

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.968
3 June 1959

ENGLISH

Twenty-fourth Session

VERBODEN RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 3 June 1959, at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. DORSINVILLE

(Haiti)

1. Examination of petitions: 233rd report of the Standing Committee on Petitions [4]
2. Review of procedure regarding petitions [9]
3. Attainment of self-government or independence by Trust Territories [11]
4. Effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories [12]
5. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa [36, 5]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.968 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 4

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS: 233rd REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(T/L.910)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): This report concerns the classification of petitions and communications addressed to the Trusteeship Council. I shall now call upon the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions to introduce the report.

Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions): I have pleasure in introducing to the Council document T/L.910 which contains the 233rd report of the Standing Committee on Petitions. This report deals only with the eighteenth and nineteenth reports of the Committee on Classification of Communications which were adopted by the Standing Committee on Petitions. It contains the classification which has been given to the various communications which were before the Standing Committee on Petitions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Are there any comments with regard to this report?

Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the discussion of the 233rd report of the Standing Committee on Petitions, the Soviet delegation took a certain position in the Committee in respect of the classification of a number of petitions.

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

I shall first deal with the petition contained in document T/PET.2/L.12, pertaining to Tanganyika.

In this petition, the President of the African National Congress, Mr. Mtemvu, addresses two requests to the Trusteeship Council. The first is that, during this session, the Council should discuss the memorandum annexed to the petition; and the second is that the Council should consider the question of establishing in Tanganyika an advisory council similar to the one for Somaliland. These two requests clearly are of a specific character. Therefore, the Soviet Union delegation proposed in the Standing Committee on Petitions -- and now proposes to the Trusteeship Council -- that this petition should be classified in accordance with rule 85, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure. If the petition were so classified, the Administering Authority would submit its written observations to the Council, which could then give the necessary serious attention to the substance of the requests; this would be done first in the Standing Committee and then in the Council itself.

In this same connexion, the Soviet Union delegation proposes that the petitions contained in documents T/COM.2/L.51/Add.1 and T/COM.2/L.151 should be classified in accordance with rule 85, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure.

Document T/COM.2/L.51/Add.1 has already been considered by the Standing Committee on Petitions and the Trusteeship Council. The decision was taken to draw the petitioner's attention to the Administering Authority's observations. The Administering Authority, in answering the petitioner's complaint regarding his difficult situation, said that the petitioner's situation was satisfactory and that he would be receiving assistance from the indigenous authorities. The communication refutes this assertion by the Administering Authority. The petitioner states that his conditions are very difficult; he suffers constantly from starvation, as does his family. He asks that the Trusteeship Council should come to his assistance and ask the Administering Authority to assist him. The petitioner has attached a number of documents to his petition. These documents could not be considered by the Committee on Classification of Communications because that Committee does not deal with the substance of petitions. The Soviet Union delegation therefore feels that the request in this petition is of a specific character, that new information has been presented which was not previously available, and that the petition should be considered under rule 85, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure.

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

I now turn to the petition contained in document T/COM.2/L.52. In this petition, the President of the African National Congress gives certain specific facts which show that the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory is not devoting enough attention to seeing to it that the local Press publicizes, in an objective way, the activities of the Trusteeship Council, not merely highlighting the statements made by representatives of the Administering Authority to the Council and the Assembly; the petitioner states that the Press should also carry stories on the statements of members of what he calls the anti-colonial groups. The Soviet Union delegation therefore considers that this petition is also of a specific character. It does not deal only with the general situation in Tanganyika.

Moreover, the petition contains a statement of the representative of the Administering Authority which, we feel, is designed to undermine the authority of delegations of Non-Self-Governing Territories. I am referring particularly to an interview given by Mr. Fletcher-Cooke to the Tanganyika Standard. The Soviet delegation feels that this petition should be considered under rule 85, paragraph 1.

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

I now wish to refer to a petition pertaining to Ruanda-Urundi. I have in mind the document classified as T/COM.3/L.25. My delegation considers that this petition does not pertain to rule 24, the rule under which it was classified, and we propose that this petition also should be considered under rule 85, paragraph 2.

I now pass on to petitions pertaining to the Cameroons under British administration. In petition T/PET.4/L.17, the specific question is raised of utilizing £20,000 sterling in order to hold a referendum in the Cameroons. The petitioner is concerned that this money might be used to bribe participants in the referendum in order to bring about the annexation of the Cameroons to Nigeria. I have spoken of one petition, but in reality there are several petitions. The petitioners complain of the influence exercised by the Administering Authority in order to bring about, as I have just said, the union of the Cameroons and Nigeria by making use of radio broadcasts for propaganda purposes.

One of the petitions raises the question that the authorities, in order to influence the population so that the referendum will serve their interests, are arresting the leaders of certain political parties in the Cameroons.

All these facts that are adduced are concrete facts and, consequently, my delegation proposes that these petitions should be classified in accordance with rule 85, paragraph 1 of the rules of procedure.

The petition contained in document T/COM.4/L.40 also, unquestionably, has a specific character, and we should like to have that petition also classified among those that are included under rule 85, paragraph 1. The Soviet delegation considers that the inclusion of these petitions under rule 85, paragraph 1, would mean that the Administering Authority would submit to us the pertinent written observations on these petitions, and then the Trusteeship Council would be able to consider them in a proper and serious manner.

I now go on to the petitions concerning the Cameroons under French administration. Petition T/PET.5/L.467 is listed under petitions raising general problems, but it touches upon very specific questions. The petition contains a request from two of the major trade unions that the Cameroons should be given funds in order to build railways in certain areas, and also that the railways of the Cameroons should become the property of the Cameroonian State. This question has an entirely specific and definite character, and, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, it should be considered in accordance with rule 85, paragraph 1.

Furthermore, in document T/COM.5/L.234 there are a number of petitions, and these petitions speak of plundering by the police in the territory and also by the indigenous administration; that is, both the police and the indigenous administration intrude upon the premises of the indigenous population and plunder them. This document has been classified by the Committee as not acceptable under rule 81. However, the Soviet delegation considers that the classification the Committee made is entirely unjustified. When a question of robbery or plundering perpetrated by one group of the population on another is brought up, then that is a question for the local courts. When the crime concerned is murder or homicide, then that is a question for the criminal court. However, when the Administration is involved or the police force which acts under the Administering Authority and the indigenous authority -- for which the Administering Authority is responsible -- then that is a matter for us, the Trusteeship Council, not the courts.

Moreover, a number of these petitions state that such acts were committed for political reasons. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation feels that document T/COM.5/L.234 should also be classified under rule 85, paragraph 1.

I now wish to take up the petitions relating to Togoland under French administration.

In petition T/PET.7/L.49, the petitioner speaks of a specific case where troops were sent to Togoland. He says that the Administering Authority is sending sizeable contingents of armed forces to Togoland. The Soviet delegation considers that this fact is specific in character since we know from the statement of the Administering Authority that everything is going well in Togoland, that there is no need for any military action by the Administering Authority. Since we have been told this, we must ask the reason why sizeable contingents of troops have been sent there. This petition cannot be considered as coming under the petitions relating to general problems since it speaks not of just one soldier but of a large contingent of soldiers. There is a fundamental difference.

These are the observations I wish to make. I should like to have the Trusteeship Council take them into account when the Council takes up the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If there are no further comments, I would invite the Council to take a decision with regard to the various proposals which have been submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has made comments concerning paragraph 4 of document T/L.910, which enumerates the actions taken in the Standing Committee on Petitions. If there is no objection, I should like to take each of these proposals in the order in which they are found in document T/L.910. The Soviet Union did begin with Tanganyika; it made comments with regard to the various other Territories; but, as I have said, it made comments on all the proposals contained in the document. Therefore, if there is no objection, I shall put to the vote the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union as contained in paragraph 4 of document T/L.910.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to documents T/PET.4/L.16 and T/PET.4/L.17 was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/PET.5/L.467 was rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/PET.7/L.49 was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/COM.2/L.51/Add.1 was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/COM.2/L.52 was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/COM.3/L.25 was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/COM.4/L.40 was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/COM.5/L.234 was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The Soviet Union proposal with regard to document T/PET.2/L.12 was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I would like to explain the vote of the delegation of India on this last proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union, concerning the petition in T/PET.2/L.12. The proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union raises many complex issues, and my delegation felt that we could not support it, as the question is one where the competence of the Trusteeship Council is involved and there is also a question of the propriety of procedures to be adopted or recommended by this Council at this stage, ten or twelve years after the Trusteeship Agreement in respect of the Territory concerned was concluded.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

The petitioner makes a request, which is that the Trusteeship Council should consider the stationing of a United Nations advisory committee in Tanganyika. The proposal was that this petition should be taken up under rule 85, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the Council. Rule 85, paragraph 1, is intended to deal with petitions which contain requests, complaints and grievances seeking action by the Trusteeship Council.

