



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

LIBRARY
FEB 8 1960
UN/SA COLLECT



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1049
5 February 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND AND FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 5 February 1960, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. VITELLI

(Italy)

1. Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories [7]
2. Report of the Secretary-General on credentials [2]
3. Appointment of the members of the Standing Committee on Petitions [14]
4. Appointment of the members of the Committee on Classification of Communications [15]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1049 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 7

ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS AFFECTING TRUST TERRITORIES

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, the representative of the United States.

Mr. BACON (United States of America): I have today no formal report to submit, but I should like to refer the Council to the provisional summary record of the Committee's last meeting which is to be found in document T/C.1/SR.135. That explains briefly and satisfactorily what happened. The Committee decided that it would not consider the administrative unions concerning the Cameroons under British administration and Ruanda-Urundi at this session, that decision being contingent upon the one taken by the Trusteeship Council yesterday because the Trusteeship Council did in fact decide to defer its consideration of the two Territories in question so that the decision of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions is exactly the same.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The decision taken by the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions is, unfortunately, in accord with the decision taken by the Trusteeship Council itself. However, one cannot but be surprised that that decision was taken before the Council took its own decision. In that way the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, instead of taking up seriously the task entrusted to it by the Trusteeship Council, refused to discharge its duties at the present session, thus prejudging, so to speak, the decision of the Trusteeship Council itself, the effect of which was that the consideration of the draft report was deferred until the summer session. The fact remains that if specific tasks are assigned to Committees it is essential for those tasks to be discharged at once.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

If we consider the agenda (T/1500) of the twenty-fifth session of the Trusteeship Council, we will note that in fact none of the questions, except for the election of the officers of the Council, was considered, which is what should have been done during the present session of the Trusteeship Council. We elected the members of the Visiting Mission and we laid down their terms of reference, and our work was limited to that. It seems to me that if the members of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions were paid for the work they have accomplished, the situation would not be an enviable one.

May I express the hope that in the future the Committee on Administrative Unions will devote the necessary attention to these problems. That this problem is an important one is derived from the fact that the Trusteeship Council felt it essential to set up such a Committee. I regret to note that no report has been submitted by the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no other observations, and if there are no objections, I shall assume that the Council approves the recommendation contained in the report of the Committee on Administrative Unions.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (T/1503)

The PRESIDENT: I now recognize the Under-Secretary, Dr. Protitch.

Dr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): A while ago the Secretariat received a telegram, addressed to the Secretary-General, from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and the Secretariat did not have the technical possibility to revise the report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1503). This document will be revised and paragraph 3 of the report will be omitted, as the

(Dr. Protitch, Under-Secretary)

name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will appear in its proper place in paragraph 2, namely after Paraguay. So that the paragraph would read:

"The names of the representatives of the following members were transmitted to the Secretary-General by communications emanating from the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the respective Governments ..."

Then, after Paraguay, the name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be inserted, and the paragraph would continue.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): We have before us the report of the Secretary-General on the credentials of the representatives of the Council, which is self-explanatory. I propose that the Council approve this report.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Concerning the report of the Secretary-General on credentials, which has been submitted to the Trusteeship Council, my delegation deems it essential to state that the legal representative of China in the Trusteeship Council and in all the other organs of the United Nations can only be a representative nominated by the Chinese People's Republic. We do not recognize in the report the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek people. May I ask you, Mr. President, to be good enough to hold a separate vote. We shall vote against the credentials of these representatives and we shall abstain on the report as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: Under rule 60 of the rules of procedure parts of a report may be voted on separately at the request of a representative and subject to the will of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. KIANG (China): The remarks we have just heard from the preceding speaker should be ruled out of order. It is an affront to this Organization that once again the Soviet delegation has spoken for a regime of murderous tyranny which is holding down hundreds of millions of people by force in the mainland provinces of China. I wish to state for the record that the Government of the Republic of China, which I have the honour to represent here in this Council, is the only Chinese Government which is freely and legitimately constituted and which alone can speak for the Chinese people in the United Nations. All members of the Council will be aware that the regime of which the Soviet delegation has spoken has been condemned by this Organization.

