

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Friday, 14 November 1958,
at 8.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .	313

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Rodzinski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822, A/C.4/L.547, A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.547, A/C.4/L.549/REV.1) (continued)

Draft resolution on economic aid for Somalia (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1) (continued)

1. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) thought that there were two omissions in the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1): there was no reference to the obligation of all Member States to help to cover the budgetary deficit of Somaliland after 1960, and no place was given to the suggestion that a special fund should be set up. Since the amendments submitted by Guatemala, India and Iraq (A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1) met his delegation's concern, he would vote in favour of them. However, the statements made at the previous meeting by the representatives of Italy and the United States had not been such as to dispel the doubts regarding the amendments felt in some quarters. He would therefore like to reply to some of the points raised during the debate.

2. The Chilean representative had implied that the Somali Government had changed its position since the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957 had been to the Territory. He himself saw nothing to justify that assertion and if such had been the case he would be the first to ask the Committee not to take any decision contrary to the wishes of the Somali Government.

3. The Australian representative had said that he was afraid that the creation of international machinery for economic aid to Somalia might tie the hands of the Somali Government before Somaliland became independent in 1960. He himself considered that the establishment of such machinery would not in any way exclude assistance by means of bilateral agreements. He felt that United Nations assistance should be the rule and bilateral aid the exception, and not the contrary, as some delegations wished. The delegations which had criticized the amendments had not put forward any convincing arguments. The reason the Trusteeship Council had not taken a decision concerning a special fund was that it had not examined the possibility in

detail, although it should have done so according to the terms of General Assembly resolution 1206 (XII). The amendments merely requested the Trusteeship Council to study the matter.

4. The Argentine representative had said that the establishment of such a fund would raise certain difficulties. The only way to find out whether that was so was to undertake a detailed examination. He saw no objection to mentioning the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as the Argentine representative had suggested at the 796th meeting. He felt that the latter's suggestions concerning the omission of the passage in the amendments relating to the Somali Prime Minister and the use of a more general formula on the centralization of funds for Somaliland were worthy of consideration and he was prepared to accept a text which did not sacrifice the essential idea.

5. Lastly, he had been unable to understand the opposition of the Italian delegation or why the Trusteeship Council should examine certain very specific possibilities and not all those which offered themselves or were mentioned in its report (A/3822). The Italian representative's statement indicated, however, that it might be possible to reach an agreement. He thought that objections to the establishment of a special fund should be addressed rather to the Trusteeship Council and that it was for the Council to call upon the technical experience of other organs if it saw fit.

6. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) noted that the discussion at the previous meeting had demonstrated that it was generally recognized that Somaliland would need financial and technical assistance after 1960. Opinions differed on the source from which that assistance should come. The factual context to be remembered was that Somalia's revenue amounted to \$8 million a year, that there was an annual deficit of about \$2 million a year, and that, apart from that deficit, Somaliland would need between \$4 million and \$5 million a year for about twenty years, unless that period could be reduced to ten years or even to five. The amount of foreign assistance required by Somalia annually would thus be nearly equal to its revenues. It was a question of foreign aid to safeguard the independence of Somaliland and the continuity of the development policy.

7. The opponents of the amendments claimed that in its report (T/1296) the Mission of the International Bank had envisaged internal arrangements and not external aid. He protested against that interpretation. Since the assistance would be required for a long time, arrangements must be made which would avoid the unforeseeable hazards of annual appropriations by the parliaments of the donor countries. Since such assistance was essential to the very survival and stability of the Territory, it was necessary that the United Nations should make provisions for it. It was, of course, a new situation and a special one, since none of the other Trust Territories needed such extensive assistance. The experiment would open a new chapter in the his-

tory of international co-operation and, since certain States were willing to provide funds, in view of United Nations interest in the Territory's future welfare, it seemed only natural to channel them through the United Nations. The countries which were willing to provide aid were Members of the United Nations.