Truly enough, this petition contains a request, but the request is not of a nature that calls for or can seek or get from the Council action of a specific nature. We felt, therefore, that this should appropriately come under paragraph 2 of rule 85, which is required to deal with petitions raising general questions.

The question really is this, that the agreement concerning this Territory of Tanganyika was concluded several years ago. The agreement was authorized by the General Assembly itself and not by the Trusteeship Council. Naturally, therefore, the Assembly at that time would have considered the desirability or the advisability of establishing an advisory committee in respect of this Trust Territory of Tanganyika as it did in the case of Somaliland, for example, under Italian administration. We felt, therefore, that any recommendation by the Trusteeship Council at this stage to reopen a question which, so far as the General Assembly is concerned, is settled in the shape of the agreement that exists, would not be very desirable or very proper on the part of this Council, and so we voted against the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If no one wishes to speak, the Council will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Committee on Petitions in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report contained in document T/L.910.

The recommendations were adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 9

REVIEW OF PROCEDURE REGARDING PETITIONS (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1713 (XX))

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): It will be recalled that at the twentieth session, during which the Council was seized of a considerable number of communications, it was decided to modify the procedure which had been followed before in classifying petitions and communications. By resolution 1713 (XX) of 8 July 1957 it was decided, as a temporary measure, subject to review at the end of a year, to establish a committee of two members to determine the provisional classification of all communications received. The membership and the working rules would be defined by the Council in an annex to the resolution. One year later, in July 1958, the Council considered this matter again and decided to maintain for one more year the procedure envisaged in resolution 1713 (XX). In accordance with that decision, the procedure relating to petitions was placed upon the agenda of the present session of the Council.

I now invite Council members to submit their observations with regard to this matter.

Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to make some brief observations concerning the existing procedure regarding petitions.

At its twentieth session the Trusteeship Council adopted resolution 1713 (XX) concerning a provisional procedure for the publishing of petitions and the establishment of a committee on the classification of petitions, the situation being that the Secretariat and the Standing Committee on Petitions were unable to consider and classify the petitions properly because of the great number coming from the Cameroons under French administration. The Soviet delegation was in principle against the recommendation of the Committee on Procedure and voted in favour of a Syrian draft resolution to introduce a temporary procedure. That draft resolution contained no provision which would have confirmed the proposals of the Committee on Procedure. In taking this position, the Soviet delegation acted on the assumption that the procedure for considering petitions, based on the rules of procedure of the Council, was satisfactory in principle. The

same conclusion, as is well known, was reached by the Committee on Procedure. As regards the difficulties which were involved in dealing with the numerous petitions coming from -- and, incidentally, they continue to come -- the Cameroons under French administration, this circumstance was a departure from the general rule and it was due to measures taken by the French authorities, which were a violation of the rules of procedure and which did not submit the observations of the Administering Authority at the proper time; neither did they make available the special representative when he should have been available. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation, in an effort to resolve the difficulties which had arisen, made a specific proposal, namely, that the Council should dispatch to the Cameroons under French administration a committee to consider the petitions on the spot. Unfortunately, the Council did not go along with this proposal.

As regards the new procedure, the Soviet delegation felt that the creation of a committee on classification -- that is, an additional subsidiary body -- would not simplify, but would rather complicate the procedure of the publication of petitions which are received in vast numbers and, in respect to the general situation on specific events in the Territory, would lead to the neglect of the rights of the petitioners which are guaranteed by the Charter. It would also lead to a refusal in practice by the Council to give serious and thorough consideration to the petitions.

Experience has shown how right the position of the Soviet Union was. The new procedure has altered to a large extent the former one concerning the handling of petitions under the rules of procedure. The Committee on Petitions, following the new procedure for two years, has eliminated from the category of petitions which called for consideration a thousand different communications from various Territories.

At the twenty-first and twenty-second sessions of the Council the Soviet delegation pointed out that, as a result of the new procedure, approximately a thousand petitions were buried, petitions in which the indigenous inhabitants of the Cameroons under French administration were protesting against mass repression carried out by the Administering Authority against the indigenous population. Instead of considering these petitions thoroughly and making recommendations to the Administering Authority, the Council availed itself of the inappropriate resolution regarding procedure and decided not to consider these petitions.

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

Thus, the temporary procedure is used in order to prevent the consideration of important and urgent petitions containing requests and complaints from the population of Trust Territories. As experienced has shown, the Committee on the Classification of Communications very often classifies petitions as communications, and does so under rule 24. As can be seen from the annex to the provisional agenda, and as was noted by the Soviet Union delegation at the last meeting, some petitions are not even included in the Agenda and are therefore not studied as to their substance either in the Petitions Committee or in the Council, although the procedure of the Council does not exclude this. The Petitions Committee is one in which the Administering Authorities still have a mechanical majority and it therefore often pigeonholes petitions, which suits the Administering Authorities.

When the classification of petitions is undertaken under paragraph 2 of rule 85, in accordance with the new procedure, a situation arises in which a great number of petitions are classified as petitions on general questions and a great number of such petitions are merged in one single document. As a result of this, the Administering Authority can refrain from submitting oral or written observations on them or can simply give very general replies covering a great number of petitions. Usually, the Administering Authority simply refrains from making observations on the petitions, thanks to the existing mechanical majority in the Committee and in the Council. As a result the recommendations of the Petitions Committee are usually approved and no detailed consideration is given to certain petitions.

In regard to paragraph 1 of rule 85, the Petitions Committee usually classifies under this paragraph detailed petitions dealing with specific matters which are not of very great significance. We should note that the Petitions Committee does not even consider these petitions in the proper manner, as can be seen from a great number of the Trusteeship Council's resolutions in which the attention of the petitioner is drawn to the observations of the Administering Authority. Also, many petitions dealing with specific incidents are classified arbitrarily, with the approval of the Petitions Committee, as petitions on general questions or as communications. It is legitimate to ask the question, has the new procedure really solved the problem of petitions? To this question my delegation gives a negative reply. This is proved by the great number of petitions

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

from both British and French Cameroons which have not yet been dealt with by the Petitions Committee. There are, for instance, more than 700 coming from the French Cameroons. The Petitions Committee should consider these petitions, many of which relate to events which took place in 1957. Surely enough time has now elapsed for their consideration.

At the same time, I wish to note that the Petitions Committee was not in session during the period between the sessions of the Trusteeship Council. What is the reason for this delay in considering these petitions? The reason is not that the procedure is not suitable, but that the Administering Authorities are not taking seriously their obligations under the Trusteeship Agreements and the Charter. The consideration of petitions is being disrupted by the Administering Authorities, which on various pretexts refuse to send special representatives to the Petitions Committee or to the Council. No written observations are being submitted by the Administering Authorities of the French Cameroons. My delegation is inclined to believe that the French Administering Authority intends to bury all these many petitions, but as is well known the Cameroons under French administration will reach self-government on 1 November 1960 and will no longer be under the Trusteeship System, so that the Trusteeship Council ought to consider those petitions now. The Soviet Union delegation and other delegations do not wish to assume the responsibility, in the eyes of the people of the Cameroons and of world public opinion, for the indifferent attitude of the French Administering Authority towards these petitions. My delegation presses for a serious and just consideration of all old and new petitions relating to the Cameroons and to all other territories.

The Soviet Union delegation acts in accordance with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and strives for the publication and further consideration of all petitions, both by the Petitions Committee and by the Trusteeship Council. The consideration of petitions on general questions is a separate item on the agenda of the Trusteeship Council which should be taken up and dealt with before the Council prepares its reports relating to the annual reports of the Administering Authorities. We must have decisions on all petitions. In regard

(Mr. Antonov, USSR)

to the great number of petitions which have not yet been considered and to the many which are still coming in, my delegation is ready to make all efforts to deal with them during the current session. The Soviet Union delegation considers that the provisional procedure which was established mainly for the purpose of considering petitions relating to the Cameroons has led to a waste of time and we suggest that it should not longer be followed.

Mr. KOSZCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): Did the representative of the Soviet Union make an actual proposal to change the procedure which is at present in force?

Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation makes the specific proposal that we should revert to the earlier procedure by putting an end to the procedure which was temporarily introduced.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The proposal of the Soviet Union delegation that the Council should revert to its original procedure concerning the classification of petitions is now before the Council for discussion.

MR. CASTON (United Kingdom): I have only two brief comments on the procedure which is at present in operation for the consideration of petitions.

The essence of this procedure lies in the establishment of a committee of two members charged with the task of provisionally classifying the communications which come in in the course of a year to the Secretariat relating to Trust Territories. This task of classification, if it were not done by the Committee on Classification of Communications, would be done by the Standing Committee on Petitions itself. This is the original procedure to which we are being asked to revert.