The PRESIDENT: May I remind the Council that the representatives who have seats here are the accredited representatives of Governments recognized by the United Nations? May I also urge delegations to facilitate the task of the Chair by expressing the views of their Governments in this debate in as restrained a manner as possible?

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I suppose, Mr. President, that your appeal to the representatives to be moderate and cautious in their statements is fully justified, and up to the present at this session of the Council all of us have acted in this spirit. With regard to the malicious and slanderous statement which we have just heard against the great Chinese Republic, I think that the person who found the courage to make such a statement does not even deserve to have these slanders and these lies refuted. The attempts made by this person to claim that he represents the great Chinese Republic can only give rise to smiles.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America): In the report of the Secretary-General, the credentials of all the representatives in the Trusteeship Council were recorded. Therefore, logically this Council should vote on the report as a whole. In the view of the United States delegation, it is unnecessary and inappropriate to vote separately on parts of the report on credentials. Accordingly, I request that the proposal of the Soviet representative be put to a vote, in accordance with the provisions of rule 60 of the rules of procedure. My delegation will vote against the proposal for a separate vote on the credentials of each member.

The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak, then we will proceed to vote. In accordance with rule 60, the Council will first vote on the question of whether, as requested by the Soviet representative, it will vote separately on the credentials of the representative of China.

The proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the proposal made by the Australian representative that the report as a whole be approved.

The report was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The request made by the representative of the Soviet Union that a part of the report on credentials should be submitted to a separate vote, in our view, was a completely legitimate request and we regret that the Council did not accede to it. We voted in favour of the Council agreeing to that request because we felt that would have been the right course for us to adopt. The credentials are issued in respect of the individual members separately, and each member is in a position to request a separate vote, and this, in fact, was done at the twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Trusteeship Council.

However, the Council having taken the decision it did, the report was put to the vote and my delegation voted in favour of the report as a whole.

But I wish to explain that the Government of India recognizes only the Government of the People's Republic of China as the Government of China, and we consider that that Government alone is competent to accredit representatives to the Trusteeship Council, as, indeed, to the other organs of the United Nations as well as to the General Assembly, and our vote in favour of the report is subject to that reservation.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): The position of Burma with regard to the representation of the so-called representative of China in this Council is well known. My delegation voted for the adoption of the report of the Secretary-General on credentials and our vote does not imply that we approve of the credentials of the representative of China who is now seated in this Council. As is well known to this Council, the Government of the Union of Burma recognizes only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. In the circumstances, we feel that the credentials of the so-called representative of China in this Council are not valid. With this reservation, we voted for the adoption of the report on credentials.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): The position of my Government on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is very well known. However, I shall reiterate it for the record. First, I think I should make it clear that with respect to our procedure, it would have been only legitimate and fair to grant the request made by the representative of the Soviet Union to vote separately on the credentials of the various delegations in the Council. It is most unfortunate that this request was not granted. If it had been granted, my delegation, in conformity with our position based on our recognition of the People's Republic of China as the only Government which represents the Chinese people, would have voted against the credentials as they appear with regard to Chinese representation.

My Government believes that the only legitimate representatives of China in the United Nations and in the organs of the United Nations are those who are designated by the Chinese People's Republic.

Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted against the Soviet proposal to have a separate vote on the credentials presented in the report of the Secretary-General because we felt the proposal was addressed almost exclusively to questioning the validity of the representation of the Chinese delegation in the Council. We believe that the present representative is the legitimate representative of China.

AGENDA ITEM 14

APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT: The Council is now required under rule 90 of its rules of procedure to appoint three administering and three non-administering States as members of the Standing Committee on Petitions to hold office from the conclusion of this session until the conclusion of the twenty-sixth session. In accordance with the Council's practice, nominations are made by the President. I wish to propose the following States for the approval of the Council: Belgium, China, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We would have no objection to the membership suggested by the President for the Standing Committee on Petitions were it not for the fact that the representative of China is not the legal representative of China. We would be in full agreement if the legal representative of China were to become a member of that Committee. Since, however, under present conditions the membership of China in the Standing Committee on Petitions indicates that the place of China will be occupied by somebody who does not represent the Chinese People's Republic, we would ask the President to have a separate vote on that candidacy.

