of that rule was still maintained without that phrase, he would have no objection to its deletion.

49. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, the phrase would be deleted.

It was so decided.

50. Mr. TORNETTA (Italy) said that his delegation doubted the advisability of including Somalia in the itinerary of the Visiting Mission to East Africa. Both the Somali Government and the Italian administration were very much absorbed in the task of preparing the country for the final important steps before independence and consequently the necessary preparations for giving adequate assistance to the Visiting Mission would obviously distract the Government and Parliament of Somalia from the planned activities, for which the time was running very short.

51. Moreover, the Government of Somalia had made known to the Italian administration its perplexity in case Somalia should be included among the Territories to be visited by the Visiting Mission to East Africa.

52. A ceremonial visit of the type mentioned by the representative of India would hardly be in keeping with the proposed terms of reference for the Visiting Mission. A more suitable occasion for a visit of that kind would be the forthcoming celebration of the Territory's independence, to which the Somali Government would certainly welcome representatives of the Council.

53. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while his delegation had originally felt that Somaliland should be included in the itinerary of the Visiting Mission it would no longer insist in view of the explanations given by the representative of Italy and, more particularly, the position taken by the Somali Government. If the Government of Somalia felt that the presence of the Visiting Mission would hinder the preparations for independence, then the Trusteeship Council should take that seriously into account.

54. The measures adopted in the case of Somaliland might be applied by the Council to Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika too, particularly with regard to preparation for independence. In the case of Ruanda-Urundi, for instance, it was the duty of the Trusteeship Council to speed up the political progress of that Territory. A definite target date should be set for the achievement of independence by Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Government might well consider drafting a detailed programme of preparation for independence, as it had done for the Belgian Congo. In that connexion the Trusteeship Council should urge the Visiting Mission to pay special attention to the basic problem in Ruanda-Urundi, the Territory's accession to independence on the earliest possible date.

55. The reforms introduced by the Belgian Government in Ruanda-Urundi were defective in many respects. They consisted of inadequate concessions and half-measures which failed to provide for the most important objectives, namely accession to independence, a broad democratization of public life and the establishment of administrative organs on a democratic basis. No target date for independence had been set, nor was provision made for universal suffrage. Women would not be allowed to vote in the first

elections to be held. The Chiefs would not be elected by universal suffrage but would be subject to the approval of the Resident. The powers of the "Mwami" would be retained. In short, the feudal structure of society in the Trust Territory would be maintained. The programme of reforms did not provide for effective measures to ensure the unity of Ruanda-Urundi. On the contrary, provision was made for separate representation for Ruanda and for Urundi. The conflict between the Batutsi and the Bahutu should be viewed as a political and social struggle and should be looked into carefully by the Visiting Mission in order to help the Council to solve the basic political problems in the Trust Territory. The United Nations should support the wish expressed by all political parties that democratic reforms should be instituted as soon as possible to ensure a transition from the feudal system to a system based on organs elected by universal suffrage. Both the Visiting Mission and the Council should seriously consider the question of providing internal autonomy for Ruanda-Urundi in 1960 and independence in 1961-1962 as requested by the people of the Trust Territory.

56. With respect to Tanganyika, the Visiting Mission should be guided by the provision in General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV) concerning the establishment of a definite target date for the earliest possible accession of that Territory to independence and specific reference should be made to it in the Bolivian draft resolution. The main political parties of the Trust Territory had asked that internal autonomy should be granted in 1960 and independence within another year or two. The request should be given serious consideration.

57. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he had not included Somaliland in the itinerary of the Visiting Mission because the Secretariat had informed him that the Visiting Mission's report could not be ready for consideration by the Trusteeship Council before the Territory's attainment of independence on 1 July 1960. That being so, it had seemed that no useful purpose could be served by including the Territory in the Mission's itinerary.

58. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the only reason adduced for the exclusion of Somaliland from the Visiting Mission's itinerary had been a recommendation by the Secretariat, his delegation would have been compelled to oppose the draft resolution, since it considered that the Secretariat should not express views regarding the appropriateness of including any Territory in a Visiting Mission's itinerary. Other reasons for the exclusion of Somaliland had, however, been put forward and those were the ones which had influenced the position taken by his and other delegations.

59. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that the Secretariat had made no recommendation in the matter; it had merely provided him, at his request, with information on the time factor involved and it was on that information that he had based his decision not to include Somaliland in the itinerary of the Visiting Mission as set out in the draft resolution.

60. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) thanked the Bolivian representative for his explanation, which had cleared up what appeared to

be a misunderstanding of the part the Secretariat had played in connexion with the draft resolution. He hoped that it was now clear that the Secretariat had made no suggestion with regard to the text of the draft resolution, but had merely given the Bolivian representative some information of a technical nature which he had requested.

61. Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) asked whether the words "special investigation" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution meant an additional investigation, which would call for a separate report, or merely a thorough investigation.

62. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he meant a careful, detailed investigation of the conditions and causes of the recent disturbances in Ruanda-Urundi.

63. Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) suggested that in that case the word "special" should be replaced by "detailed" or "thorough".

64. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the word "special" had probably been used because the General Assembly had adopted a special resolution on the matter in question. It would therefore be better to retain that word.

65. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he saw no substantial difference in meaning between the words "detailed", "thorough" and "special", any one of them seemed acceptable to him.

66. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) considered that the word "special" was appropriate and should be retained since it defined more specifically the general terms of reference laid down for the Visiting Mission in operative paragraph 1.

67. Mr. KIANG (China) said he did not think that the retention or deletion of the word "special" would make any difference since in any case the intention of the draft resolution was to implement the General Assembly's recommendation that the Visiting Mission should report to the Council on the conditions and causes of the recent disturbances in Ruanda-Urundi.

68. The PRESIDENT said it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that the word "special" should be retained. If there were no objections, that would be done.

It was so decided.

69. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked for a separate vote on the words "and in the observations of the Administering Authorities on these reports" at the end of paragraph 2. He was aware that the phrase had been used in previous resolutions but he considered it highly inappropriate in the present context. The Council should not bind its Mission to the views expressed by certain Administering Authorities.

70. Mr. KIANG (China) considered that operative paragraph 2 merely directed the Visiting Mission to give attention to the observations of the Administering Authorities and in no way bound the Mission to them. The phrase in question was a standard one which had been used in Council resolution 1714 (XX) adopted in 1957; he did not think its deletion was necessary.

71. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the words "and in the observations of the Administering Authorities on these reports".

The words were adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

72. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Bolivia (A/L.959), as amended.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.