It seems to my delegation that the Committee on Classification, since it was first established, has done very useful, practical work. In a great majority of cases, the provisional classification which the Committee suggests is one which is suggested unanimously by its two members. In almost every case, this provisional classification has been accepted by the Standing Committee on Petitions and subsequently by the Trusteeship Council. The effect, therefore, of the existence of the Committee on Classification of Communications has been to take away from the Standing Committee on Petitions a heavy load of work in classifying communications which otherwise the Standing Committee would have had to do itself and which would, to some extent, have detracted from its main responsibility, which is to examine those communications which are classified as petitions. It is also, as is quite clear from the report which we have just considered and adopted in the Council, at liberty to review the classifications suggested by the Committee on Classification of Communications.

There is one other effect which the existence of the Committee on Classification has had. Not only has it eased the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions itself, but it has also expedited for the petitioners the examination of their petitions. It has done this because, being a committee of two, it is much easier to convene the Committee at times between sessions as the flow of communications requires. I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Classification myself, and I know that we are able to get through a great deal of work at meetings convened as the occasion demands in an afternoon when it might have been very difficult for all six members of the Standing Committee on Petitions to be assembled. In this way, it has been possible for the

provisional classification to be done promptly and frequently and for the documents concerned to be circulated in very good time.

For these reasons, my delegation would be in favour of the continuation for as long as the flow of communications makes this necessary of the Committee on the Classification of Communications which was set up under resolution 1713 (XX) of the Council. I do not believe that the reasons given with regard to the continuation of the work of this Committee involve in anyway the questions of principle which trouble the representative of the Soviet Union. This Committee does a procedural, a practical job, and it does it in a way which in most cases eases the work of all of us and expedites the examination of petitions. If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes in particular cases to question the judgement of the Committee on Classification, he is of course perfectly free to do so in the Standing Committee on Petitions and again in the Trusteeship Council. We have seen that indeed he does take advantage of the opportunity which he has of doing so.

MR. GERIG (United States of America): I think we all agree that one of the most difficult tasks which the Council has ever had before it during its existence is the question of dealing expeditiously and efficiently with petitions. I believe it was on the initiative of my delegation several years ago that an attempt was made to rationalize the procedure in such a way that we could accomplish the handling of these petitions in a manner more satisfactory to everyone.

We have followed the new procedure with a great deal of interest and we have also come to the conclusion that this new method of dealing with petitions by setting up a small Committee on Classification is one that really should be continued; that if we were to abandon it, we might very likely revert to the position of accumulation of petitions in such a manner that the work might very well break down altogether.

For these reasons, my delegation ~~supports the continuation of the Committee on Classification and hopes that it will be continued.~~

MR. RASGOTRA (India): Mr. President, you will have observed that 285 petitions are listed for examination at the current session of the Trusteeship Council. Before I express my delegation's view on this question of the continuation of the present procedures, I would like to ask, through you, the Council's Secretary whether he can tell us the number of petitions which still remain unexamined and are not on the agenda of the present session and also whether he can give us some approximate figure of the petitions that have come in recently, say in the last month or six weeks. What I wish to determine is the volume of the flow of petitions because our consideration of this whole issue will have to be determined in the light of that volume and in the light of the volume of the work which still remains to be done.

The SECRETARY: Except for a few petitions to which the normal time-limit of two months still applies, all other petitions are now on the agenda of the Council.

MR. RASGOTRA (India): There is one part of my question which has not been answered -- whether an indication can be given by the Council's Secretary as to the flow of petitions in the last two or three months in terms of the number of petitions that have been coming to the Secretary-General.

The SECRETARY: In the last few months, that is, roughly from the beginning of the year until now, the Secretariat has received and brought to the attention of the Committee on Classification of Communications approximately 500 petitions. I would now add that there remain, as of the present, thirty-eight petitions which have as yet not been put to the Committee on Classification of Communications.

Mr. RASGOPIRA (India): I wish to thank the Council Secretary for the information he has given us. In the light of the figures which have been furnished to the Council, it seems to my delegation that perhaps the time has not yet arrived for us to decide on the discontinuation of the procedure which the Council adopted on the basis of a report furnished to the Council by a Committee under your wise and able Chairmanship, Mr. President. That was in 1957.

I think that the representative of the Soviet Union has a point when he says that this procedure was adopted by the Council in special circumstances, to meet a special emergency. But judging from the rate at which petitions have been forthcoming from at least some of the Territories, it seems to my delegation that perhaps it would not be very wise for us, at this stage, to abandon these procedures hastily. We do not know that the flow of petitions is going to diminish considerably in the next six months or in the next year. After its present session, this Council will meet toward the end of January of next year. Between now and then there may be another 900 or 1,000 petitions. If that is going to be the case, then by the termination of present procedures, what we will be doing is to revert the responsibility for classifying petitions to the Secretariat.

If the flow of petitions is going to be large, it seems to us that that in itself would be a very unsatisfactory procedure. After all, many of these petitions, as the representative of the Soviet Union himself pointed out, are very important petitions. They are very controversial; they are contentious. Is it right for the Council, at this stage, to throw the responsibility for classifying those petitions -- and they have to be classified -- on the Secretariat, rather than on a Committee of the Council the membership of which is evenly divided between the Administering and non-Administering Powers on the Council?

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

The representative of the Soviet Union raised another very valid point, namely that in respect of a large number of petitions, it has not been possible for the Standing Committee on Petitions or for this Council to take action, due largely to the fact that full co-operation on the part of certain Administering Authorities has not been forthcoming. That, as I say, is a valid point. But the Committee on Classification of Communications is not to blame for that situation, nor are the present procedures to blame for the situation.

If an Administering Authority does not furnish observations, the Standing Committee on Petitions cannot examine those petitions. The situation therefore has to be rectified in different ways. I notice that in paragraph 6 of the report (T/L.910) which the Council adopted earlier this afternoon, there is a reference to a recommendation that:

"... the communications circulated under rule 24 which raise general problems, as are listed in columns 2 and 3 of paragraph 2 of the present report, be examined by the Trusteeship Council."

That is, I think, the correct approach to this problem. The Council can make a special request to the Administering Authorities concerned to give their co-operation, to bring in their special representative, to furnish their observations, so as to enable the Council or its Standing Committee on Petitions to examine those petitions.

But we do feel that at this stage the discontinuance of the procedure that we have been following for the last few sessions, or dissolving the Committee on Classification of Communications, is not going to help the Council to any great extent. In fact, it may hinder the progress that we have made in the examination of petitions so far. It can be argued, as the representative of the Soviet Union argued, that the classification made by the Committee on Classification of Communications has in some cases been erratic. But then the running away from that Committee is not going to help us because classification by the Secretariat or by any other body can be equally erratic.

Therefore, I would suggest for the consideration of the representative of the Soviet Union that while we have a large number of petitions coming from some of the Territories, we should continue the present procedure at least for another year, if necessary, and then review the procedure once again. It is possible that

after the early part of 1960, it may not be necessary for us to maintain the present apparatus, as some of the Territories will have become independent and others will have approached independence by another year, and the flow of petitions may be expected to diminish considerably.

That would be my request to the representative of the Soviet Union and I hope that he will give it sympathetic consideration.

Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In stating its view on this question, the Soviet delegation is pursuing only one aim, which I already explained earlier. My delegations aims at the publication and thorough consideration of all petitions by the Committee and by the Council, and the consideration of petitions as a separate item on the agenda of the Council, separate from the consideration of the annual reports of the Administering Authority, and the adoption of specific decisions on all petitions.

We are opposed to the procedure in principle, as we have been in the past. We are against the temporary procedure which was adopted at a recent date, but we shall not vote against the proposal to extend the term of office of the Committee on Classification of Communications, in the spirit that was explained here by the representative of India. We shall abstain.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union will indeed figure in the record of this meeting. The representative of the Soviet Union said that he would not be opposed to the continuation of this procedure, but that he would abstain if a vote were taken. I wonder if we really need to come to a vote. I believe that upon the proposal of the President, the Council might continue the procedure as it was envisaged in Trusteeship Council resolution 1713 (XX). If I hear no objection, I will take it then that the Council agrees that the procedure be continued for one further year.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation has no objection to the President's proposal, on the understanding that the petitions raising general problems will be examined by the Trusteeship Council and that this examination will be facilitated by the Administering Authorities.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees that the procedure set forth in Trusteeship Council resolution 1713 (XX) should be continued for another year.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 11

ATTAINMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE BY TRUST TERRITORIES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1274 (XIII))

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In resolution 1274 (XIII), the General Assembly noted that:

"... by the measures already taken or to be taken by some Administering Authorities in consultation with the United Nations and the peoples of the Territories concerned, Togoland under French administration, the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, the Cameroons under French administration, Somaliland under Italian administration and Western Samoa under New Zealand administration, are expected to achieve in 1960 the objective of the Trusteeship System ...".

