

UNITED NATIONS  
**ECONOMIC AND  
 SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
 OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **413th**  
 MEETING  
 TUESDAY, 15 AUGUST 1950, AT 3 P.M.  
 PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Technical assistance for economic development (concluded): (b) Expanded programme of technical assistance for the economic development of under-developed countries (E/1733). . . . .	331	General Assembly resolution 331 (IV): "Inter- national collaboration in regard to economic, social and educational conditions in non-self- governing territories" (E/1714) . . . . .	337
Forced labour (E/1671) . . . . .	331	General Assembly resolution 266 (III): "Problems of the economic development and social progress of the former Italian Colonies" (E/1581, E/1581/ Corr.1 and E/1758/Rev.1) . . . . .	339
Trusteeship Council resolution 110 (V): "Higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa" (E/1707) . . . . .	337		

*President:* Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

*Present:* Representatives of the following countries:  
 Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Den-  
 mark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru,  
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,  
 United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized  
 agencies:

International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture  
 Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and  
 Cultural Organization, International Monetary Fund,  
 World Health Organization.

**Technical assistance for economic development (con-  
 cluded)**

(b) EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
 FOR THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDER-  
 DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (E/1733)

1. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India), Chairman of  
 the Economic Committee, expressed regret that he had  
 omitted to draw the Council's attention at the previous  
 meeting to the report by the Secretary-General on the  
 Technical Assistance Conference (E/1733). He suggested  
 that the Council should take note of that report and  
 express satisfaction with it.

2. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that the  
 report was of necessity brief and factual, and that  
 consequently it did not reveal the fact that the Con-  
 ference had in three days achieved successful results, a  
 result which was largely due to the brilliant chairmanship  
 of the President of the Council, to whom the United  
 States Government was very grateful, and to the  
 excellent preparatory work done by the Secretariat, in  
 particular the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of

the Department of Economic Affairs and the Director  
 of the Division of Economic Stability and Development.

3. The PRESIDENT said that the task of presiding  
 over the Conference had been made easy by the excellent  
 preparatory work done by the Secretariat and by the  
 obvious determination of all countries represented at the  
 conference to co-operate in carrying out United Nations  
 technical assistance plans.

4. He suggested that the Council adopt the following  
 resolution:

*"The Economic and Social Council*

*Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the  
 Secretary-General on the Technical Assistance Confer-  
 ence held in June 1950 (E/1733) in accordance with  
 Council resolution 222 A (IX) and General Assembly  
 resolution 304 (IV)."*

5. He also suggested that it be incorporated in the  
 resolution on technical assistance passed by the Council  
 at the 412th meeting.

*It was so agreed.*

**Forced labour (E/1671)**

6. The PRESIDENT, recalling the decision made by  
 the Council at its 366th meeting during its tenth session  
 to defer further discussion of the problem of forced  
 labour, and also reminding the Council that it had  
 accepted the recommendation of the Committee on  
 Non-governmental Organizations that it grant the  
 representatives of the International Confederation of  
 Free Trade Unions and the World Federation of Trade  
 Unions a hearing on the subject, invited comments on  
 the communication of the Director-General of the Inter-  
 national Labour Office concerning the question of a

survey of forced labour and measures for its abolition (E/1671) and on the draft resolution (E/L.104) submitted jointly by the United Kingdom and the United States delegations.

7. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that the Council's recent discussion on item 24 of its agenda, the report of the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Slavery, which had been set up to inquire into the last survivals of that ancient and vicious system, at present confined to a few remote regions and well on its way to final extinction, had recalled the classic symbols of slavery, such as men crowded into the hold of a slave ship, or chained to the oars of galleys, or the slave market or the tropical plantation. At its present meeting, the Council had to consider a modern system of forced labour, which had a different set of symbols, such as the filthy cattle trucks packed to suffocation with men and women, the barbed-wire fence, the police car arriving at dead of night, and the vast concentration camps stretched out across the frozen wastes of Siberia. The two systems had much in common. Both of them at different times had been given legal status. Both formed an essential part of the economic system of the countries where they were practised. But while the old system of slavery was dying out, the modern system of forced labour was increasing and spreading from country to country.

8. The unexpected reversal of the progress made during the last 150 years towards greater freedom was so unexpected that many people still found it difficult to believe. But people had found it difficult to believe the horrors of Nazi concentration camps until terrible and graphic evidence had been produced, and there were still people who insisted that the Nazi concentration camps had never really existed. In the same way, there were still people who, in spite of the testimony of numerous witnesses and the publication of official documents of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, did not believe in the existence of the Soviet forced labour system and in the horrors of concentration camps such as those at Dalstroi in Eastern Siberia and Karaganda in the central Asian desert.

9. At the ninth session of the Council, the United Kingdom delegation had made clear from official USSR documents, and in particular the *Corrective Labour Codex of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic*,

- (a) That in the USSR people were condemned to forced labour without trial in a court of law;
- (b) That people were condemned not only for ordinary crimes, but for holding opinions contrary to those of the USSR Government; and
- (c) That the forced labour camps and colonies provided the Soviet Union with an immense supply of cheap, regimented and mobile labour.

10. Parts of the *Codex* had been so shocking that members of the Council could hardly have been blamed if they had doubted its authenticity, and therefore the United Kingdom delegation had provided them and the Press with photostatic copies.

11. The United Kingdom delegation was at that moment circulating facsimile reproductions of other official documents with English translations. That additional material, which included most of the texts he was about to quote, made clear two significant features of the problem: the first was that people could be condemned and exiled to Siberia even when their innocence was admitted by the USSR authorities, which condemned them on the grounds that they were related to a person alleged to have committed an offence; the other was that the system of forced labour was spreading with dangerous rapidity in the countries within the USSR sphere of influence. He would take Czechoslovakia as an example.

12. USSR law was clearly in contradiction with article 10 of the Declaration of Human Rights, which affirmed that:

"Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him",

for paragraph 8 of the *Corrective Labour Codex of the RSFSR* read:

"Persons are directed to corrective labour who have been sentenced there by:

"(a) Sentence in a court of law

"(b) Decree of an administrative organ".

13. But, in addition to those facts, which he had made clear at the ninth session of the Council, further evidence had been obtained by the United Kingdom Government. Article 283, paragraph 8, of the Ordinance of the Central Executive Committee, which was included in the collection of laws of the USSR Government No. 36 of 19 July 1934, signed by Mr. Kalinin and Mr. Enukidze read:

"Under the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs, USSR, a special council is to be organized, which, on the basis of regulations laid down for it, is to have the power of applying, as an administrative measure, expulsion, exile, imprisonment in corrective labour camps for a period of up to five years and expulsion beyond the confines of the USSR."

The words "as an administrative measure" meant that a man could be condemned to forced labour or exile without any trial in a court of law.