8. There was nothing to be lost by adopting that method, which was more flexible than bilateral assistance. In that way it would be possible to avoid pressures which tended to be interpreted as political pressures. That method of pooling the resources of the donors and channelling them through the United Nations would ensure the Territory's economic and political stability. By centralizing small contributions, useless administrative expenses would be eliminated. The record of the International Bank could serve as an example and it gave grounds for thinking that the United Nations would be in a position to administer the aid to Somaliland effectively.

9. Some delegations had said that the questions must not be prejudged, and that Somaliland should decide for itself, after it had attained its independence, what the arrangements for assistance should be. The United Nations was quite as competent to formulate a judgement on that point as the Governments of countries which contemplated granting subsidies to Somaliland. It was paradoxical to fear that the United Nations, which had assumed responsibility for the Trust Territory and was leading it towards independence, wished to decide its future unilaterally. That was rather what the countries which contemplated granting it bilateral aid were doing.

10. It had also been implied that the Somali Government did not wish to receive assistance from international organizations. That was not a correct statement of the facts. The statement by the Prime Minister of Somalia which was recalled in the amendments had not been refuted by any competent Somali authority. The Prime Minister had told the 1957 Visiting Mission that his Government was in a rather difficult position in trying to obtain international assistance, because it could not act quite freely, and he had expressed the hope that the United Nations would be able to make arrangements to obtain for Somaliland the assistance it needed. The report of the International Bank confirmed that the Somali Government had approached the United Nations, which had not, however, responded to its appeals. In the circumstances, it was not surprising that Somaliland was trying to obtain bilateral assistance. However, the Minister for Economic Affairs of Somalia had stated during the twenty-second session of the Trusteeship Council that, while his Government was negotiating bilateral assistance, it was relying, naturally, on the assistance of the United Nations. All the political parties in the Territory were agreed in recognizing that the source of assistance should be the United Nations. Given the wishes of the people of the Territory, it was high time for the United Nations to study the possibility of aiding Somaliland. He wanted it to be understood that his delegation was not for the exclusion of bilateral assistance altogether but, in view of the special circumstances of the Territory, international assistance through a common fund seemed more desirable.

11. He was surprised at the way in which the views of the Administering Authority had been presented to the Committee. While he welcomed the reiteration of the

Italian Government's offers of assistance, he could not understand why aid through the United Nations should now be ruled out. Mr. Frondizi, the Administrator of Somaliland, had admitted, in his statement to the Legislative Assembly of Somalia in October 1957, that assistance through the United Nations would be preferable, as bilateral aid was incompatible with independence. It would appear, therefore, from that very statement that the arguments of the opponents of the amendments had no real force.

12. Moreover, the sponsors of the amendments were not asking for a special fund to be set up at once, but merely that the matter should be studied by the Trusteeship Council. It was possible that after such a study the Council would decide that it was not appropriate for the United Nations to give the Territory assistance. For the time being, however, there was no reason why it should not study the possibility of providing Somaliland with the assistance the people of the Territory wished to receive.

13. Accordingly, the Indian delegation, together with the delegations of Guatemala and Iraq, had submitted amendments (A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1) to the draft resolution. Those amendments did not imply any desire to impose the slightest financial obligation on any State, for it was specified that only Governments which were willing and in a position to offer such assistance would do so. In the opinion of the Indian delegation, the amendments offered the best means of assisting a territory in a world in which political and economic tension was rife. Somaliland was situated in a very delicate area and it was essential to ensure its future in conditions of economic stability and certainty.

14. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) said that there had been repeated expressions of anxiety about the economic position and the financial difficulties in which Somaliland would find itself when it became independent. Parallel with that concern there had been a feeling of international solidarity, which had been strengthened by the fact that the United Nations had assumed responsibility in determining the date by which the objectives of the Trusteeship System were to be achieved in the Territory. Those feelings were reflected in the draft resolution before the Committee and they had also inspired the amendments submitted to that draft.

