



CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1306 and A/1306/Corr.1) (*continued*) 73*Chairman:* Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Farrag (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, presided.***Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1306 and A/1306/Corr.1) (*continued*)**

[Item 13]*

1. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that in addition to the amendment (A/C.4/L.83) which he had proposed to the draft resolution submitted by Denmark, Mexico, the Philippines, Syria and the United States of America (A/C.4/L.78) and which consisted of a phrase to be inserted in sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the draft, he also proposed the deletion of the last part of that sub-paragraph. The text of sub-paragraph (a) would then read:

“(a) To study the prevailing policies, laws and practices which in the Trust Territories relate to land, land utilization and to the alienation of land, taking into account the present and future needs of the indigenous inhabitants and bearing in mind the inadmissibility of alienating the land of the indigenous inhabitants.”

2. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) agreed in principle with the joint draft resolution. He would also vote in favour of the Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.84), which was a distinct improvement on the original text.

3. While he agreed with the representative of the Soviet Union that alienation of the land of the indigenous inhabitants should be forbidden, he regretted that he would nevertheless have to abstain if that amendment was put to the vote, because it was out of place in the joint draft resolution. On the other hand, he would vote for the amendment if the USSR delegation submitted it in the form of a separate draft resolution.

4. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) asked the USSR representative to submit his proposal as a separate draft

resolution, because the question it dealt with differed in substance from that of the joint draft resolution.

5. Mr. S. RAO (India) thought that the question referred to in the USSR amendment could be satisfactorily dealt with by adding, in sub-paragraph (a) of the joint draft resolution after the words “indigenous inhabitants”, the following words: “from the standpoint of the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter;”.

6. As long as the studies that the Trusteeship Council was requested to undertake, probably with the help of the specialized agencies, had not been completed, the Administering Authorities concerned would continue to administer those Territories as before. It was difficult to understand exactly at what stage the USSR delegation wished to have the principle of the inalienability of the land of indigenous inhabitants applied. The text proposed by the representative of India was based on Article 76 of the Charter and should not give rise to any objection.

7. Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) was glad to note that the United States and other Administering Authorities, by signifying their agreement with the joint draft resolution, had given proof of their desire to promote the economic and social advancement of the Territories they administered.

8. He was entirely in favour of that text but would nevertheless like to make a few drafting amendments based on the suggestions of the representative of India. He would, for instance, urge that the title of the Spanish text should be amended, as it seemed to imply that economic development concerned only certain Trust Territories of a distinctly rural character.

9. While he approved in principle the ideas contained in the USSR amendment, he would nevertheless be obliged to vote in the negative for the same reason as the representative of Indonesia. The Committee might, however, adopt a separate draft resolution on that subject, provided such a resolution took account of the diversity of Trust Territories and was not of too absolute a nature.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

10. Mr. MIKAOU (Lebanon) joined with the representative of Iraq in asking the USSR representative to submit the text in the form of a separate draft resolution.

11. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was prepared to vote in favour of the Indian amendment and to withdraw his own amendment, while reserving the right to submit a separate draft resolution at a later stage.

12. The CHAIRMAN asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.78) whether they accepted the Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.84).

13. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) accepted, for the first paragraph of the preamble, the wording: "the essential conditions in ensuring, maintaining and promoting the economic and social advancement . . .".

14. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) also accepted it but objected to the deletion of the second paragraph which merely drew the conclusions that followed from the principle laid down in the first. He saw no objection to the amendment of the title of the Spanish text, as suggested by the representative of Venezuela.

15. Mr. S. RAO (India) reminded the Committee that it had to deal with the economic development not of under-developed areas in general but of the Trust Territories. He was willing to give up the second part of his amendment concerning the deletion of the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution but it was important that the resolution should mention first the Trust Territories.

16. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) preferred the original text of the joint draft resolution.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment as amended by its author. The amendment consisted in replacing the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution by the following text:

"Recognizing that the equitable distribution and proper utilization of the land together constitute one of the essential conditions in ensuring, maintaining and promoting the economic and social advancement of the inhabitants of Trust Territories".

18. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he would vote against that amendment, not because he was opposed to the Indian text, which he thought excellent, but because the original text of the draft resolution seemed to him to be still better.

19. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) said the Committee had a choice of three different solutions: to adopt the paragraph in its original form, to accept the wording approved by the representative of Denmark or, finally, to adopt the amendment by India as modified by its author.

20. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) thought there were no objections to the wording "conditions in ensuring, maintaining and promoting the economic and social advancement . . ." as proposed by India and accepted by Denmark; there was thus no need to put it to the vote.

21. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) asked whether it was proposed to vote on the first part of the

Indian amendment or on the second part concerning the deletion of the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

22. The CHAIRMAN understood that the representative of India had agreed to delete the second part of his amendment and to replace in the text proposed by him for the first paragraph the words "of all Trust Territories" by the words "of Trust Territories".

23. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) did not see the exact difference between "ensuring" and "promoting".

24. Mr. S. RAO (India) explained that he had taken the word "promoting" from Article 76 of the Charter. He was prepared, however, to delete the words "ensuring" and "maintaining".

25. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) also thought that the word "promoting" would be sufficient.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment with the deletion of the words "ensuring" and "maintaining".

The Indian amendment, as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

27. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), Mr. MANTILLA (Ecuador) and Mr. HAY (Australia) explained that they had been unable to take part in the vote because they had not known exactly what was being voted on.

28. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) suggested to the Chairman that the amendment should be voted on again.

29. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile), supported by Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) and Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark), asked that a new vote should be taken on the Indian amendment in two parts: first, on the deletion of the words "ensuring" and "maintaining" and, secondly, on the replacement of the words "under-developed areas" by the words "the inhabitants of Trust Territories".

30. After a discussion in which Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), Mr. QUE-SADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina), Mr. COQUET (Mexico), Mr. LIU (China), Mr. CRAW (New Zealand), Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Mr. S. RAO (India), Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile), Mr. J. COOPER (United States of America) and Mr. H. COOPER (Liberia) took part, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the paragraph adopted should again be put to the vote.

It was so decided.

31. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) proposed that the meeting should be suspended for half an hour in order to enable the authors of the various proposals and amendments to confer with the Chairman.

That proposal was adopted by 25 votes to 22, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and was resumed at 5.5 p.m.

32. The CHAIRMAN announced that as a result of the consultations held during the adjournment the

representative of India would withdraw the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.84 and substitute the following amendment:

“Replace in the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution the words ‘of under-developed areas’ by the words ‘of the inhabitants of Trust Territories.’”

33. Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Committee) read the first part of the draft resolution as it would appear if the amendment by the Indian delegation were adopted:

“Recognizing that the equitable distribution and proper utilization of the land together constitute one of the essential conditions in ensuring, maintaining and promoting the economic and social advancement of the inhabitants of Trust Territories”.

34. Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) said that the new amendment augmented the confusion which had hitherto characterized the discussion. He explained that, when he had previously voted for the Indian amendment, he had voted in favour of the two corrections that amendment made in the original text, particularly the second, which deleted the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution. Now it would appear that the representative of India was withdrawing the second part of his amendment and Mr. Himiob would like that matter to be explained. If the representative of India was really dropping the second part of his original amendment, Mr. Himiob would now vote against the new amendment, for in his opinion both parts of the original amendment were closely linked.

35. Mr. BIHELLER (Czechoslovakia) asked whether the authors of the joint resolution had agreed to delete the words “ensuring” and “maintaining” and replace them by the word “promoting”.

36. The CHAIRMAN replied that there was joint agreement to keep the three words “ensuring, maintaining and promoting” in the text; the new amendment by India now referred only to the end of the first paragraph.

37. Mr. LIU (China) agreed with the representative of Venezuela and said that whereas he had abstained on the first vote, he would now vote against the Indian amendment if the latter did not propose the simultaneous deletion of the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution. It would not be logical to refer in the first paragraph to a particular case, Trust Territories, and then in the second paragraph pass on to the general case, under-developed areas.

38. Mr. GARREAU (France) also agreed with the representative of Venezuela. His delegation was placed in an embarrassing situation. It was prepared to vote for the new Indian amendment to the first paragraph, in the hope, however, that the second paragraph of the draft resolution would be dropped. But if the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution was replaced by the new Indian amendment, and the second paragraph of the joint draft kept, the text would have no further sense, since all reference in the first paragraph to under-developed areas would have been deleted.

39. Mr. S. RAO (India) asked that, in order to clarify the situation, the draft resolution should be put

to the vote paragraph by paragraph, with the appropriate amendments.

40. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) understood the concern of the representative of France and said that the Fourth Committee certainly shared his desire to vote a coherent text. He proposed the closure of the discussion and the holding of a vote on the amendments and draft resolutions.

It was so decided.

41. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) asked that the vote should be taken by roll-call on the new amendment proposed by India.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Sweden, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Against: United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Philippines.

Abstaining: Greece, Iran, Israel.

The amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 17, with 3 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the text of the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.78), as amended.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The first paragraph of the joint draft resolution as amended was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

44. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) asked that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina.

Against: Belgium, Canada, China, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia.

Abstaining: Brazil, Greece, Iran, Israel, Thailand, Afghanistan.

The second paragraph of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 31 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) wished to explain his vote. He had voted against the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution not because he denied that the Trust Territories were under-developed areas, but because the second paragraph seemed to him to contradict the first paragraph already adopted.

46. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands), Mr. LIU (China), Mr. HIMIOB (Venezuela) and Mr. ISA (Pakistan) expressed the same view.

47. Mr. SALAZAR ROMERO (Peru) stated that he had voted for the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution because he considered the affirmation made in that paragraph essential.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the oral amendment submitted by India to sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution, to the effect that there should be added, after the words "indigenous inhabitants", the words "from the standpoint of the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter".

49. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the significance of the reference to the Charter in the Indian amendment was not altogether clear to him.

50. Mr. S. RAO (India) pointed out that the draft resolution spoke of present and future needs of the indigenous population. It could not therefore be separated from Article 76 of the Charter. It was more-over important to clarify the position of the Trusteeship Council in face of the task it was being asked to assume.

51. Mr. COQUET (Mexico) asked for a vote to be taken by roll-call not only on the Indian amendment, but also on each paragraph of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the amendment proposed by India to sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Iran, Israel.

The Indian amendment to sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 30 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the whole of sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution, as amended.

The Netherlands, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Ecuador, Iran.

The whole of sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on sub-paragraph (b) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ecuador, Iran.

Sub-paragraph (b) of the third paragraph of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the fourth and last paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina,

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ecuador, Iran.

The fourth and last paragraph of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the whole text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.78), as amended.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The whole text of the joint draft resolution as amended was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

53. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) pointed out that he had voted on the Spanish interpretation of the amendments submitted. He must therefore make full reservation in the case of an error in the interpretation.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.