The Assembly then invited:

"the Administering Authorities concerned to formulate, in respect of the remaining Trust Territories, early successive intermediate targets and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational development of these Territories so as to create, as soon as possible, the pre-conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence".

Finally, the Assembly requested:

"the Trusteeship Council to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session on the progress made in implementing the present resolution".

(The President)

That resolution has already been examined by the Trusteeship Council. On 2 February 1959, the Council noted the resolution and asked its drafting committees to take account of the resolution in examining the annual reports of the Administering Authorities. The Council also decided to place the resolution on the agenda of the present session.

I now invite members of the Council to submit their observations on this item.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French):

My delegation would simply like to emphasize two points made in preceding resolutions on this matter.

In the resolution adopted at its thirteenth session, the General Assembly requested the Trusteeship Council to report to the Assembly at its fourteenth session on the progress made in implementing the resolution. My delegation would express the hope that the Council's report to the Assembly's fourteenth session will contain a summary of the progress made in implementing the Assembly resolution.

My delegation would also like to emphasize the Trusteeship Council's instruction to the drafting committees to take into account, in its examination of annual reports of Administering Authorities, the General Assembly resolution to which I have just referred. We hope that the drafting committees will constantly bear in mind the Assembly resolution which is the subject of the present discussion.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In our opinion, the question now being considered by the Trusteeship Council -- namely, the General Assembly resolution concerning the attainment of self-government or independence by Trust Territories -- is so important that the Council cannot merely take note of the Assembly resolution and draw the drafting committees' attention to the resolution. It seems to us that more specific action on the part of the Secretariat and the Trusteeship Council is called for.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

The Soviet Union delegation attributes particular importance to this question. The attainment of self-government or independence by Trust Territories is, of course, a crucial question for the Trusteeship Council. Our attention must therefore be focussed on it; it must be at the centre of our discussions. Our actions must be guided by the General Assembly resolutions on the question. We must take note of the fact that at a number of successive sessions the General Assembly has considered this matter and has adopted more than one resolution on it. Hence, one must ask oneself why, year after year, the General Assembly adopts resolutions on this subject. Apparently, everything is not as it should be. The General Assembly, quite properly, is showing its concern and deep interest in the fate of the Trust Territories and its desire that specific dates for the attainment of self-government or independence should be established; that, where such dates have already been established, they should be strictly observed; and that the final aim of the International Trusteeship System should be achieved.

We cannot fail to note paragraph 2 of the General Assembly resolution, which states that dates for the attainment of self-government or independence have not yet been established for some Trust Territories. Although no specific Administering Authorities are mentioned in that paragraph -- the phrase used is "Administering Authorities concerned" -- members of the Trusteeship Council and Members of the General Assembly understand clearly which Administering Authorities are concerned. The Trusteeship Council should therefore draw the attention of the Administering Authorities concerned to the fact that, in respect of such Trust Territories as, say, Ruanda-Urundi, New Guinea, the Pacific Islands, Nauru and Tanganyika, it is necessary to establish definite dates for the attainment of self-government and intermediate targets and dates, so that the Council may be able to follow the progress in these Trust Territories as they move towards the achievement of the final aim of the Trusteeship System.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Of course, here we must consider two sides. In the first place, the achievement by the Trust Territories of independence depends on the Administering Authorities although, fortunately, in many cases it does not depend on the Administering Authorities. At any rate, the duty of this Council is to call upon the Administering Authorities to adhere strictly to the recommendations of the General Assembly. Secondly, the Trusteeship Council itself can do something in order to improve the situation in this field, and it can do something for the better implementation of the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly on this question.

If we take the report of the Trusteeship Council submitted to the thirteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, we see that there is a special chapter devoted to the question of the attainment of independence for self-government by Trust Territories. If a layman reads that chapter, he would gather no impression whatsoever as to what the position in this matter is at this time. This is rather a bookkeeper's account. It is not even a bookkeeper's account because in two short pages there is some formal data with some references to some resolutions, and then there is a whole page devoted to references to specific paragraphs, sections, and chapters of this or that report of the Trusteeship Council. Of course, no one will look up all of these references. No member of the General Assembly could glean the information from all these sources that would give him a picture of the situation. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a possibility here of improving even the form in which the information is submitted to the General Assembly.

The Soviet delegation has a specific consideration that it wishes to express and that it wishes to have discussed in the Council. Perhaps it would be appropriate to follow the same method that was followed in the past, namely, not to submit a separate report on this question but to include a special chapter in the general report of the Trusteeship Council. However, that chapter should be presented in such a way that members of the General Assembly could understand fully what date had been established for what Territory and what has been done specifically to bring about the achievement of the final aims of the Trusteeship Council. It could also be possible to see where dates had not been set yet.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Such a specific account, which would be prepared by the Secretariat, would in our view be most useful to the General Assembly; it would serve its purpose. It seems to me that the Secretariat of the Trusteeship Council has very skilful and capable workers available who know the situation in the Trust Territories very well. They could do this job in an excellent manner. They could prepare a working paper for the consideration of the Council at a later stage in our session, a draft chapter of the report of the Council on this question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As no other representative wishes to speak, I have two proposals to make to the Council. First, I propose to the Council that we should ask the Drafting Committees which will meet during this session to take account of the General Assembly resolution when they consider the annual reports of the Administering Authorities. Secondly, the Council might decide to ask the Secretariat, when it prepares the report of the Council to the General Assembly, again to reserve a special chapter for this question, a chapter which would be as complete and detailed as possible.

These are the two proposals I am submitting to the Council, and if there is no objection I will consider that these proposals are adopted.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): Mr. President, I thank you for having made these proposals. If they are put to a vote, my delegation will abstain with respect to them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): It was not my intention to put these proposals to a vote. I said that if the Council had no objection, I would consider these proposals as accepted by the Council.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): I want to make it quite clear, Mr. President, that I am not accepting your proposals.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That being the case, I think it would be preferable to put these proposals to the vote.

The proposals of the President were adopted by 6 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 12

EFFECTS OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN TRUST TERRITORIES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1275 (XII))

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In resolution 1275 (XIII) of the General Assembly, the General Assembly again requested:

"the Administering Authorities to include in their annual reports information concerning the effects of the association with the European Economic Community of the Trust Territories under their administration on the economic development of these Territories and on their development towards independence or self-government". (paragraph 1)

The General Assembly also requested the Trusteeship Council:

"to examine this question at its next session and to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session". (paragraph 2)

This resolution has already been examined by the Trusteeship Council at its twenty-third session. In this connexion, the Trusteeship Council took note of that resolution and decided to continue the study of the question at the present session. I now invite the members of the Council to submit their observations.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to make an observation which is perhaps of a formal nature. The resolution which the Trusteeship Council adopted at its twenty-third session is not included, if I am not mistaken, in the collection of resolutions of the Council's twenty-third session. I hope that this omission will be rectified.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): It seems to me that, properly speaking, there was no resolution of the Trusteeship Council; it was simply a decision of the Council.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to know the difference between a decision and a resolution of the Council, according to the rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Is the representative of the United Arab Republic addressing that question to the President or to the Secretary?

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): To the Secretary if he can answer the question.

Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary): The representative of the United Arab Republic is quite correct in stating that this particular decision to take note of this resolution was not included in the documentation. It will be included subsequently.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Is the representative of the United Arab Republic satisfied by the reply?

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): Yes.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): My friend from the United Arab Republic may be satisfied, but I am not. I would like to know what the difference is between a resolution of the Council and a decision of the Council. An answer to that question was not given, Sir.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As I said a moment ago in reply to my colleague from the United Arab Republic, I do not think there was a resolution of the Council. A decision was taken, but there was no written text in the form of a resolution according to the usual form known to all members of the Council. That is all I can say in the circumstances.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, I regret that I do not completely agree with the point of view which you have just advanced, because there are items on the agenda which were examined and concerning which decisions were taken, and these decisions figure in the collection of resolutions and so forth. Therefore I think that equal treatment should be given to this decision.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that the representative of the United Arab Republic is right. The point which he brought up is distinct from the matter brought up by the representative of India. The decision of the Council will certainly figure in the official document. But, as far as India is concerned, I think the reply I gave was all I could say. We took decisions but we did not have a formal resolution submitted with regard to that matter. In document T/1335 on page 25, we have other decisions taken by the Trusteeship Council at its twentieth session. This is in the official document in a somewhat different form from that taken by resolutions which appear in the earlier part of the document.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation would also like to make the following remark. The General Assembly had asked the Secretary-General to make a report on this matter. I should like to know whether this report is ready and whether it can be circulated to the Council during the present session. If there is any hope whatsoever of having this report circulated to the Council, my delegation would propose that the examination of this matter be deferred until the Secretary-General's report is circulated.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of the United Arab Republic has raised a rather important question, and he is entirely right, in asking when we shall receive the report on the effects of the inclusion of certain Trust Territories in the European Economic Community. At the last session of the General Assembly the Trusteeship Council was unable to say anything on this question. In the relevant chapter of the report of the Trusteeship Council it was said that no detailed information on this question had been received by the Council and in view of this the Council did not consider the substance of the question and it was unable to express any opinions on the effects of the inclusion of Trust Territories in the European Economic Community. I think it would be entirely improper for the Council to submit similar communications to the General Assembly again, at its fourteenth session particularly, since in a special resolution the General Assembly asks the Trusteeship Council for the second time to make a report on this question. Therefore it seems to me that the Trusteeship Council is entitled to propose to the Administering Authority concerned to submit the necessary information so that it might be included in the next report to the General Assembly.