Mr. KIANG (China): I request a separate vote on all the candidates nominated by the President.

Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to support the request just made by the representative of China. It seems to me that it would be discriminatory to put only one candidacy to a separate vote. If one is voted on separately, then all must be voted on separately.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the proposal just made, I shall put to the vote separately each nomination for membership of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

The appointment of Belgium was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The appointment of China was approved by 9 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The appointment of India was approved by 12 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The appointment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was approved by 11 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The appointment of the United Kingdom was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The appointment of the United States of America was approved by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: All the nominations made by the President having been approved, the Standing Committee on Petitions will be composed of Belgium, China, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

AGENDA ITEM 15

APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT: The Council must now appoint two members of the Committee on Classification of Communications to hold office until the conclusion of the twenty-sixth session.

I wish to propose the following States for the approval of the Council: Australia and the United Arab Republic.

In the absence of any observations or objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT: We have now taken action on all the items on the agenda of the twenty-fifth session with the exception of the examination of petitions. It will be recalled that discussion of this question took place at our 1047th meeting, at which time the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions explained the Committee's difficulties in examining petitions at the present session. I understand that there is one report which is being distributed as document T/L.960. I should like, however, to ask the Chairman of that Committee whether the Committee has adopted any other report for consideration by the Council.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The Committee has finalized one report which should come before the Council -- the two hundred and forty-fourth report -- but which I have before me still in draft form. The report has been finalized, but I presume that it is not yet ready for circulation. It deals with two petitions from the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. If the Council wishes, it can take action on it now, but since the document is not before it, I do not see how it can proceed.

In addition to this report, the Committee has discussed one further petition from a gentleman from Ruanda-Urundi, whose name the Council will recall -- Mr. Rodriga. A decision was taken this morning, but that has not yet been finalized. The Standing Committee on Petitions is scheduled to meet on Monday, 8 February, to finalize the draft of a resolution on that and then to draw up its final report, which it is customary for the Standing Committee on Petitions to present to the Trusteeship Council.

That being the case, I would suggest that the Council might consider taking up this matter on the afternoon of Monday, 8 February, so that the Committee's final report on its work for the session can be presented to the Council for its approval.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has just heard the observations of the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions. In view of his suggestion, I think the Council will agree that probably the wisest course is to postpone this item until the next meeting, which might take place next Monday afternoon, 8 February.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions told us at previous meetings that a situation had been created in the Committee whereby the examination of petitions had become practically impossible. During the whole period of the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions at this session only three petitions have been examined, although there are several hundred petitions on our agenda.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Far be it from me to discredit in any way or to cast any doubts on the efforts of the Chairman of that Committee; he and the representative of the Soviet Union in that Committee, it is well known, have done all in their power to get the Committee to work actively and to examine the petitions inscribed on the agenda. However, for reasons that are well known to all, the examination of these petitions has been rendered practically impossible at the present session, the reason being that the Administering Authorities, in violation of the rules of procedure of the Council, have not, within the delays proscribed by the Council, presented their written observations and have not sent to the Standing Committee on Petitions their Special Representatives, who could have given additional information and answered questions put by members of the Committee. Thus, the Committee on Petitions has been presented with a fait accompli.

This is another example of the fact that very little useful work has been done at the present session of the Trusteeship Council. We wish to draw the attention of representatives to that fact, as we consider that the examination of petitions and decisions concerning them is one of the most essential functions of the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Indeed, the indigenous inhabitants of Trust Territories appeal to us. These are human beings; they have complaints, they have proposals. They expect from the United Nations certain decisions, certain actions. Not only have no decisions been taken, but these petitions have not even been examined. And that is not because certain members of the Trusteeship Council do not want it, but because the Administering Authorities concerned refuse to co-operate in the Committee on Petitions and in the Trusteeship Council and make it impossible satisfactorily to examine these petitions.