14. Another ordinance of the Central Executive Committee, signed by Mr. Kalinin and others on 5 November 1934, made it clear that people were condemned in the USSR for holding political or religious views which the Government considered heretical. For the ordinance simply laid down a number of "measures against people who are regarded as socially dangerous" including confinement in corrective labour camps for a period of up to five years without there being any mention of the question of guilt. It was specifically stated in the article beginning in column 603 of volume 29 of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*, an official publication of the State Publishing House in Moscow, that:

"In corrective labour establishments a strict class policy is carried out, and class-hostile elements are not permitted to enjoy the privileges laid down for

those persons deprived of freedom who are of working-class origin”.

15. The USSR representative, at the 319th meeting of the ninth session<sup>1</sup> of the Council, had tried to explain that the purpose of the forced labour camps and colonies was simply to re-educate and reform the inmates; such a contention was flatly contradicted by the official *Soviet Encyclopaedia*, which contained an article on corrective labour including the following passage:

“The wholesale denial of the possibility of re-educating criminals from among class-hostile elements [cannot be admitted] . . . On the other hand, that view is also incorrect which regards corrective labour establishments as purely educative or even purely economic establishments and in this way glosses over the elements of compulsion in the work of corrective labour establishments and slips into a denial of the class question in the carrying out of corrective labour policy and into a refusal to carry out the tasks of crushing class-hostile elements and corruptive elements.”

16. The encyclopædia also drew attention to the school of thought which regarded forced labour purely as an economic system. Forced labour had played a vital part in the economy of the USSR and in particular in the economic development of its more remote areas, where climatic and other conditions were particularly harsh. But the *Encyclopædia*, like the *Codex*, made it absolutely clear that the primary purpose of the forced labour system was to crush those who disagreed with the Communist Party and its leaders. Article 22 of the basic criminal code of the USSR read:

“Punishment in the form of exile can be applied by a sentence of the state prosecutor against persons recognized as being socially dangerous, without any criminal proceedings being taken against these persons on charges of committing a specific crime or of a specific offence and also, even in those cases where these persons are acquitted by a court of the accusation of committing a specific crime.”

That article showed that, in the USSR, punishment was awarded to people who had not committed a crime or an offence, but who disagreed with the Government's policy, or who were merely suspected of being capable of disagreeing with the Government's policy and were therefore considered socially dangerous. In addition, persons whose sole responsibility for a crime lay in their being related to the person accused were punished for the crime. Article 58 1c of the section on counter-revolutionary crimes in the *Criminal Codex of the RSFSR* published by the USSR Ministry of Justice in 1948 read:

“In the event of flight abroad by land or air of a member of the armed forces, the adult members of his family, if they in any way assisted the preparation or the commission of this act of treason, or even if they knew of it but failed to report it to the authorities, are

to be punished; by deprivation of liberty for a period of from five to ten years and confiscation of all property.

“The remaining adult members of the traitor's family [that was those persons who neither assisted nor were even aware of the intention to desert] and those living with him or dependent on him at the time of the commission of the crime, are liable to deprivation of their electoral rights and to exile to the remote areas of Siberia for a period of five years.”

17. It had long been known that hard punishments were inflicted on the innocent relatives of persons who escaped from the USSR, but he had still been shocked to see in cold print that text which had been issued by the Soviet Ministry of Justice at the very time when the USSR representative, Mr. Pavlov, was making speeches about human rights at the Paris session of the General Assembly. There was much more material in the documents the United Kingdom delegation had had distributed to prove many times over again the truth of what he had said.

18. The USSR authorities were notoriously reluctant to publish facts and figures, and had obvious reasons for not wanting to admit how large a percentage of the people of that country were condemned to forced labour. If, as he believed, a large proportion of the population of the USSR was, in fact, working in forced labour camps and colonies, then either the Soviet system had produced an infinitely higher proportion of criminals than any other social system or else the regime was unpopular and only maintained by force and the mass imprisonment of its opponents. The United Kingdom Government had expressed the view in 1948, after careful calculations based on such figures as were then available, that there were more than 10 million people condemned to forced labour in the USSR. Perhaps the actual figure was at present greater than 10 millions, since there had recently been mass deportations from some of the smaller countries of the USSR. About 3 million people from the Baltic States and from Moslem communities such as that of the Chechens had been deported to Siberia or Central Asia. If the figure was wrong, the USSR authorities might follow the example of other countries in which regular criminal and prison statistics were published, and give exact figures of persons undergoing forced labour.

19. Some relevant though incomplete figures had, however, been published: for instance the figure of 127,000 forced labourers who had received some kind of amnesty after being employed on the construction of the Baltic White Sea and the Moscow Volga Canals. That figure was approximately equal to the total prison population of the entire Russian Empire in 1914. The average prison population of England and Wales during the last ten years had varied between 9,000 and 19,000, which the United Kingdom Government thought unpleasantly high; yet the USSR authorities had amnestied 127,000 prisoners employed on only two of their countless forced labour projects. The USSR Foreign Minister himself had admitted that there were many such projects, for in 1931, when the forced labour system was still in its infancy, he had said: “Mass projects employing those deprived of liberty are organized for a variety of different

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifth Year, Ninth Session, 319th meeting.*

objectives: for highway construction . . . in the building industry, in peat exploitation . . . in metallurgical plants [etc.]" The authors of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* had made no attempt to conceal the size of the forced labour contingent. It contained the statements:

"A brilliant example of success of Soviet corrective labour policy is the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal named after Stalin where tens of thousands of prisoners received labour habits and qualifications.

"The grandiose victories of socialism on all fronts made possible the wide employment of labour criminals in the general channel of socialist construction in the process of which the criminals are transformed into toilers of socialist society. At the present stage it has become possible to begin also the work of re-educating *déclassé* elements from the shattered hostile classes by passing them through the 'testing furnace' of de-kulakisation, isolation and labour coercion.

"With the entry of the USSR into the period of socialism, the possibilities of exerting influence by corrective labour grew to an unlimited degree."

20. As the representative of India had recently pointed out, there had been no unemployment problem in the Nile Valley when thousands of slaves had been made to drag great rocks to build the Pyramids. There had been little talk of unemployment in the old slave plantations. At the present time, the rulers of the USSR were boasting that they had eliminated unemployment; if they had done so, it was at the price of unlimited forced labour. The official USSR publications alone provided overwhelming evidence that the amount of forced labour in the USSR was immense and that it was a fundamental part of the USSR economy and a means of crushing all opposition and independent thought in that country.