15. Although the amendments had been criticized as prejudging the capacity of the Somali people and their leaders to take a decision concerning assistance which their country would need and as even exerting some kind of adverse effect on the independence and sovereignty of Somalia, he would point out that the sponsors of the amendments had no intention of compelling the Somali people to do anything that was contrary to their wishes. They only asked that consideration should be given to the feasibility of establishing a fund for channelling any financial and technical assistance that might be furnished to Somalia. It was hard to see how such a step taken under the auspices of the United Nations could impair Somalia's independence any more than would be done by bilateral assistance.

16. He hoped that the proposed study would provide the answer to the pertinent questions raised by the representative of the United States at the previous meeting.

17. It had also been noted that some of the statements referred to in the amendments had been made in 1957

and that since then new views had been put forward. Although that was true, a statement, especially when in the form of a suggestion, was certainly not invalidated merely because it had been made at an earlier date than some other statement.

18. The objection had also been made that the proposal in the second amendment (A/C.4/L.553 and Add. 1, para.2) would be difficult to carry out. It was, of course, possible that some practical difficulties might be encountered, but the proposed study would provide the necessary opportunities for discovering the nature of such difficulties and even the ways and means by which they might be overcome. With regard to the fear that the solution proposed in the amendment might establish a precedent, only a detailed study could provide a satisfactory answer. It was impossible for the amendment to lead to the establishment, within the newly independent country, of a body that would control its economic and financial policy. Nobody wished to deprive Somalia of the right to appraise its needs and draw up programmes to meet them.

19. A typical feature of the present era was international co-operation and the interdependence of countries. Somalia would be the first to benefit from a form of co-operation which would help to ensure its independence and economic stability. That was the sole objective which the sponsors of the amendments had in view. The United Nations had to make every effort to discharge the responsibility it had accepted with respect to Somaliland. While not wishing to criticize bilateral assistance, which could perform a useful service, the delegation of Guatemala considered that international assistance, to which the United Nations was attaching increasing importance, was preferable. It was that principle which had guided the sponsors of the amendments.

20. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that he warmly welcomed the draft resolution and he would vote for it, because Somaliland was a Territory which, on attaining independence, would have to face serious economic and social problems. It was generally realized that after 1960 Somalia's budget deficit and balance of payments deficit would amount in each case to about \$5 million a year. The report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822) indicated that the Territory would continue for a time to need outside financial aid, without which its administrative services and economic development plans would have to be considerably curtailed. Since, according to the Administering Authority, the necessary assistance would amount to about \$4.5 million, the Irish delegation particularly welcomed operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

21. With regard to the amendments, he noted that, in the first paragraph that it was proposed to add to the preamble of the draft resolution, reference was made to a statement by the Mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. However, a careful examination of the Mission's report (T/1296) showed that what the Mission had had in mind in that statement was an internal form of technical co-ordination. In stating that financial and technical assistance could be administered in common, the Bank's Mission had been really contemplating the administrative co-ordination of that assistance inside Somaliland. The amendment was therefore based on a misinterpretation of the words "administered in common". In the view of the Irish delegation, the

Bank did not have the authority to make such a suggestion. In any case, the representative of Italy had recently stated that measures had been taken in 1957 for setting up within the Territory, through the Agency for Economic Development of Somalia (ASES), the type of co-ordination referred to by the International Bank.

22. With regard to the second paragraph that it was proposed to add to the preamble, the reference to the statement made by the Prime Minister of Somalia in 1957 was, to be sure, relevant, but note might also have been taken of the reassuring statement made by the Prime Minister on 12 October 1958 to the effect that aid from Italy would enable the Somali people to look forward to the future with confidence and that a satisfactory solution had been found to the problem of technical and financial assistance after 1960.