We consider that this situation is absolutely abnormal and unsatisfactory and we reserve our right to draw the attention of the Fourth Committee and of the General Assembly to the situation that has been created in connexion with the examination of petitions. This has become almost a practice. We have seen examples of it in the past, and we see examples of it at present. Petitions are simply not being examined. The Committee on Petitions, despite the fact that it is called a Standing Committee, in actual fact hardly does anything at all -- and we know full well who prevents it from doing this work.

That is why we wanted to make this categorical statement, despite the fact that it is not very pleasant for the ears of Administering Authorities. We consider that it is the duty of all members of the Trusteeship Council to speak their minds on this point, since the situation is indeed abnormal. There is a violation of the rules of procedure and a violation of the Charter, a violation of our own decisions in the Trusteeship Council. Petitions are not being examined. Hundreds of petitions accumulate and are put in the archives of the Organization, while the indigenous inhabitants still await and hope for some form of action by the United Nations. We must understand that such inaction on the part of the Committee on Petitions and the Trusteeship Council can only serve seriously to disillusion the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. If the Trusteeship Council does not wish such a result, I think it should see to it that the provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council are applied.

The PRESIDENT: I had suggested holding a meeting on Monday afternoon on this question, but I do not yet know the wishes of the Council in this regard. If there are no objections, we shall have another meeting of the Council on Monday afternoon, and at that time shall dispose of this particular item.

It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Mr. KIANG (China): I should like to know whether the President intends at the next meeting to consult the members of the Council regarding the organization of the work of the next session. It will be recalled that, when my delegation agreed to the deferment of the two principal items of this session, we had very much in mind the timing of the summer session.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I would support the remarks of the representative of China, but in a somewhat different form. Some Governments represented here are naturally interested in the opening date of the next session of the Council and equally in the provisional time-table, if one could be contemplated, for that session. If members are ready to discuss the arrangements and the organization of business for the next session, could we not do that even this afternoon, since we have no further formal business before us? If that is agreeable, I might begin by asking whether the Secretariat has set down, as it is normally accustomed to do, some kind of provisional time-table of business. In the past, we have found that to be of great assistance. May I address that question to the Secretariat?

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representatives of China and Australia for their comments. I had intended to take up this subject, but I had not yet had the opportunity.

Members will recall that, at its twenty-fourth session, the Council decided to convene its twenty-sixth session in advance of the normal date -- to be precise, on 3 May 1960. During this session, various members have suggested that it would be desirable, in view of the fact that certain reports have been postponed from this session to the twenty-sixth session, to open the twenty-sixth

session even earlier. If that is to be done, of course, it will be necessary for the Council to take a decision to that effect. Do any members of the Council have any observations to make as to the date on which the Council should begin its twenty-sixth session?

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I think that some members were considering 15 April as a good date for the commencement of our summer session. However, I see that 15 April falls on a Friday. In view of that fact, and in view of the further fact that we have deferred consideration of two reports, the one on Ruanda-Urundi and the one on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, until the summer session, why can we not begin that session on Monday, 11 April? If that is convenient for members of the Council, we might agree on that date and then ask the Secretariat to draw up a time-table for us, so that members who are responsible for certain Territories will know at what time each Territory is coming up for consideration. In that way, they will be prepared -- and I can understand the point raised by the representative of Australia -- to have their special representatives here at the proper time. I think that the Council might agree at today's meeting to begin the twenty-sixth session on 11 April, and then leave the rest for the Secretariat to present to us on Monday.