21. Perhaps Czechoslovakia was the most painful example of a country to which the system of forced labour had spread. The introduction of the five-year plan for that country in October 1948 had been accompanied by the promulgation of law 247 concerning forced labour camps. The authors of that law had made no attempt to disguise such camps as educational institutions. Possibly the Czechoslovak forced labour camps were the least inhumane of such communist institutions, but they constituted a wholesale violation of human rights. The law contained no provisions for a trial of any sort. Section 2 of the law began with the words:

"To the camp shall be sent:

"(a) Persons who have reached the age of 18 and are not older than 60 and are physically and mentally fit but shirk work or menace the structure of the People's Democratic Order or national economy . . .";

section 3 with the words:

"A commission of three, whose members and deputies shall be nominated by the Regional National Committees, shall decide upon sending persons to a camp, upon the duration of their term, etc. . .";

and in section 5 it was simply stated that: "An appeal lodged against a decision under section 3 has no delaying effect." There was no suggestion in the law that those

condemned to forced labour should have legal advice or be heard in their own defence. Probably the first time they heard of the charge against them was when the police came to their house in the middle of the night and removed them to the camp. The United Kingdom delegation had circulated to delegations a specimen decree of the type issued through the security police, although paragraph 24 of the regulations showed that an arrest could be made in anticipation of the issue of a decree. It was true that the victim had the theoretical right to appeal against the arbitrary decision of the Commission, but in the meantime he would be subjected to forced labour and his business might be taken over and his wife and family turned out of their house. The law amounted to sheer terrorism and political oppression.

22. When a country like Czechoslovakia, which had once been most progressive, was being engulfed as it was at present in the rising tide of forced labour, the danger of freedom everywhere was clear. The United Kingdom delegation had repeatedly suggested that the United Nations should investigate forced labour on the spot. But the Governments of the USSR and Czechoslovakia had refused to permit such investigations inside their territory. As had been pointed out at the ninth session, the USSR delegation to the Council had even refused to agree to an investigation in the USSR by a commission of trade unions, such as it had itself proposed. The United Kingdom delegation would not oppose a further effort to persuade the USSR and other countries to agree to an investigation on the spot, although the documents he had quoted showed that there was little justification for hope that such an effort would be successful. In the meantime, while an investigation on the spot was not possible, the United Kingdom and the United States delegations had proposed, by jointly submitting a draft resolution (E/L.104), an alternative form of study, which would be of more limited value than an actual investigation on the spot, but the best that could be done in the present circumstances. The suggestion was that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office should appoint a small *ad hoc* committee to consider the evidence on the subject already produced both inside and outside the Council, to make such other inquiries as it might see fit, to summarize the evidence, draw conclusions and present a balanced and objective report. Such action would be of help both to the Council and to the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation. The two delegations had suggested that the committee should consist of five independent members, especially competent to deal with the problem. The Council might appoint a judge or other person with great experience in weighing evidence as one member, a man with experience of labour relations as another, and as another member a man with personal experience and wide knowledge of concentration camps, preferably in Germany, since some one who had escaped from other concentration camps might lay the committee open to charges of not being impartial. The two delegations had tried to draft clear terms of reference for the committee, providing that it should not duplicate the work already being done by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Slavery and that, without its interest being confined to any

particular part of the world, it would pay special attention to mass forced labour used for economic or political purposes; for they hoped that the committee would devote its main efforts to combating the threat to civilizations both in the east and in the west and arresting the processes of suppressing freedoms dearly won in one country after another.

23. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the discussions on the subject of forced labour at the eighth, ninth and tenth sessions of the Council had brought out two shocking facts. The first was the existence in the present so-called "enlightened" age of slave labour conditions as cruel as any in history. It had become evident to all people in free countries, except to the blind and those who wished to keep their eyes closed, that thousands were being deprived of human rights, and that families were being separated and herded into concentration camps, which it had been hoped would have ceased to exist with the defeat of the Nazi regime. Perhaps one of the most terrifying facts of the present situation was that, while the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a member of the United Nations and of the Economic and Social Council, was the country which had initiated the practice of forced labour and compelled other countries to adopt it, it was posing as a liberator of the oppressed masses of the people of the world. The second fact was that, so far, the Council had been able to do little towards solving the problem of forced labour; for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its friends, while admitting the existence of forced labour, had refused to give information about living conditions, mortality rates and the types of work performed in forced labour camps or, in fact, any information about those camps which would help the United Nations to attain its objectives and guarantee peace. Speeches about forced labour in the USSR and its satellite countries made clear man's inhumanity to man in those countries, but they were not enough. The United Nations had found a way of taking military action to combat aggression; it must also find a way of combating other forms of violation of the United Nations Charter and the ruthless exploitation of masses of individual human beings who were subjected to forced labour. Unfortunately, the Council could not do much more to help the miserable human beings in communist concentration camps, but it could and should do much more to correct mistaken concepts in free countries about conditions in communist countries.

24. To help correct such mistaken concepts, he would quote some additional facts about conditions in those countries.

25. The Grand National Assembly of Roumania, at its seventh ordinary session, had on 30 May 1950 approved, of course unanimously, after only one day's debate, a long new National Labour Code, whose authors admitted that they had been inspired by corresponding instruments of the USSR; the Code provided, *inter alia*, that "Roumanian citizens, in exceptional cases such as calamities and important State projects, may be called for temporary compulsory labour". Those words might seem rather weak to those who were familiar with the daily arrests that were made in Roumania. The words

"in exceptional cases" and "temporary" were far from being precise; perhaps the latter denoted a temporary final period of life on earth.

26. On 24 March 1949, the following passages, which had not been denied by the Czechoslovak authorities, had appeared in the *New York Times*:

"He [the Czechoslovak Minister of the Interior] said he would need 10,637,952,000 crowns (212,759,040 dollars) this year compared with 3,879,983,000 crowns (77,597,860 dollars) in 1949. Expenditures for internal security will exceed those for national defence by more than 1,000,000,000 crowns.

"The Interior Ministry's own income [he observed significantly] will increase by about one-third over last year's, thanks to increased revenues from the forced labour camps as well as from the *Official Gazette* and the sale of pamphlets."

27. He did not suppose that the revenue from the sale of the *Official Gazette* and the pamphlets was very large. The information showed that forced labour had become an integral part of the Czechoslovak economy, as it was of the economy of the USSR and other communist countries. On 11 August 1950, the information agency Reuter had despatched from Prague the following message: "The Czechoslovak Government to-day announced the setting up of labour camps where security offenders could be sent for periods of up to two years." That announcement was a clear admission by the Czechoslovak Government that it was its policy to send security offenders to labour camps.

28. On 25 April 1950, the *New York Times* had contained the information—said to be the best available—that so far between 800,000 and 1,000,000 Lithuanians out of a total population of less than 3,000,000, more than 500,000 Latvians out of a total population of 2,000,000, and more than 200,000 Estonians out of a population of 1,150,000, had been deported from those countries, most of them at less than one hour's notice without more of their belongings than they could themselves carry.