The Soviet delegation supports the proposal put forward by the representative of the United Arab Republic to the effect that we should postpone the consideration of the present item until a later stage of the present session of the Council so that we may consider then specifically some documents prepared by the Secretariat of the United Nations on this question. It seems to me that, if we receive no information from the Administering Authorities, the Secretariat is in a position to collect already published information of an official, semi-official

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

and unofficial character. It could collect documents also of the United Nations and the specialized agencies on this question, and on this basis it could prepare a report. If some data seem erroneous to the Administering Authorities, they undoubtedly will make observations. At any rate there will be a stimulus for the Administering Authorities to submit some information.

Mr. CLAEYS-BCUVAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I can assure my colleagues that the information submitted by the Belgian Government concerning Ruanda-Urundi will contain precise indications concerning the effects which have occurred so far owing to the Territory's being associated with the European Economic Community provided for under the Treaty of Rome. Having said that, I should like to add that the Secretary-General has, I believe, received an invitation from the General Assembly to supply a general study on this matter. If my memory is correct, this information has already been supplied.

As to later developments, it is evident that the Secretary-General will have available, as the Council will, all information submitted by the various Administering Authorities responsible for these Territories. In effect the Secretary-General will only have that information, as will the Council and the General Assembly. At the present stage of the examination of the question, it seems to me that the only measure to be taken, in view of the resolution passed by the General Assembly, would be to take note of it. Of course, the question will come up again when we examine each Territory concerned.

Mr. KSCZIKUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): As far as Togoland and the Cameroons, which will soon accede to independence, are concerned, a debate on the effects of the European Economic Community on these Territories will really be academic. I might recall that it has been said that it was premature to consider the effects of the Treaty of Rome upon the Trust Territories. I may add -- and this is an item of information which may be of interest to the Council -- that at this time the commercial implications of the coming into force of the Treaty of Rome as far as the associated Territories are concerned -- and they include the Trust Territories -- are now being

(Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, France)

discussed at Geneva within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The current session of GATT will consider the records of consultations with regard to such matters as the production of cocoa, tobacco, and so forth, products which are exported in considerable volume by these Territories. It is obviously too early to prejudge the results of these discussions, but we should be aware of the fact that proceedings have been started in GATT and the discussions have been very fruitful.

I believe it would be desirable for the Secretariat, in accordance with the procedure that has been established, to study the information that is becoming available from GATT. There is a working group there, and there are the records of consultations to which I have already referred. All these are detailed studies. We cannot think of anything else that could be said in respect of the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories. We have already pointed out that the association of Trust Territories in the European Economic Community has seen the export of their commodities to European countries facilitated and therefore the situation has only improved as a result of this new situation.

Mr. VITELLI (Italy): As the representative of a country which is also part of the European Economic Community, I should like to join the representatives of Belgium and France in their statements and to associate myself particularly with what the representative of France has just said. There is nothing more for me to say; I merely wished to go on record as having associated myself with their statements.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation has listened with great interest to the statements made by the representatives of France and Italy. These statements deserve examination and study. It seems that discussion of this item on our agenda has indeed begun and, therefore, we should like to maintain our proposal to defer discussion until we can examine the statements which have just been made so as to be able to define our position at a later meeting.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The delegation of India has attached considerable importance to this question of the possible effects of the association of Trust Territories with the European Economic Community. We have made that evident at previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council and in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.

Last year the Assembly adopted this resolution, the second preambular paragraph of which is of special importance. It says in that paragraph:

"Noting with concern that the Administering Authorities have thus far submitted no information on the possible effects of the association, etc." (Resolution 1275 (XIII))

For us merely to take note of this resolution, in the view of the Indian delegation, is not good enough. The Assembly has asked us to examine this question at the sessions of the Council this year. It is obvious that certain Administering Authorities have still not submitted information on the possible effects of this association, but we have heard just now from the representative of Belgium that information concerning the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi will be available to the Council. The other Trust Territory to be discussed at this session which is so associated is the Territory of Somaliland under Italian

administration. I understood the representative of Italy to say that information concerning the association of that Territory with the European Economic Community has not been submitted and perhaps will not be submitted. If that is the case, I would suggest that we nevertheless make a report to the Assembly on the subject and say that the Belgian Government submitted information, the substance of which is this, and that these other countries have not submitted information.

I think that it is too important a matter to be treated rather lightly. If information is not forthcoming, we should report to that effect, and whatever information is submitted we should examine and then submit our findings to the General Assembly. I would go to the extent of suggesting that, in the Trusteeship Council's report to the Assembly, there should be a separate chapter on this question in which all available information, or lack of information, should be tabulated for the benefit of the Assembly.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to make its proposal even more specific. We would ask you, Mr. President, to be good enough to defer examination of this item until after we have examined the annual reports for these Territories. I think this is a precise proposal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council has before it a formal proposal from the United Arab Republic calling upon the Council to defer examination of this item until after we have examined the situation in the various Trust Territories. If there is no objection, I shall assume that this proposal is adopted by the Council.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 3g and 5

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF WESTERN SAMOA (T/L.908):

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR 1958 (T/1450 and 1455)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF WESTERN SAMOA, 1959 (T/1449)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Powles, special representative for the Trust Territory of Western Samoa under New Zealand administration took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Political Advancement

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I simply wanted to say that contrary to custom I will not put any questions since I have been in Western Samoa and I had every occasion necessary to put whatever questions arose; perhaps during the course of the discussion some new element may arise, but for the present moment I have no questions.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before asking my first question, with your permission, Mr. President, I wish to make a brief general observation on the question under debate. We have considerable information on the question; we have the report of the Administering Authority, we have a specially prepared collection of documents submitted by the Administering Authority which supplements the information contained in the report of the Administering Authority, and we also have the report of the Special Visiting Mission which visited Western Samoa. Therefore, a number of questions are fully discussed.

Nevertheless, on some secondary questions it seems to us that it is necessary to obtain some clarification, and also, if possible, we need some additional information which may be made available either by the special representative of the Administering Authority or by the Chairman of the Visiting

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Mission which studied the situation in the Trust Territory on the spot. My first question is the following: In all official documents of the Administering Authority pertaining to the future of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa there are references to internal domestic self-government, and sometimes a reference to full self-government. Nowhere, as it seems to me at any rate, and in those documents available thus far, is there reference to independence. Yet in the report of the Visiting Mission and also in some statements, including the statement which we heard at the last meeting, and also in the statement which was made by the Prime Minister of New Zealand to the members of the Visiting Mission, in all those statements there was a somewhat passing reference or use of the word "independence". Therefore, it would be desirable to know precisely what, in the opinion and in accordance with the policy of the Administering Authority, is the final aim. Is it self-government or independence?

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

In order to clarify my question, I wish to refer to the statement of the representative of New Zealand, Mr. McIntosh. He said that the Administering Authority had in mind the achievement by the Trust Territory of self-government or independence; that is, in this oral statement, we see the word "independence". In the same statement, it is further said that a Treaty of Friendship is contemplated which will make provision for the independence of Western Samoa. A little further on, we find that the Treaty of Friendship will be an agreement between independent countries; that is, Western Samoa and New Zealand will be on a footing of equality and there will be two independent Governments or States.

The question is: What is the official policy of the Administering Authority? Why do official documents not speak of the independence of Western Samoa as the natural way to terminate the International Trusteeship System in that Territory?

Mr. MCINTOSH (New Zealand): I regret that there should have been any ambiguity on the part of any delegation concerning this point. In the view of the Administering Authority, self-government and independence are synonymous terms, and I used them both yesterday in the statement I was authorized to make by my Government.

New Zealand does not have any qualifications. Independence is what is intended and we propose, in the Treaty of Friendship, to define it in those terms. Perhaps we regard the term a little differently from some other representatives of countries round this table. We in New Zealand have had self-government for many years and we regard ourselves as independent. A former Prime Minister of New Zealand, in commenting on self-government within the Commonwealth, said that we regarded it not as independence with something taken away but as independence with something added. To our way of thinking, there is no difference in the terminology.