Dr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): The Secretariat has given some thought to the plan of work for the twenty-sixth session although I do not want in any way to suggest at this moment any date for the beginning of the next session. Nevertheless, in view of what the representative of the United Arab Republic has said, we are aware that Good Friday falls on 15 April although it is not an official United Nations holiday. However, if it is the desire of the members of the Council, we could have the session start on 14 April. Why 14 April? This date takes into account the heavy schedule of work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories which, according to its tentative and approved schedule of work, may continue until 14 April or about that time to finish its regular session. So if the members of the Council would like to have a kind of tentative schedule, which the Secretariat has prepared on the assumption that the work of the twenty-sixth session may start on 14 April, we could distribute such a very tentative time-table which has been made up in a most economical and, I should say, most considerate way. This time-table tries to allow the Council to finish its summer session at a reasonable time. That is under the assumption, as is indicated in the short page of the outlined time-table, that the Council would start immediately with two daily sessions. We are at the disposal of the Council to distribute this tentative schedule.

Miss TENZER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I was about to propose to the Council that we should not take a final decision on the date before we do in fact have the Secretariat's paper on the organization of our work because I believe that only after we have seen that document will we be able to decide whether the opening date for the summer session is realistic and whether the reports to be considered will be ready. There are a number of questions to be considered in the light of the Secretariat document. I therefore propose that we defer a final decision until Monday.

The PRESIDENT: As regards the remarks just made by the representative of Belgium, I ask the Council if it is agreeable to having the Secretariat circulate this time-table. If it is agreeable, then of course the Secretariat will distribute the time-table.

Mr. de CAMERET (France) (interpretation from French): In the past the Committee on Information has not met longer than we have when we met here to agree on a working plan for information. I realize that this year the Committee on Information will meet much longer than it usually does. I believe that the Secretariat has told us that the number of documents to be considered was much greater than in the past. The Secretariat has stated that the Committee on Information would finish on 14 April. That is the date proposed for the opening of the Council session. It seems to me to be most undesirable for us to set a date today without knowing on what date the Committee on Information will be able to finish its work.

It is extremely difficult for my delegation to participate in the work of both the Committee on Information and the Trusteeship Council. Therefore, I hope that the Trusteeship Council, which usually meets in June, will start its session at the end of April.

The PRESIDENT: Two suggestions have been made: that the Council would like to have the time-table of the twenty-sixth session and also the time-table of the Committee on Information before making any decision. I shall have to find out from the Secretariat what we can do about this.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am inclined to support the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic for various reasons. It is perhaps not necessary to go into details, but we have to look beyond this session of the Trusteeship Council also. I know that there are at least three delegations here in this Council which will be engaged in the work of a six-member Committee which was appointed by the General Assembly to look into certain matters also related to the work of the Committee on Information in a different way. Now that is a work of a very delicate and prolonged nature which will require a great deal of study, preparation of documentation and so on, and it will have to be completed in good time for the General Assembly.

Our main motivation in supporting the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic is that the Council should finish its work as early as possible. It is estimated that that six-member Committee should meet some time early in July, if possible, and finish its work by the middle of August. Therefore,

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

from our point of view it is absolutely necessary that we wind up the Council's work of the summer session by the end of June. If that is going to be the case, it will be necessary for us to begin our work around the middle of April.

What the representative of France has said about the Committee on Information of course not only applies to his delegation, but also to mine, the Australian delegation, the New Zealand delegation, the delegation of the United Kingdom, the United States delegation and many other delegations; most of them are here. We are proceeding on the assumption that the Committee on Information should be able to finish its work sometime very early in April, and therefore it should be possible for us to commence the summer session of the Council on the 15th; that is Friday -- and Good Friday at that. We could begin on the 14th or possibly the 11th. I think that there would be no harm in that. We would support that suggestion today -- or perhaps the Council wishes to take it up at its next meeting. We would certainly welcome a paper from the Secretariat giving a sort of time schedule of the work of the Council's summer session, but I do not see that that will alter in any material way the considerations that the members of the Council have in mind on this subject.

Dr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): I am sorry to take the time of the Council again, but I may not have been very clear so far as the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories was concerned. The schedule for that Committee runs approximately to the middle of April but, according to my information -- and I think that the representative of India is right in saying that there is every possibility that this Committee may finish earlier, that is, by 10 April or not later than 12 April. That was the reason why the Secretariat in this tentative time-table -- which, if the members of the Council wish it, we will circulate -- took as a possibility the starting of the twenty-sixth session of the Council on 14 April.