29. Conditions in the eastern zone of Germany, in particular in the uranium mines there, had been described by the representative of the American Federation of Labor and the head of the United States delegation at the tenth session of the Council. Recently, the German Social Democratic Party had published a sickening document, describing conditions there in great detail. He would quote from that document part of a passage reproducing a letter to the wife of a man who had escaped. The letter read:

"From Labour Office Teltow-Mahlow  
Branch Office Zossen 21 March 1949

"To Mrs. Frieda Heyer

"Concerning your assignment to work in Aue

"The medical examination has revealed your capacity for the contemplated assignment from here to Aue for work. You are therefore requested to present yourself at the Labour Office in Aue with the installation assignment card and to begin working in Aue in place of your husband who has made his own employment there impossible by fleeing with your knowledge and your help. (Signed) NITSCHKE."

The letter made it clear that the order that she should go to work in her husband's place was based on a medical examination; there was no mention in the letter of a court of law finding her guilty of conniving at her husband's escape. The authors of the document had pointed out the intolerable position of women in forced labour camps in the eastern zone of Germany; they had stated that they were considered fair game both for USSR soldiers and German workers, that to live they had to make friends with many of those men, that they were compelled to work until six weeks before giving birth and that their babies were thereafter soon taken away from them so that they could resume work.

30. He could continue citing similarly appalling facts for a long time and speak about the sufferings of the numerous people in Hungary who were without news of members of their families, and of the disappearance of thousands of German and Japanese prisoners of war in the USSR.

31. Surely it was obvious that the situation called for preventive action. Some such action could be taken at the national level; laws such as those in his own country could be passed forbidding forced labour. Efforts should be made to throw light on the intolerable conditions such as those he had described. That was the purpose of the draft resolution submitted jointly by the United States and the United Kingdom delegations. It provided for the assumption of joint responsibility for that task by the International Labour Organisation and the United Nations; the United States delegation felt that, if both organizations were not made responsible, some countries might be provided with an easy excuse for not complying with any recommendations that were made. He hoped that five specially competent and impartial individuals would be appointed members of the committee suggested in the draft resolution, and that the committee would inquire particularly into the existence, in any part of the world, of systems of forced or corrective labour which were employed as a means of political coercion or punishment for holding or expressing political views which were on such a scale as to constitute an important element in the economy of a given country. The action for which the draft resolution provided might not be as far-reaching as some members of the Council desired, but he hoped the Council would adopt it since it was the best that was possible in the present circumstances and would represent a step forward.

32. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) said that he was grateful to the United States and the United Kingdom delegations for the evidence they had produced of horrors which were becoming increasingly clear to people in free countries.

33. The Canadian delegation, while it condemned the practice of forced labour and those governments and authorities who indulged in that practice, and while it was in favour of action to make it clear that such practices were acts of savage barbarity, thought that the main problem confronting the Council was how it could bring the prevention of such practices any nearer. It was a very difficult problem with which the Council had repeatedly tried to come to grips. It had asked the Secretary-General to ask governments how far they were willing to co-operate in an effort to solve the problem of

forced labour. The disappointing replies from countries against whom charges of forced labour had been made had shown that the governments of those countries would not co-operate in the solution of the growing problem of forced labour in the same way as all governments had expressed a readiness to co-operate in eliminating the last vestiges of the problem of slavery. In view of the difficult position, most careful consideration should be given to the specific suggestion contained in the draft resolution submitted jointly by the United Kingdom and United States delegations before the Council took a decision on it; for the Council could not afford to set up a body to study forced labour which would fail in its task. There would not be sufficient time before the remaining items on the Council's agenda were completed for governments to give the suggestion in the draft resolution adequate consideration. The Council should not set up machinery for dealing with forced labour, unless it was convinced such machinery would be effective. He would therefore propose that the Council adjourn the debate on forced labour and not take a decision on the joint draft resolution until its next session in the hope that Member Governments would give the suggestion in the draft resolution careful consideration before that session. He was aware that there might be objections to delay in taking action on the problem, but adjournment of the debate would be justified by the fact that it would be easier at the next session to determine whether the machinery proposed by the United States and United Kingdom delegations would be suitable. He would assume, unless some member of the Council expressed a view to the contrary, that, if the debate were adjourned, the International Labour Organisation would await a further communication from the Council following the discussions which would take place at the next session of the Council before taking further action in the matter.

34. Invoking rule 49 of the Council's rules of procedure, he moved the adjournment of the debate on the item until the next session of the Council.

35. The PRESIDENT said that, before the motion was put to the vote, only two representatives might speak, one for and one against the motion.

36. Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that he wished to support the motion for adjournment. In the view of his Government, the question of forced labour posed a number of difficult problems on which it did not seem possible to take effective action at the present stage.

37. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he would not formally oppose the motion, but he would abstain when it was put to the vote, because he felt that, although the arguments adduced by the Canadian representative deserved to be considered, effective action should be taken on the subject as soon as possible.

38. The PRESIDENT put the Canadian representative's motion to the vote.

*The motion was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

39. In reply to Mr. Cumes (Australia), the PRESIDENT said that it was not in order for him to ask the representative of the International Labour Organisation for its views on the decision just taken.

40. Mr. JENKS (International Labour Office) evinced a desire to speak on a point of order.

41. The PRESIDENT ruled that no comments on the subject of forced labour would be in order at a meeting of the Council until its next session.

**Trusteeship Council resolution 110 (V): "Higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa" (E/1707)**

42. The PRESIDENT recalled that the item on the Council's agenda relating to higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa had originated in the resolution adopted by the Trusteeship Council at its fifth session on 19 July 1949 and inviting the Economic and Social Council to take into account the higher educational needs of the Trust Territories in its study of programmes of technical assistance to under-developed areas. The Secretary-General had submitted a note on the problem (E/1707) to which was appended a draft resolution which the Council might wish to adopt. The United States had submitted an amendment to that draft resolution (E/L.84) proposing the inclusion therein of two additional paragraphs.

43. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) said that the Mexican delegation supported the draft resolution in the Secretary-General's note and also the United States amendment (E/L.84). Both were useful and important.

44. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation would be prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General, but believed that it was desirable that further emphasis should be placed on the contribution which could appropriately be made in developing higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa by the Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee. It was the purpose of the amendment to ensure full and proper co-ordination between all the bodies concerned in the application of the technical assistance programmes. The Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee should be prepared to receive requests from Administering Authorities in accordance with the Trusteeship Council resolution 110 (V) and the Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX), paragraph 9 (d). The second paragraph of the amendment (E/L.84) formed a practical corollary to the Trusteeship Council's resolution by providing for consultation between the President of the Economic and Social Council and the President of the Trusteeship Council.

45. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) supported both the draft resolution contained in the Secretary-General's note (E/1707) and the United States amendment thereto (E/L.84). He expressed the earnest hope that the Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee would, assuming that the draft

resolution and the amendment were adopted by the Council, pay special attention to the higher educational needs of Trust Territories. Indeed, in his view, that problem should be given the highest possible priority.

46. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) supported the Secretary-General's draft resolution and the United States amendment thereto. Economic and social matters were usually treated on a functional basis, and no distinction was made between sovereign States and non-self-governing territories, full information upon which was always supplied by the United Kingdom in its capacity as an Administering Authority. The United Kingdom had a good record in the matter. On the assumption, however, that the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution and the amendment thereto were, in regard to the past a statement of fact, and in regard to the present a reference to existing practice, he would be prepared to support them.

47. The PRESIDENT ruled that the general discussion was closed. He put to the vote the United States amendment (E/L.84) to the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1707).

*The amendment was adopted unanimously.*

48. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1707).

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

**General Assembly resolution 331 (IV): "International collaboration in regard to economic, social and educational conditions in non-self-governing territories (E/1714)"**

49. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the account given by the Secretary-General in document E/1714 of the action taken under the terms of the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, and particularly resolution 331 (IV) on international collaboration with regard to economic, social and educational conditions in non-self-governing territories. The draft resolution suggested by the Secretary-General should be examined together with the amendment submitted thereto by the United States (E/L.85). The latter proposed the insertion of an additional paragraph in the Secretary-General's draft resolution whereby the attention of the Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee would be drawn to the provisions laid down in General Assembly resolution 331 (IV).

50. That amendment was similar to the first paragraph of the United States amendment submitted to the Secretary-General's draft resolution on higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa (E/1707), which the Council had just adopted.

51. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the United States amendment to the Secretary-General's draft resolution contained in document E/1714 had been submitted for the same reasons as had prompted the amendment to the Secretary-General's resolution on higher education in the Trust Territories in Africa (E/1707).

52. Mr. Arnold SMITH (Canada) stated that his delegation would support the Secretary-General's draft resolution as given in document E/1714 as well as the United States amendment thereto (E/L.85). His delegation noted with some concern that only two administering authorities, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, had availed themselves of the opportunities offered them under the technical assistance programmes of the United Nations and specialized agencies. Other administering authorities should follow that example and should endeavour to derive benefit for the non-self-governing territories which they administered, from such international help as was available. He earnestly hoped that the technical assistance programmes would make a positive contribution to the advancement of the peoples living in non-self-governing territories and that the responsible authorities would not hesitate to take advantage of existing international facilities.
53. Mr. DE LACHARRIÈRE (France) said he wished to make a reservation in regard to the distinction between non-self-governing and self-governing territories. Such a distinction might exist in politics, but was futile in the economic and social field, with which the Council was concerned, since certain problems arose in the same way for all regions where economic and social development was similar, whether such regions were self-governing or not.
54. In any case, the notion of non-self-governing territories was extremely obscure; there were degrees of self-government, and it was difficult to establish when a territory was freely administered. In that connexion, he quoted the example of the City of Paris.
55. When the United Nations Charter was drawn up, several definitions of non-self-governing territories were proposed, but none was adopted. The States which transmitted information under Article 73 of the Charter had intimated in doing so that they regarded it as within their national competence to decide which were the territories on which they were to supply such information. France, for example, transmitted information on a number of territorial entities belonging to the French Union without affirming *ipso facto* that those territories were necessarily non-self-governing territories as defined by the Charter.
56. Those reservations related in the main to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General and the United States amendment to it. Consequently, the French delegation would have to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.
57. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) said that his delegation was in favour of both the Secretary-General's draft resolution (E/1714) and the United States amendment (E/L.85) to it.
58. The Chilean delegation supported the Canadian representative's observations that countries administering non-self-governing territories should avail themselves of the existing international technical assistance facilities following the example of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.
59. His delegation did not share the French representative's view. The analogy between the self-government of the City of Paris and that of territories like the Cameroons and the Congo did not seem to hold good. He did not agree that the distinction between self-governing and non-self-governing territories affected the political aspect of the question to the exclusion of its economic and social aspects. Indeed, it was the progress made in the economic and social fields that enabled political self-government to be achieved. The General Assembly at its next session would be discussing the important question of the "colonial clause", and the necessity for including such a clause in the draft covenant on human rights. The French representative had told the Social Committee that a colonial clause was essential, it being understood that the people living in non-self-governing territories would be called upon to express their opinion. He wondered how such a statement in the Social Committee could be reconciled with the statements just made by the French representative.
60. If there was a distinction from the social point of view between self-governing and non-self-governing territories, the distinction was still more obvious on the economic side. However, as the Council's session was drawing to a close, he would not make a full statement on the economic relations between the non-self-governing territories and the administering authorities.
61. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that he did not wish to comment in detail on the issues raised by the Chilean representative, but would point out that the administering authorities had definite obligations to respect the constitutional developments which were taking place in non-self-governing territories. That was the reason which had governed the attitude of his delegation on the so-called "colonial clause".
62. Since, in his view, the draft resolution proposed by the Secretary-General (E/1714) was conceived in terms of a functional approach to the economic and social problems of the world as a whole, he was prepared to support it, but on the understanding, as he had stated in connexion with item 8, that it consecrated existing facts and practice.
63. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) also disagreed with the French representative's views and his comparison between the non-self-governing territories and the City of Paris. The Mexican delegation was surprised to observe such an attitude at a time when Member States should display their unity and strengthen international co-operation, that they should forget that the need for international co-operation was stressed in the United Nations Charter. At the last session of the General Assembly, several delegations had in the Fourth Committee voted against the transmission of information concerning non-self-governing territories, while others took advantage of the degree of self-government granted to certain territories to state that they would cease transmitting information. Although the words "international co-operation" had not always been given full weight in the Fourth Committee, the position should, he thought, be different in the Economic and Social Council, whose members should keep Article 74 of the Charter in mind.



64. Mr. MASOIN (Belgium) agreed in principle with the view that administering authorities should use international technical assistance facilities.

65. The reason why Belgium had not applied for technical assistance facilities for the development of the Belgian Congo, for instance, was because she had already prepared and launched a vast programme spread over a period of ten years. Belgium might, nevertheless, apply for such assistance in the future, should an occasion arise.

66. He regretted that, since discussion had not remained on the purely technical level, but had been transferred to the legal and political plane, he would be obliged to abstain from voting on the resolution.

67. The PRESIDENT ruled that, since there were no more speakers, the general discussion on item 7 of the agenda was closed.

68. He put to the vote the United States amendment (E/L.85) to the draft resolution contained in document E/1714.

*The amendment was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

69. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1714).