I regret that there should have been any misunderstanding on the subject on the part of the representative of the USSR.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since we have heard this clarification by the representative of New Zealand, will he agree to speak of the independence of Western Samoa? Since he considers self-government and independence synonymous, perhaps in the future all documents could speak of independence and then there will be no ambiguity,

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

particularly since, as the representative of New Zealand has now noted, it is intended to give genuine unqualified independence. Therefore, Western Samoa is to become an independent State the same as New Zealand or any other sovereign State.

I wish to ask this specific question: Would the Administering Authority agree in the future to use in its documents the word "independence" as the definition of the final aim of the International Trusteeship System? Thus we could agree here that the achievement of independence would be the natural conclusion of our International Trusteeship System. In this connexion, I wish to ask this specific question of the representative of New Zealand: Would he agree, would his Government agree that in the plan which is discussed on page 63 of the report of the Visiting Mission, there should be included a specific measure, namely, the proclamation of the independence of Western Samoa with specific indication of a date?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): It is a matter of which the New Zealand Government will no doubt take note. But I would remind the representative of the USSR that in our country the term "self-government" is in current usage. In Samoa, the same term has been used, and I do not think there is any doubt whatever on the part of the Samoan people or our own as to what is intended. I think it is very likely that both terms will continue to be used.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation, the same as many other delegations, would of course prefer to see the word "independence" in order to ensure that the full meaning of this word would be given effect in the legislative acts which will be passed in respect of the Trust Territory. The Charter of the United Nations speaks not only of self-government but also of independence, and members of the Council will remember the lengthy discussions which took place here in the past as to what was the final aim of the Trusteeship System -- self-government or independence.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

It was sometimes said that self-government and independence were alternative solutions; they were two different possibilities. Therefore, to mix up these terms here would only be detrimental to the clear understanding of the policy being pursued by the Administering Authority and we would not be creating a clear idea of the final outcome. That is, will the Territory be self-governing -- not fully independent -- or do we have in mind converting the Trust Territory into a really independent sovereign State which might, for instance, become a Member of the United Nations? What does the Administering Authority think? After Western Samoa has become an independent State, can it apply for membership in the United Nations?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): I do not think we should throw any discredit on the term "self-government". I can only repeat that we ourselves have used the term for so long that it is unlikely that we would want to introduce any variation or any implication of difference between the two. As to an application by Western Samoa for membership of the United Nations, I think that is a much wider question and one which in theory it should be fairly difficult to answer. There must be many small communities attaining self-government or independence in the same position and in theory there is no reason why they should not become Members of the United Nations. But I do not think that the Administering Authority is in a position to provide the answer to the representative of the USSR. It is for the United Nations itself to do so.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand that the question of admission, of course, is decided by the United Nations: by the Security Council and the General Assembly. But I asked the question with something else in mind. If self-government is really equivalent to independence in the thinking of the Administering Authority, and if it is planned to give genuine independence, then there should be no obstacle to the admission of Western Samoa to the United Nations. For in the proper consideration of the application of Western Samoa, the United Nations is likely to decide that the newly born independent State should be admitted. But if Western Samoa does not have independence -- for instance, it is not responsible for its foreign policy -- then the possibility of applying for membership in the United Nations no longer exists.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Our delegation wishes to know the following: Will Western Samoa, after Trusteeship has ended, have the right to conduct its foreign affairs and to act independently in the foreign policy field and, let us say, will that Government have the right to apply to the United Nations for membership, and will it be able to conclude any trade or other agreements with other States, and so on, since these are inalienable and basic attributes of any sovereign and independent State?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): The Treaty of Friendship which we propose to discuss with the Samoan people will cover the question of the conduct of Samoan external relations and it will be for the Samoan people themselves to decide whether or not they wished to make application for admission to the United Nations. As to trade agreements, I would not think there is any doubt that they would have the right to conclude whatever trade agreements they liked, with or without New Zealand's help. I do not think that there is any particular problem in this at all and I am afraid that I do not see the difficulty which is being placed before me by the representative of the USSR.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In my view, if some difficulties were to emerge, it would be better if we prevented now any misunderstandings from arising in the future. Let us take, for instance, the question of the Treaty. It has been called "The Treaty of Friendship" but according to its contents it should be called "A Treaty on the Relationship between New Zealand and Western Samoa".

I must confess that we do not quite understand why this Treaty is already considered at this time as a settled matter, as something self-evident. The specific question which we wish to address at this time to the representative of the Administering Authority is the following: Does the Administering Authority agreed that it is necessary to give Western Samoa full independence without any restrictions in the form of a future Treaty on relationship between New Zealand and Western Samoa?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): New Zealand entirely agrees that it is the purpose and the intention to give full independence to Samoa and at the same time to agree to enter into a Treaty of Friendship with the Samoans. I would remind the representative of the USSR that the Samoans themselves had been consulted on this point and I would draw his attention to the resolution which was adopted at a meeting of the Fautua and the Legislative Assembly on the recommendations of the Working Committee with whom we are in contact. I will read out the terms of the resolution which I think clarifies the points:

"1. This meeting ... believes that it is in the best interest of Western Samoa to enter into a Treaty of Friendship with New Zealand. Consideration of the terms of such treaty should be undertaken before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement but ratification should not take place till after the termination of Trusteeship in order that the two parties to the Treaty shall possess equal status.

"2. This meeting considers that the Treaty should deal with matters of external affairs and defence but would prefer to await a Memorandum being prepared in New Zealand before expressing its views in greater detail.

"3. It is considered that the right of the Government of Western Samoa to conduct trade negotiations on its own behalf should be clearly stated and defined in the Treaty.

(Mr. McIntosh, New Zealand)

"4. Specific provisions for the termination of the Treaty, if this should at any time be desired by one of the parties, should be included.

"5. It is recognized that there are likely to be a number of administrative matters concerning which Western Samoa and New Zealand will continue for some time to be closely associated. Such matters should be dealt with in some manner less formal than a Treaty in order that they can be easily modified or terminated when desirable."

I would draw the particular attention of the USSR representative to the first four paragraphs of that resolution.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from French): I am grateful to the New Zealand representative for reading out that text. I think that all members of the Trusteeship Council are familiar with it. I would draw attention to the part of the resolution which refers to the desire of the Samoan leaders -- at least of those representatives of the Samoan people who have thus far been consulted by the Administering Authority -- that the Treaty of Friendship should be ratified after the achievement of independence and the creation of the State of Western Samoa. It seems to me that it is not by accident that this desire has been expressed. I should like to ask the representative of the Administering Authority whether the Samoan representatives have been given this alternative: that Western Samoa should first receive full independence, without any restrictions, without any Treaty of Friendship, without any instrument concerning relations between Western Samoa and New Zealand; and that the question of the conclusion of any treaties between the independent State of Western Samoa and New Zealand should be settled after the accession of the Territory to independence, when such treaties could be concluded on a footing of equality, with respect for the sovereignty of each party.

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): It is understood by the Samoan community and the New Zealand authorities that Samoa will achieve full independence and will then conclude its treaty with New Zealand.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to have some clarification as to whether there is not some qualification here. Will the treaty be concluded and ratified after independence has been achieved, or is it only a question of ratification?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): I should have used the word "conclude". I believe that that is the word for which the USSR representative is searching.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am grateful to the New Zealand representative for the attention which he is giving to my many questions and for his attempts to furnish the necessary clarification. I should like to ask some further questions concerning the Treaty of Friendship.

Why do the representatives of the Administering Authority refer to independence only in connexion with this Treaty of Friendship? Why is it proposed to recognize the independence of the Territory in that precise document? As we know, under the present plans of the Administering Authority, the Treaty of Friendship will contain a provision to the effect that after a certain period of time it may be renounced by either party. In such a case, what would remain of the independence of Western Samoa, if this treaty were to be the basic instrument recognizing independence? Hence, one must again ask whether the Administering Authority contemplates the publication of some official declaration proclaiming that the Trust Territory of Western Samoa is an independent State and that the trusteeship of the United Nations has come to an end. Would such a declaration, if issued, mention independence, and not merely self-government?