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Secretariat to circulate the tentative time-table of the twenty-sixth session so that members may be informed and, let us hope, reach a decision today.

The Council has heard the representative of the United Arab Republic suggest the date of 11 April. Further, we have heard the Under-Secretary state why he thought it advisable to begin our twenty-sixth session on 14 or 15 April. The Indian representative, in supporting the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic that the session should begin on 11 April, said at the same time that he had no particular objection to its beginning on 14 or 15 April. The Belgian representative asked to be allowed to consult the draft prepared by the Secretariat before reaching any decision. That draft has now been distributed and representatives have had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the dates indicated therein. Are we now near a decision on the date on which we might begin our twenty-sixth session?

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): My delegation favours the proposal that the Council should begin its next session in the middle of April. We consider that as 15 April is Good Friday there are no doubt some representatives who would prefer not to have a meeting on that day, and therefore we feel that the suggested date of 14 April would probably be most appropriate. We believe also, that it would be awkward for some delegations if there were an overlap between the Committee on Information and the Trusteeship Council, and the Committee on Information may not be able to finish its work until 11 or 12 April.

The time-table prepared by the Secretariat is very optimistic, but hope springs eternal in the human breast we are assured, and all we can do is to try to live up to the Secretariat's hope. As far as the actual timing of the discussion on Western Samoa is concerned, 2 May to 9 May, I can give no categorical assurance that we shall be ready to discuss Western Samoa at exactly that date, but my Government has told me that it will try its best to fit in with whatever time-table is acceptable to the Council and I feel that probably those dates will be acceptable to it.

Miss TENZER (Belgium)(interpretation from French): Contrary to the view put forward by my colleague and friend from New Zealand, I believe that this schedule of work prepared by the Secretariat is somewhat pessimistic. I am rather surprised to see that five days have been provided for Nauru, six days for Samoa, and five days for Somaliland. In particular I am surprised that the end of the discussion on Somaliland should be scheduled for 3 June when, at the end of that month, Somaliland will become independent.

I do not think that we should be too pessimistic, and if we begin on 14 April I think we shall have ample time to finish our work by the date foreseen. However, before a date is decided upon I should like to ask the representative of Australia if his delegation believes that it will be possible to begin the examination of conditions in the Territory of Nauru on 18 April, as provided in this tentative time-table.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Yes, Mr. President, on 18 April.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): This time-table is perfectly acceptable to my delegation and I was glad to hear the representative of Australia say that the Council can commence consideration of the report on Nauru on 18 April. The representative of New Zealand is not sure that the report will be available in due time for consideration to commence on 2 May. If that is the case, I would like to ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether we can take up the report on Tanganyika in that period. If it can be worked out that way, I think it should be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom): I have two observations on that subject. The first is that I think that the Council will remember that when the United Kingdom delegation first made the proposal by which the annual report on Tanganyika for 1959 was to be made available for discussion by the Trusteeship Council in 1960, instead of in 1961, as had previously been the case, we did say that if we were to do this -- and we are going to do it -- we must ask that Tanganyika be considered towards the end of the summer session of the Council.

Quite specifically, I said that 15 June would be the date which we had in mind, and I did say that possibly, if this met the convenience of the Council, we could try to manage the date of 8 June. Gradually, we are being pushed backwards. I think perhaps by a super-human effort we might manage the date of 6 June. But quite apart from our convenience, there is the matter of the report of the Visiting Mission to be considered. The Visiting Mission will presumably not be able to present its report on Tanganyika until sometime in May at the earliest.