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

**General Assembly resolution 266 (III): "Problems of the economic development and social progress of the former Italian colonies" (E/1581, E/1581/Corr.1, and E/1758/Rev.1)**

70. The PRESIDENT, on behalf of the Council, welcomed the United Nations Commissioner in Libya, whom he invited to make a statement before the general discussion on item 2 of the agenda took place. The Council had before it the Secretary-General's note on problems of economic development and social progress of the former Italian colonies (E/1581 and E/1581/Corr.1) and his note (E/1758/Rev.1) transmitting a communication from the United Nations Commissioner in Libya, containing a draft resolution and also a joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United States (E/L.103).

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Pelt (United Nations Commissioner in Libya) took a seat at the Council table.*

71. Mr. PELT (United Nations Commissioner in Libya), thanking the President for giving him an opportunity of addressing the Council, said he proposed to amplify the views which, in his capacity as United Nations Commissioner in Libya, he had expressed in the communication which he was authorized to make to the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the General Assembly's resolution 289 A (IV). That communication (E/1758/Rev.1) had called attention to the special responsibilities of the United Nations towards Libya and to the latter's undeniable need for technical

and financial assistance, which should be given, not only during the transitional period which must elapse before that country became a member of the United Nations, but for a longer period. Clearly recognizing that the former Italian colonies would be faced with serious economic and social problems, the General Assembly had, by its resolution 266 (III), requested the Council to take the problems of economic development and social progress of those territories into consideration when studying and planning its activities in connexion with the economically under-developed regions and countries. The resolution had been adopted even though the Assembly had not been able to reach agreement on the future of all those colonies.

72. By its resolution 289 (IV), the General Assembly had decided that Libya should become an independent and united State not later than 1 January 1952. The United Nations had thus obviously assumed a special responsibility towards the Libyan people, a responsibility which was not limited to aiding them to draw up a constitution and achieve political independence, but which also entailed helping that people to organize an effective administration suited to their needs and capacities and to build up a sound economy which would enable the new State to live and develop. Independence could be lasting only if it were supported by effective administration and by a sound economic and social policy. The Libyan people had made a start towards establishing their political independence. A committee composed of twenty-one representatives of Cyrenaica, Tripolitania and the Fezzan was at that moment in session in Tripoli and was engaged in drawing up a plan for the convocation and composition of the national assembly, which would draft the Constitution and decide upon the form of the future government of Libya. But the establishment of an administration and the laying of the economic foundations for the new State also demanded the attention of the United Nations.

73. The Libyan people desired and needed a great deal of technical and financial assistance. He had been constantly asked both by the leaders of the people and by the rank-and-file to bring them such assistance. The Libyan people were deeply grateful to the United Nations for having voted their independence, but they now looked to the United Nations and the specialized agencies, as much as to the administering Powers, for help in implementing that decision.

74. Libya was very much an under-developed country. Its indigenous people had been denied educational and other opportunities under fascist rule and, although the administering Powers had made considerable efforts to improve the educational system and to train Libyans in the tasks of administration, time and money had been wanting. Despite great improvement, there were still very few people with the training and experience needed to run the modest administration of the future State. The Libyan people were, moreover, fully aware that they must acquire greater skill in order effectively to exploit the resources of their country.

75. Those resources were scant. No sub-soil mineral resources had been found in sufficient quantities to justify commercial exploitation. Land and water were

the only natural resources, and water was scarce. The margin for export was uneven. The administering Powers had to cover a deficit of nearly 5 million dollars. But the thorough studies which had already been made by them had shown that a viable though modest agricultural economy could be developed and would suffice to keep the country going on a reasonable basis.

76. The United Kingdom had already requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to initiate a comprehensive exploratory survey of the economic situation of Cyrenaica and Tripolitania under the terms of the expanded programme of technical assistance. It had suggested that a team of experts should survey the economic situation and draw up a long-term development programme with recommendations for implementation by stages based on plans for capital investment, whereby minimum initial capital investment would be ensured, succeeding stages being financed from accruing wealth. The studies proposed in the economic field ranged from agriculture to the establishment of secondary processing industries and the supply of cheap power for agriculture and industry. The Secretary-General would no doubt carefully consider those proposals in the light of the findings of the preparatory mission on technical assistance to Libya dispatched by him, which had recently carried out a survey and had completed its report.

77. The United Kingdom had also requested UNESCO to lend assistance in training administrators and junior civil servants. The full details of the programme would be worked out between a representative of UNESCO, who had at Mr. Pelt's request visited Libya, officials of the administering Powers and of the United Nations Mission in Libya. It was intended to form a junior technical and clerical training-centre equipped for training 250 persons. Furthermore, the French and United Kingdom Governments had (under the expanded technical assistance programme) asked for thirty-nine fellowships for the training of administrative personnel and of teachers.

78. A teachers' training-college and the application of a wide educational programme were being planned.

79. In his capacity as United Nations Commissioner in Libya, he had strongly supported the requests made by the French and United Kingdom Governments and hoped that they would be granted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of UNESCO.

80. The Council for Libya, established to aid and advise him in the execution of his task, had recommended that he should draw upon all the available resources of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. That advice had been unanimously reiterated by that council as recently as 2 August 1950. The Council for Libya had on that occasion expressed the opinion that, in view of the decision of the General Assembly, the United Nations had a special responsibility in assisting Libya to establish a sound administrative system as well as a viable economy. It had therefore requested him to examine the probable economic and financial resources as well as the essential expenditure of the future Libyan Government in order that, once it had been constituted, the national assembly of Libya would have at its disposal

all the information necessary to assist it in organizing the future government. The Council had mentioned certain subjects which should be studied as soon as possible in the fields of administration and economic development and had urged him to request the Secretary-General to do all in his power fully to implement, with the co-operation of the administering Powers, the recommendations of the preparatory mission on technical assistance to Libya.

81. Lack of time had made it impossible for him to submit concrete proposals regarding assistance to Libya, but he urged that the Council should recommend to all the authorities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies that they give special and early consideration to such requests for assistance as would be submitted by the administering Powers.

82. The Economic and Social Council should note that a paradoxical situation would arise once Libya had achieved its independence on 1 January 1952. Only States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies could make claims on the technical assistance programme. Meanwhile, it was more than likely that a period of several months would elapse between Libya's achievement of independence and the time when, under the rules and practices of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, the formalities could be completed for it to become a Member of the United Nations, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 289 A (IV), paragraph 11. Thus it might happen that technical assistance for Libya, initiated upon the requests of the French and United Kingdom Governments, acting in their capacity as administering Powers, would lapse immediately the country had become independent. Libya would thus be penalized for attaining independence through a decision taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Complex legal and administrative problems were therefore raised. Since time would be needed to solve them, he would suggest that the Council request the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its next session proposals for the solution of the problem. Technical assistance to Libya should not be interrupted; it should be carried on in orderly fashion for a reasonable period of time after Libya had become independent and until such time as it had become a Member State of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies and was able to submit requests for continued assistance on its own behalf.

83. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) thanked the United Nations Commissioner in Libya for his interesting report and stressed the tremendous responsibility of the United Nations in having to create a new country in such a short space of time and under difficult conditions. He paid tribute to the work done by the United Nations in Libya and to the tireless efforts of the United Nations Commissioner, as well as to the efforts of the administering Powers.

84. Explaining the reasons which had led his delegation to submit the draft resolution (E/L.103) jointly with the United States delegation, he said that as one of the co-authors of General Assembly resolution 266 (III), the Chilean delegation had a very special interest in the

problem of Libya. The reports on Libya showed that, over the very limited period during which the United Nations Mission had functioned, a profound national sentiment had grown up in that country, and internal difficulties had been overcome. Such results were more important in the eyes of the Chilean delegation than all the economic factors, and proved that the United Nations had been right in deciding to proclaim the independence of Libya in the very near future.

85. The joint draft resolution by the Chilean and United States delegations aimed at solving the problems likely to arise between the time when Libya was declared independent and the date of its admission as a Member of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. It was important for the Economic and Social Council to adopt a resolution under which Libya would continue to receive technical assistance during that period.

86. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation would wholeheartedly support both the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1758/Rev.1) and the draft resolution proposed by Chile and the United States (E/L.103). He had heard the statement of the United Nations Commissioner in Libya with the greatest interest and emphasized his Government's concern with regard to the application of the technical assistance programme in Libya. The United Nations Commissioner had drawn a clear and accurate picture of the economic circumstances of a country with a mainly agricultural economy, with unproductive areas and a largely nomadic population. There was a very great deal of work to be done, but it was essential first and foremost to decide along what lines development should be directed.

87. When in June 1949 the United Kingdom had applied to the United Nations for technical assistance to initiate a comprehensive exploratory survey of the economic situation in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica under the expanded programme of technical assistance, it had suggested the study of seven different types of activity. The first related to the development of agriculture and horticulture in arid areas, including the study of the most suitable crops both from the point of view of cultivation and from that of cash returns from local sale. Other suggested studies related to irrigation, to the development of animal husbandry and a meat-canning industry, to soil conservation and afforestation, the latter being closely linked to the former, and necessitating that special attention be given to the use of such types of timber as could find a ready sale on the local market. Further, his Government had also suggested that the long-term possibility of developing secondary industries should be explored and had referred to such industries as canning, olive oil, soap, sponge-fishing, etc. Last, but by no means least, it had drawn attention to the need for developing supplies of cheap power for the benefit of agriculture and industry. His Government had been happy to note that all United Nations missions had consistently stressed the importance of supplies of cheap electric power.

88. It went without saying that all those plans must be conceived in terms of long-range policy. In the light of experience, his Government believed that technical assistance plans for Libya should be drawn up for a period

of from twenty to thirty years, divided into a number of phases and connected with capital investment plans for the first phase at least. The whole question of investment remained an uncertain, though indispensable, factor in the achievement of the plans.

89. One most urgent problem would be by no means solved when Libya became an independent state in 1952. Training in public administration was absolutely essential in order that the country might at least have the nucleus of a civil service. His Government had asked UNESCO to collaborate in a scheme of training-courses to be given locally. It had also proposed candidates from Cyrenaica and Tripolitania for the United Nations fellowship and scholarship programme, to be trained abroad. Although he understood that a number of those applications would be granted, he had gathered that two applications had been rejected because the candidates were deemed not to have reached a sufficiently high standard. He knew that it was difficult to make exceptions to general rules, but would submit that unless Cyrenaica and Tripolitania were able to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the United Nations, it would be difficult, if not well-nigh impossible, to build up a civil service in the country. He therefore made a plea for leniency when considering those candidates.

90. From the point of view of the future of Libya as an independent state, he could not lay too much emphasis on the last part of the joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United States (E/L.103). The help of the United Nations could not be withdrawn after 1 January 1952. It must be continued and should be seen in terms of development plans calculated for a period of from twenty to thirty years.

91. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) expressed his gratitude to the United Nations Commissioner in Libya, as well as to the United Kingdom representative, for their detailed and illuminating statements, which had described circumstances in a territory which had until recently been under the suzerainty of an imperialist Power. Without attempting to gloss over the facts, the United Kingdom representative had confirmed how difficult and how unsatisfactory conditions were in that territory. There was surely a moral to be drawn from those circumstances—namely, that no attention had been given to the development problems of that territory when it was a colony. But it was not only for the Economic and Social Council to take the lesson to heart; the Trusteeship Council should do so also.

92. The United Nations had taken a great responsibility and had embarked upon a new venture in endeavouring to create upon the ruins of colonial domination a new State which would enjoy sovereign power. There were other areas which had lately become independent and which had inherited the same problems, which lacked civil services, trained personnel and skilled industrial and agricultural labour. There was need for surveys, for demonstrations, for investigations and for the application of integrated programmes of economic development. All that must be done for Libya, but certainly also in other areas experiencing similar difficulties. The Technical Assistance Board and the Technical Assistance Committee should devote special attention to the

problems of those areas. He wished to echo the eloquent plea made by the United Kingdom representative for special training facilities for administrators. Circumstances certainly demanded that the usual standards of selection should not be applied too strictly in places like Libya.

93. In his statement, the United Nations Commissioner in Libya had drawn attention to the possibility of an intervening period between the achievement of independence and the time when Libya might become a Member of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. That there could exist any doubt about the new sovereign State's joining the community of nations at once was significant of the conditions and handicaps under which the United Nations now worked.

94. Turning to past history, he recalled that the General Assembly had set the date of 1952 for the independence of Libya, not in the belief that conditions would then be satisfactory and that the United Nations Mission would have accomplished a miracle during its comparatively brief period of work, but because it had wished to give the people of Libya an ideal and a definite goal to strive for. Had action been taken in accordance with the traditions of the imperialist Powers and had emphasis been laid upon the gradual attainment of independence, the date for independence might well have been set in 1972 or 1982. But it would appear that the General Assembly's policy in reducing the period of training and development to a very few years had been justified by the enthusiastic response of the Libyan people. The United Nations Commissioner had made that point very clear. For all those reasons, the Council should draw the General Assembly's attention to the desirability of finding a legal and constitutional solution whereby the hiatus arising out of the transitional period might be bridged and the technical assistance programmes of the United Nations applied without interruption.