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): I think that that question could best be answered by referring the USSR representative to page 63 of the Visiting Mission's report. In the timetable given there, reference is made to the possibility that August 1961 will be the date when New Zealand will pass an act authorizing the abrogation of New Zealand's powers over Western Samoa upon the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement at the end of 1961. The General Assembly itself will take appropriate action in respect of the Trusteeship Agreement -- that is to say, the termination of the Agreement. I should think that those two documents would constitute sufficient authority for the independence of Western Samoa.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the Visiting Mission's report and in statements by the representatives of the Administering Authority, reference has been made to the fact that the Treaty of Friendship will be patterned after the agreement between the United Kingdom and Tonga. I should like to know what stage has been reached in the consideration of this matter. Is it contemplated that there will be an agreement establishing a protectorate? For, if we carefully read the text of the treaty of friendship between the United Kingdom and Tonga, dated . . . 26 August 1958, we see that in essence this agreement establishes a protectorate. Would not the result of a similar treaty between Western Samoa and New Zealand be that, on the one hand, it will be stated that Western Samoa has achieved self-government, or perhaps even independence, but that, on the other hand, a so-called Treaty of Friendship will be concluded under which in effect Western Samoa will be deprived of independence without ever having attained it? The Visiting Mission's report speaks of the conclusion of such an agreement, and I should therefore like to have some clarification from the representative of the Administering Authority.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I should like to speak on a mild point of order. I do not wish in any way to inhibit the representative of the Soviet Union -- whom I am glad to welcome to the Council -- in his efforts to elucidate the position with regard to Samoa, the question we are discussing. It is perfectly true that there have been certain references to Tonga in documents relating to Samoa. I must say, however, that ~~Tonga is another~~ matter, and it is not strictly within the purview of this Council. I might interject here that I certainly do not agree that the Tonga Agreement between the United Kingdom and Tonga creates a protectorate. I do not want to go into the constitutional position. I would be very glad to do so with my friend from the Soviet Union outside of this Council chamber. But having made this statement, I am not asking the President to make any ruling; I am just observing that we cannot stray too far from Western Samoa.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council has taken note of the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): Some confusion has perhaps arisen through repeated references to the Tonga style of association in connexion with Samoa. For many years the Samoan leaders felt that the Tongan relationship was the one they desired, but that concept, I think, has been abandoned in Samoa. It certainly has been abandoned in New Zealand. We have every intention of concluding a very short treaty, the terms of which have still to be discussed, between the Samoans and ourselves. I can assure the representative of the USSR that there is no intention of reproducing the treaty with Tonga. It will be a much shorter and simpler document. I do not think it will leave any doubt as to the meaning of the term "independence".

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In reply to the observations of the representative of the United Kingdom, I wish to say that this observation should be addressed to the Administering Authority, to the representatives of New Zealand, since the discussions of the type of agreement is contained in a memorandum of the Government of

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

New Zealand on the future of the Trust Territory. That memorandum is contained fully in an annex to the report of the Visiting Mission. Therefore, the representative of the United Kingdom, having read the report of the Visiting Mission, might have made the observation earlier to the effect that the memorandum discussed questions which in essence did not come within the competence of the Trusteeship Council.

But it seems to me that this is a formal approach, and I think that the representative of the United Kingdom will not object to our studying the documents to which reference is made. The question is an important one and if a Tongan type solution is contemplated, as the memorandum of the Administering Authority says, then we must of course look into that agreement. We cannot act here blindly without knowing the actual position, without studying the documents in accordance with which it is planned to decide the future of the Trust Territory.

My next question relates to the drawing up of the law on citizenship and on the electoral system. In the report of the Visiting Mission we are informed that these laws are now under discussion. This is an important question and considerable space is given to it in the report of the Visiting Mission. I should like to know the main intentions here. Are there some basic provisions in accordance with which this legislation will be drafted? Is it contemplated in this legislation to have full equality as between persons of European status and persons of Samoan status? In particular, I should like to know whether Samoan employees who have already broken with the traditional system of the matai will be able to participate in elections? Is it contemplated to give the franchise to the entire population? Is universal franchise contemplated or is it planned to maintain some preferential status for citizens of European status? Will there be any distinction as regards electoral laws?

Mr. POWLES (Special representative): While I appreciate that the questions contain matters of great importance, there are a large number of matters contained in these questions, and this makes it rather difficult to give any coherent answer. These matters are discussed very fully in the Visiting Mission's report and again in the statement which I made to the Council.

(Mr. Powles,
Special representative)

It is necessary to distinguish, as was pointed out in the Visiting Mission's report, between questions on citizenship and questions of domestic status.

The question of the electoral suffrage is another matter again. I agree that they are important issues, but I would be very grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union if he could be more specific in his questions.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am quite prepared to ask more specific questions, and I am glad that the representative of the Administering Authority is inviting me to put specific questions. One specific question is: will Samoans who have broken with the traditional system be able to participate in the elections on the same footing as citizens of European status? Will they be able to vote on the basis of universal suffrage? That is my first specific question.

Page The second point is that I have an observation on which I should like some clarification. If there is no provision for universal suffrage, then there will not be equal rights for all citizens, that is, Samoans and Europeans. Hence, in order to establish equal rights and to make these rights uniform, it will be necessary to take universal suffrage away from the Europeans and to integrate them into the matai system. That would be somewhat awkward. What solution is contemplated for this dilemma?

Mr. POWLES (Special Representative): It is not possible at the moment to say with any degree of certainty what will be done. The Mission itself, while it was in the Territory, made a suggestion to the assembled representatives of the Samoan people that the electoral laws might contain a provision for a non-Matai roll, and the suggested details of that provision are contained in the Mission's report. That suggestion is now being taken under consideration by the Working Committee in Western Samoa, and it is not possible to say at the present time what their answer will be to it.

The question of whether there will be any difference between the electoral rights of two different classes of citizens is to a certain extent bound up with my answer to the previous question. It also depends upon the decision of the Samoan people as to whether they decide to have a single domestic status for all inhabitants of the Territory. That ultimate objective, as members of the Council will recollect, has been an objective of the Administering Authority for very many years and, as I mentioned in my opening speech, it seems that there is now at least a possibility that that objective can be achieved, so that the necessary provisions can be put in the new constitution, but it is quite impossible to be certain or definite as to what will be decided in this matter by the Samoan people. The matter is still under their consideration.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are devoting considerable attention to this question of universal suffrage in the Trust Territory because at this time the basis on which elections take place or will take place in the future for the legislative organs is a very narrow basis. Members of the Council know that at this time only the Matai, that is, one-seventh of the adult population, participate in elections. In fact, in the elections in 1957, out of 5,000 Matai, only 1,141 persons voted. These 1,141 persons determine who is to be in an organ which is then considered as a representative organ of the Trust Territory.

We note the statement of the Administering Authority contained in the special memorandum, to the effect that the Administering Authority is for the introduction of universal suffrage. The Visiting Mission also clearly spoke in favour of the introduction of universal suffrage. Moreover, in the report of the Visiting

Mission we read references to the fact that in the Trust Territory the trend is growing to have universal suffrage introduced. In this connexion the question arises what specific steps are taken by the Administering Authority, with a view to introducing universal suffrage in the Territory, to explain to the population the advantages to be derived from such a system, so that in the end the introduction of this democratic measure might be ensured, one which is customary in many States and which therefore would not leave Western Samoa an isolated island where universal suffrage could not be introduced.

The specific question is: what steps are being taken now by the Administering Authority to ensure the introduction of universal suffrage?

Mr. POWLES (Special Representative): This question, of course, has been discussed around this Council table on almost every occasion when the Samoan issue has come up for debate. There have been numerous indications given of the attitude of the Administering Authority in this matter. There have over a long period of years in Western Samoa been many occasions when this question of universal suffrage or Matai suffrage has been debated and discussed. It has been a matter of public issue in the Territory for quite some time, with the result that it has now become very clear that for the present the system of electoral representation by the Matai is a system which fully meets the needs of the Samoan people. Indeed, that situation was recognized by this Council last year, when members had the opportunity of having a distinguished delegation of Samoan leaders here present, when the whole system was discussed; and a resolution of the Trusteeship Council on that issue recognized the fact that for the present it was desirable to proceed upon the basis that the only system satisfactory to the Samoan people as a whole and the only system which would form a proper basis for the viable independence of their Territory was the system under which they now worked.

It is not necessary or even advisable to conduct any large or wide-scale campaigns in the Territory on the subject of universal suffrage, because it is a matter that everybody knows about and everybody talks about. Knowing about it and talking about it, they have deliberately taken their choice in the other direction.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 2nd Meeting (PM)

June 4 - 1959

Press Release TR/1484
3 June 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 1

Before resuming the review of conditions in Western Samoa, the Trusteeship Council this afternoon took up various other trusteeship matters.

The first of these was a report (Doc. T/L.910) of the Standing Committee on Petitions. In the report the Petitions Committee submits for the Council's approval the classifications recommended for 363 petitions and communications, in accordance with the rules governing the examination of petitions. (Petitions raising general questions concerning a particular trust territory are usually taken into account by the Council during its review of the annual report on that territory. Petitions containing specific requests or grievances are normally examined individually by the Petitions Committee which then reports on them to the Council.)

The report of the Petitions Committee was introduced by the Committee Chairman, GEOFFREY CASTON (United Kingdom). He said the classifications recommended were based on the proposals of the Committee on Classification of Communications.

VALENTIN A. ANTONOV (USSR) considered the classification recommended for certain of the petitions covered in the report as unjust. The ones he referred to, he said, raised specific issues and not merely general questions. They should therefore be classified as petitions requiring individual examination, in his view. He proposed that they be classified as petitions falling under rule 85, paragraph 1, of the rules governing the examination of petitions.