For both these reasons, therefore, I think that 6 June is really the earliest possible date on which I can undertake to be ready for the discussion of Tanganyika. I think, however, that in fact when our session gets under way, we will find that this is perhaps neither excessively optimistic or excessively pessimistic as a time-table, and I have every reason to believe that it might work out just about right. I suggest, therefore, that bearing in mind that this time-table, like all the time-tables for our work, is a tentative one and will have to be revised as we see how the reports are coming in and how our work goes, that we do adopt it as a tentative basis for our work at the twenty-sixth session.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): At the beginning, I would like to state that I have no hard and fast feeling regarding this time-table. I think that my delegation could go along if it were the consensus of opinion that we should accept it. But I still feel that if we can advance the date of our meeting to 11 April, we might be doing better. I should say, very frankly, that I was very much encouraged in stressing this point after hearing the statement of the representative of India.

The only point which seemed to be relevant to our advancing the date of the summer session was the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. It seems that there was a strong feeling that that Committee might finish its work during the early part of April, perhaps on Saturday, 9 April. I am sure that the members of the Committee, who are also members of the Trusteeship Council, when they realize that the session is approaching, will do their utmost to expedite their work and to finish as early as possible.

I stress this point for another reason. The Secretariat has worked out the time-table on the assumption that we are going to have two meetings a day. I think that is going to be rather burdensome and very strenuous for all of us. Some delegations are going to find it extremely difficult to work on that basis. For that reason, if we can advance the beginning of the summer session by a few days, at any rate, we might be able to have some relief and then we could meet twice a day only when it is necessary. We could thus meet once a day, as usual, between two and six in the afternoon. If we took these two points into consideration, we might just as well revert to my earlier suggestion and accept 11 April as a good starting date for our summer session.

I hope that my colleagues will take that into consideration, and I also hope that we will not take a decision at today's meeting. We can defer the matter until Monday so that we may consult among ourselves and see what we can do. I do not think that anyone is going to force his ideas on the Council. It is going to be a matter of agreement among all the members of the Council. For that reason, I would suggest that we leave a final decision on this point until Monday.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (intepretation from Russian): What the representative of the United Arab Republic has just said seems to us to be extremely convincing. If indeed we examine the outline of the time-table that has been distributed, we can see that even if we sit twice a day, we might be unable to finish our work by 30 June. Furthermore, even if we were to begin on 11 April, much will depend upon the date on which the members of the Council will receive the annual reports of the Administering Authorities or the reports of the Visiting Mission, since in order to get ahead with its work the Council needs not only to know whether the Special Representatives of the Administering Authorities are ready to examine the question, but also if the other members of the Council are ready.

Thus, if on 6 June the representative of the United Kingdom is ready to examine the reports on Tanganyika, but we receive them on 5 June, then, of course, the Council will not be able to do anything on 6 June but hear the introductory statement of the Special Representative. We all need some time to read reports. If we work twice a day every day, we will only have the night to read reports, and normal people usually sleep at night. I think that if we can begin our session as early as possible, that is to say, at least on 11 April, that would be the least we can do under the given circumstances.

As concerns the time-table, I should like to ask the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council, through you, Mr. President, to tell us, if he is able to do so, when he expects to receive the annual reports on the Territories which are on this time-table. Also, when does he expect a report of the Visiting Mission. I think that these dates would help us to better understand this time-table. The representatives of the Administering Authorities might also tell the Council when their Special Representatives will be able to arrive here, and when they will present the annual reports, so that before the examination of the situation in a Territory, they could participate directly in the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions, which Committee will have to do a lot of foot work to catch up with all that it did not do at this session.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): To refer to a point raised by the representative of India and also indirectly by the representative of the Soviet Union, we have every reason to believe that the annual report on Western Samoa will be available for distribution in the first half of April. At least the New Zealand Government is making every effort to have the report ready by that time. The actual date which the Special Representative or Representatives would be able to come to the Council depends on consultations between the Government of Western Samoa and the Government of New Zealand. I feel sure that they will make every effort to meet whatever date is convenient to the Council.

But it is because of this little necessity for negotiations that it is rather difficult for me to give a categorical assurance that the date of 2 May would be acceptable. However, I am quite willing to accept 2 May as a tentative time-table. But perhaps if the Council deferred its final decision until Monday, I might be in a better position to give a firm assurance.