95. He wholeheartedly supported the two draft resolutions now before the Council (E/1758/Rev.1 and E/L.103), but held that the Chilean and United States joint draft resolution (E/L.103) would gain if the text of the penultimate paragraph of section B were to be made identical with the text of the penultimate paragraph of the Secretary-General's draft resolution (E/1758/Rev.1). The reference to a special need for early action in Libya was less satisfactory than the requests that due regard should be paid to the technical assistance needs of Libya. Early action had in point of fact been taken, not only by the United Nations but also by several specialized agencies. What was needed now was the full and uninterrupted implementation of the technical assistance programme. He therefore proposed that section B of the joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United States (E/L.103) be amended in the light of his comments.

96. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that the joint draft resolution submitted by his delegation and that of Chile (E/L.103) was intended as a substitute for the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General and included in document E/1758/Rev.1.

97. As for the Indian representative's suggestion, a precise reference emphasizing technical assistance was made in the second paragraph of section A of the joint draft resolution (E/L.103), which was an essential addition to the resolution submitted by the Secretary-General. That paragraph explicitly referred to all the former Italian colonies, which were covered by the terms of General Assembly resolution 266 (III). The sponsors had thought that the reference was sufficiently clear and emphatic, although he agreed that the case of Libya differed from that of other former Italian colonies since it was shortly to become independent and the time factor must therefore be taken into account.

98. Mr. AKHTAR (Pakistan), recalling that Libya had a deficit budget of 5 million dollars and that financial stringency hindered economic development, urged that every possible step be taken to bridge the gap of the transitional period and also to make available adequate financial provision for Libya through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other means. He welcomed the statement that detailed surveys were being carried out under the ægis of the United Nations, but considered that special attention should be given to the financial needs of Libya and to the possibility of meeting those needs.

99. He supported the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1758/Rev.1).

100. Mr. CABADA (Peru) joined in the thanks and congratulations to the United Nations Commissioner in Libya. But he drew attention to a fundamental error in document E/1581/Corr.1, paragraph 13, where it was stated that:

"During the ten-year period of trusteeship, the Administering Authority, Italy, would be entitled to make applications under 3 (a), but would not, unless admitted to membership in the United Nations, be entitled to make applications under 3 (b). As a member of several participating specialized agencies, Italy would be entitled to make applications under (c)."

101. It was surely obvious that the legal status of the administering Power was not the same as that of the territory under its administration. Yet the fact that Somaliland was under the trusteeship of Italy, which was not a member of the United Nations, did not mean that Somaliland, a Trust Territory and hence closely bound up with the United Nations, had no right to technical assistance in all its aspects. While he did not propose to submit a resolution on the subject, as the time did not seem ripe, he would be glad if the Secretary-General would bear his observations in mind.

102. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Peruvian representative to the fact that the Secretary-General's note entitled "Problems of Economic Development and Social Progress of the Former Italian Colonies" (E/1581) clearly stated that former Italian Somaliland would not be able to benefit from the technical assistance programme, not only because the Administering Authority was not a member of the United Nations, but also because the territory itself was not a member, and General Assembly resolution 200 (III) was clearly

restricted to members of the United Nations. Consequently, even in accordance with the Peruvian representative's interpretation, no request for technical assistance could be made. But former Italian Somaliland was, on the other hand, entitled to make requests under the expanded programme of technical assistance because the Administering Authority was a member of a specialized agency.

103. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), referring to the comments made by the Indian representative on colonial policies and administration, said that his own Government, which had responsibilities for non-self-governing territories, was among the least self-satisfied in its approach to the state of economic and social development throughout the world. As evidence of that, the United Kingdom had been one of the first three contributors to the Technical Assistance Fund. Moreover, as the Indian representative was probably aware, the conceptions and policies applied by the United Kingdom Government in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica were closely akin to many long-term plans applied in other non-self-governing territories under United Kingdom ægis. There were more than twenty such ten-year plans at present in operation at a cost of over 200 million pounds.

104. Mr. DE LACHARRIÈRE (France) also paid tribute to the United Nations Commissioner in Libya. As the administering Power for a part of Libya, the French Government had worked in close co-operation with the United Nations Commissioner, and the French delegation was therefore well able to bear witness to the qualities he had displayed.

105. The French delegation considered that the aims stated in General Assembly resolution 226 (III) with regard to the future of the former Italian colonies were somewhat out of date, since the territories concerned now had governing authorities—namely the administering Powers, which could submit applications for technical assistance. However, one difficulty, mentioned in the Secretary-General's report and in the verbal statement by the United Nations Commissioner, remained to be solved. It arose from the existence of a transitional period between the present provisional arrangement and the time when an independent Libya would be admitted to membership of the United Nations. The draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General, supplemented by the amendment submitted by the United States delegation, offered a solution to that difficulty and would enable all the international assistance which Libya might require to be made available to her.

106. Replying to the argument put forward by the Peruvian representative concerning the special position of Somaliland, he said that, since neither Italy nor Somaliland was a member of the United Nations, Somaliland could not become a beneficiary under the regular technical assistance programme. The French delegation therefore considered that due account should

be taken under the expanded programme of technical assistance of Somaliland's anomalous situation.

107. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) warmly supported the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Chile and the United States (E/L.103) as a proof that the United Nations was conscious of the responsibilities which it had undertaken with regard to Libya. He was happy to note that the United Nations had succeeded where the Great Powers had failed, and welcomed the opportunity to offer his congratulations to the United Nations Commissioner in Libya.

108. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) expressed doubt as to whether the interpretation of the position of former Italian Somaliland as given in document E/1581 was wholly correct. The point must be kept in mind that General Assembly resolution 289 (IV) had granted Italy authority to administer the territory in accordance with the United Nations trusteeship system. On the other hand, General Assembly resolution 266 (III) would seem to extend the technical assistance programme to all territories. It would be unfair to exclude one territory which was actually placed under United Nations authority from the benefits of the United Nations programmes of technical assistance. He wondered whether the Legal Department of the United Nations Secretariat could give an opinion on that point. If his (Mr. Kotschnig's) interpretation were wrong, he would be prepared to support the French representative's point of view.

109. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in Charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that the Legal Department would be consulted on the point.

110. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) noted that reference was made in the documents to "the former Italian colonies" as well as to "Italian Somaliland". That would seem to be contradictory.

111. The PRESIDENT stated that he presumed that the old term for the territory of "Italian Somaliland" had been inadvertently used. He ruled that the general discussion was now closed and requested the Indian representative formally to move his amendment.

112. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that, in the light of the explanations given by the United States representative, he would not press his amendment to the resolution put forward by Chile and the United States.

113. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Chilean and United States joint draft resolution (E/L.103), which had been submitted to replace the Secretary-General's draft resolution (E/1758/Rev.1).

*The resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.