The President, MAX H. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), said that, in the absence of other comments, the Council would vote on the Soviet proposals for upgrading the petitions he mentioned, one by one.

All the Soviet proposals were rejected by the Council which then approved the classifications recommended by the Standing Committee on Petitions, by a vote of 13 in favor, none opposed, with one abstention.

Next, the Council took up the item relating to the review of procedure regarding petitions.

The PRESIDENT recalled that because of the large number of petitions received, the Council two years ago approved certain modifications of the procedure followed up to that time in the examination of petitions. At that time, the Council established, on a trial basis and subject to review at the end of one year, a two-

(more)

member Classification Committee to screen new petitions received before their examination by the Petitions Committee.

The PRESIDENT recalled further that last year the Council decided to continue for another year the revised procedure regarding petitions, subject to review at the end of that period.

Mr. ANTONOV (USSR) recalled that the Soviet delegation had opposed, in principle, the revised procedure which it believed might result in curtailing the right of petition. The new procedure, he recalled, had been approved as a result of the large number of petitions received from the French Cameroons.

Experience had shown, he went on, that under the new procedure a great number of the petitions, many relating to past events and charging "mass repression" by the administering authority, were classified in a way which had prevented their proper examination. The Council, in his view, should examine these petitions, particularly since the French Cameroons was due to become independent in 1960.

The USSR, he said, opposed the new procedure. It believed that the Council should revert to the original procedure concerning the classification of petitions.

Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said if the Classification Committee had not been established the task of classifying petitions would have been done by the Petitions Committee itself thus detracting that Committee from its proper task of examining petitions.

Since its establishment, the Classification Committee had done useful work, in Mr. CASTON's view. In the great majority of cases the classification recommended by the Classification Committee was reached unanimously. And in almost all cases, they were accepted by the Petitions Committee and, subsequently, by the Council itself. The Classification Committee had thus expedited the handling of petitions, he said, and his delegation favored its continuation.

BENJAMIN GERIG (United States) also spoke in support of continuing the Classification Committee.

M. RASGOTRA (India) said the issue should be determined on the volume of petitions being received and the number of petitions which still remained to be examined. He asked whether this information could be supplied.

H.A. WEISCHHOFF, Director of the Division of Trusteeship, said all petitions, except those to which the two-month rule applied, were on the agenda of the current session. He added that from the beginning of this year until now, approximately 500 petitions had been received.

Mr. RASGOTRA suggested that the present procedure be continued for another year. Mr. ANTONOV (USSR) said his delegation had only one aim, namely to have all petitions properly examined and specific recommendations approved. He would abstain if continuation of the new procedure were put to the vote, he added.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of objections, the revised procedure would be continued for another year.

JAWDAT MUFTI (United Arab Republic) accepted the decision on the understanding that petitions raising general questions would be examined by the Council, facilitated by the administering authorities.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 2nd Meeting (PM)

Press Release TR/1484
5 June 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 2

Next, the Trusteeship Council took up a resolution of the General Assembly (1274(XIII)) on the attainment of self-government or independence by trust territories.

In this resolution, the General Assembly notes measures already taken or to be taken by some administering authorities in consultation with the United Nations and the peoples of the territories concerned, by which Togoland under French administration, the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, the Cameroons under French administration, Somaliland under Italian administration and Western Samoa under New Zealand administration are expected to achieve in 1960 the objective of the trusteeship system laid down in Article 76 b of the United Nations Charter. It also invites the administering authorities concerned to formulate, in respect of the remaining trust territories, early successive intermediate targets and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational development of these territories so as to create, as soon as possible, the pre-conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence. The resolution reaffirms earlier resolutions on the same subject, and once again urges the administering authorities to implement the terms of those resolutions and requests the Trusteeship Council to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session on the progress made in implementing the present resolution.

The PRESIDENT asked for comments.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) expressed the hope that the drafting committee which prepared the Council's report to the General Assembly would bear this resolution in mind.

VALENTIN I. OBEREMKO (USSR) said it was the Council's duty to appeal to the administering authorities to adhere to the Assembly's request. The setting of target dates was particularly important for Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi, Nauru, the Pacific Islands, and New Guinea. He suggested that the Secretariat prepare a draft chapter on this question for inclusion in the Council's report.

(more)

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council ask its drafting committee to take the resolution into account and also request the Secretariat to reserve a separate chapter on the subject in the Council's report to the Assembly. The Council accepted the President's proposal by 6 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Next, the Council considered a General Assembly resolution (1275 (XIII)) requesting the administering authorities to supply information concerning the effects of the association with the European Economic Community on the trust territories and asking the Council to report on this matter to the General Assembly's fourteenth session, opening in mid-September.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) suggested that the Secretariat prepare a working paper for discussion later in the session.

Mr. OBEREMKO (USSR) said that, if the administering authorities "refused" to provide information, the Secretariat could collect "semi-official" data for discussion by the Council.

ALFRED CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) assured the Council that his delegation would submit "precise information" with regard to Ruanda Urundi's association with the European Economic Community. In his view, the subject should be discussed not as a separate topic, but in relation to each territory.

JACQUES KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) observed that it would be "academic" to discuss the matter in connection with Togoland and the French Cameroons, since these territories were about to become independent. He pointed out that the commercial implications of the Rome Treaty, under which the European Economic Community was established, were now being discussed by the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in Geneva. In his view, it was too early for the Council to judge the effects on trust territories of the association with the Community.

GIROLAMO VITELLI (Italy) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Belgium and France.

M. RASGOTRA (India) said that the Assembly's request must not be taken "lightly." The Council should submit a report on the subject.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) proposed that the item be postponed until after the examination of the annual reports on the various territories.

The Council agreed to this course.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media--not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 2nd Meeting (PM)

Press Release TR/1484
3 June 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 3

The Council then resumed examination of conditions in the trust territory of Western Samoa, administered by New Zealand. Before it were the 1958 annual report of the administering authority on the territory and the report of the Council's 1959 visiting mission to the territory.

The PRESIDENT invited G.R. Powles, the New Zealand High Commissioner for Western Samoa, to take a seat at the Council table as the special representative of the administering authority.

The PRESIDENT said the Council would begin the questioning of the special representative for Western Samoa, commencing with political conditions in the territory.

Mr. OBEREMKO (USSR) noted that, in the official documents concerning the future of the territory, reference was made only to full self-government. Independence was not mentioned except in yesterday's oral statement by the representative of the administering authority, he added. He asked what was the official policy of the administering authority in respect to the future of Western Samoa.

A.D. McINTOSH, Secretary for External Affairs of New Zealand, said that, in his understanding, the two terms, self-government and independence, were synonymous. For example, New Zealand was self-governing and it regarded itself as independent, he said.

Mr. OBEREMKO said, in that case, he would prefer to see the word "independence" used in all legislative acts relating to Western Samoa, so that there would be no misunderstanding as to the policy pursued by the administering authority and as to its final outcome. Would Western Samoa, for example, qualify for United Nations membership after its independence? he asked.

Mr. McINTOSH said that "in theory" there was no reason why Western Samoa should not apply for United Nations membership. However, it was up to the United Nations to decide whether to approve an application.

Mr. OBEREMKO made it clear that he had asked the question in order to elucidate whether Western Samoa would become a "sovereign" state, fully responsible for the conduct of its foreign affairs.

(more)

Mr. McINTOSH said he did not see the "difficulty" of the Soviet representative. It would be up to the Samoans to decide whether they wished to apply for United Nations membership.

"It is the intention to give full independence to Samoa and at the same time to enter into a Treaty of Friendship with the Samoans," he declared.

It was fully understood, he added, that the Samoans would first obtain independence and then conclude their Friendship Treaty with New Zealand.

Mr. OBEREMKO asked whether the agreement between the United Kingdom and Tonga which, he said, "creates a protectorate," was to serve as a model for the proposed Friendship Treaty between New Zealand and Western Samoa.

Sir ANDREW COHEN (United Kingdom) intervened to say that, although references to Tonga were made in the documentation before the Council, Tonga was not under discussion nor was it correct that the treaty referred to had created "a protectorate."

Mr. McINTOSH declared that there was no intention of reproducing the Tonga Treaty for Western Samoa. The envisaged Treaty of Friendship would be a "much simpler, shorter" document, he said.

Mr. OBEREMKO then sought clarification of the steps being taken now by the administering authority in order to ensure universal suffrage.

The special representative, Mr. POWLES, said that "for the present the system of the matai fully meets the needs of the Samoan people." The Council had recognized this fact, he noted. It was not advisable to campaign for universal suffrage; everyone in the territory knew about this possibility but the people had "deliberately" chosen the present system (under which only the matai, or heads of traditional families, vote).

The Council will meet again tomorrow, 4 June, at 2:30 p.m. and continue questioning on Western Samoa.

(END OF TAKE 3 AND OF PRESS RELEASE TR/1484)