Dr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): Before I ask you, Mr. President, to be kind enough to call upon the Secretary of the Council, I should like to stress one point, namely, that in preparing this timetable the Secretariat took very seriously into consideration the points raised by the Soviet Representative and by other representatives that the Council should have sufficient time to examine the different reports, as well as the convenience of the Administering Authorities in bringing their special representatives, and also the fact that very often reports do not arrive on time. That is why this timetable may look rather optimistic or pessimistic, but, nevertheless, it is as realistic as it is possible to make it at this moment.

I will ask the Secretary of the Council to give the dates when it is anticipated the different reports will be received. So far as the reports of Visiting Mission to East Africa are concerned, at present the date has not been fixed for its departure. Nevertheless, we are again assuming that sufficient time will be given to the Administering Authorities of those two Territories to present their comments on the reports and that these will be circulated in sufficient time to enable the members of the Council to consider them.

The SECRETARY: I cannot give the Council any precise information on the dates on which the reports will be received. However, in the informal discussions with the delegations which preceded the drawing up of this timetable, we stressed the necessity of the presentation of the annual reports on these Territories several weeks in advance of the dates mentioned, and the delegations concerned stated that they would do everything in their power to comply.

With regard to the reports of the Visiting Mission there are many imponderables, due to the fact that the itinerary of the Mission has not yet been absolutely decided upon and to the fact that it is not possible exactly to predict the length of the Mission's deliberations on its return to Headquarters. In fact, the date of 6 June for Tanganyika, which will be the first Territory to be affected by a report of the Visiting Mission, seemed to be the earliest possible on which this Territory could be placed on the agenda and still leave time for a certain consideration of the adopted report by the members of the Council and, in particular, by the Administering Authority concerned.

Mr. de CAMARET (France)(interpretation from French): I should like to support the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic that we defer our decision on the timetable of our next session until Monday. It will be understood that each delegation will need some time to consider our programme of work, and it does not seem to me to be realistic to adopt this programme at first sight, taking into account the time we have taken to consider Territories in the past. While it is true that Somaliland will not present an acute problem, on the other hand, the Territories which are going to attain the objectives of Article 76 of the Charter -- for example, Western Samoa and the Pacific Islands -- will require great attention on our part. I remember that in the past some drafting committees, such as that for Nauru, took twenty to twenty-five days. Therefore, I believe that in fixing a time of five days we are being too optimistic.

I do not know any reasons why we could not meet after 30 June, and I believe that we should wait for two days before we take a decision on this programme of work which, although provisional, raises questions of substance.

I therefore propose that we defer a decision until Monday, and I should like to reserve the position of my delegation with respect to the date of 14 April. Our next session is supposed to be the summer session, but it is proposed that we start in spring.

Mr. TORNETTA (Italy): As the Council is aware, Somaliland is in a very special position this year. There will be a discussion on Somaliland at our next session, and the Administering Authority has not only to submit an annual report to this Council -- and we do not know in what way the Council will examine this report -- but first of all we have to submit a special report in connexion with the resolution of the General Assembly. This report will refer to the latest steps decided upon and taken before independence, and in preparing this special report, the Administering Authority will require the collaboration of the Somalia Government. The date when the special report will be available must also be fixed in consultation with the Somalia Government.

(Mr. Tornetta, Italy)

Of course, we hope that everything will be ready in time to follow the timetable prepared by the Secretariat, but if the Council decides to resume this discussion on Monday, I may be able to give more definite information.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard various observations on the date when we should start our twenty-sixth session. One school of thought has advocated the date of 11 April, and another school of thought has advocated 14 or 15 April. The opinion then prevailed that it would be better to postpone a decision on this matter until next Monday.

It has been indicated to me by the Secretariat that it would be better if we met at a later hour than usual on Monday, so as to enable the Secretariat to distribute the reports of the Committee on Petitions, which is to meet in the morning. Therefore, if it is agreeable, the Council will meet at 4 p.m. on Monday.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.