23. With regard to the amendment to paragraph 4, he had three objections. First of all, a request to the Trusteeship Council to study the feasibility of establishing a United Nations fund for channelling financial and technical assistance to a Territory was an entirely new procedure which raised some very important problems. The Economic and Social Council or the Second Committee would seem to be the competent bodies to study that possibility. The members of the Fourth Committee whose Governments were represented on the Economic and Social Council would no doubt consider that the Trusteeship Council was not the appropriate body to undertake whatever studies might prove necessary, especially in view of the lengthy debates which had taken place in the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council prior to the establishment of the Special Fund.

24. The second objection related to a question of principle. It should not be forgotten that Somaliland would attain independence in 1960 and that, consequently, the sovereign Government of Somalia would alone be authorized to decide how the country was to obtain economic assistance and how that assistance should be channelled. In other words, when Somaliland became independent, its Government might not want a special fund to be established. The Administering Authority had taken considerable precautions, as was shown by the statement of the Italian Government quoted by the representative of Italy at the 782nd meeting, to make it clear that it intended to respect Somaliland's sovereignty when the Trusteeship System ended. Members of the United Nations should take the same attitude and not seek to influence the Somali Government concerning the manner in which it would be given financial assistance.

25. The third objection concerned the general principle of furnishing multilateral aid through the United Nations. The Irish delegation had always been in favour of the principle whereby assistance furnished to the under-developed countries should be multilateral, since in that way the political tensions which inevitably went with economic assistance granted on a bilateral basis could be avoided. That principle, however, had nothing in common with the setting-up, under United Nations auspices, of special funds for multilateral assistance that would be concerned with specific countries in need of assistance. If the General Assembly decided to establish a special fund for Somaliland, there was a likelihood that many other funds of the same kind would also have to be established since several

Territories were progressing towards the termination of trusteeship. While he was in favour of multilateral aid, he doubted the wisdom of establishing special funds whenever a country was in need of assistance. That would undermine the principle of multilateral aid, as envisaged in the case of the Special Fund, according to which Member States in a position to do so should furnish economic aid through the Special Fund, while the distribution of that aid among the recipient countries would be effected by the Managing Director of the Fund in co-operation with its Governing Council. If, after a special fund was set up for Somaliland, other funds of the same kind were established, the contributing countries might wish to decide themselves on how their aid was to be distributed and would pay their contributions to certain funds rather than to others. The ultimate result would be a return to the bilateral system.

26. Although the sponsors of the amendment had maintained that nothing more was envisaged than the preparation of a study, a study was generally recognized as opening the way to practical measures, and experience had shown that the mere fact of undertaking a study often implied approval of those measures.

27. For those basic reasons, the amendments caused the Irish delegation grave misgivings and could not be given its support.

28. Mr. PIETERS (Netherlands) endorsed the objections raised at the 796th meeting by the representative of the United Kingdom against the amendments to the draft resolution, which he considered very pertinent. As the representative of Ireland had pointed out, the establishment of a fund for Somaliland could have a detrimental effect on the functioning of the Special Fund for the development of under-developed countries by diverting much-needed resources from the Special Fund, which at present was able to finance only a small number of projects. If the initiative taken by the United Nations in setting up the Special Fund was to succeed, every effort must be made to increase the resources of that Fund, and any proposal, however well-grounded, which might discourage States from contributing to it could not fail to arouse strong opposition.

29. The Netherlands delegation would vote against the amendments to the draft resolution and, should those amendments be adopted, would be forced to vote against the draft resolution.

30. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), who had been a member of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957, recalled the circumstances in which the Prime Minister of Somalia had, at the time of the Mission's visit, suggested the financial measures that would be needed to promote Somaliland's development when it had attained independence. Although the Visiting Mission had not been able to commit the United Nations to providing the requested aid any more than its members could have committed their Governments to do so, it had seen fit to take note of the Prime Minister's suggestion in its report (T/1344) without presenting it in the form of a recommendation. The Mission had left it to the United Nations to assess the merits of that suggestion.

31. When the matter had been raised in the Trusteeship Council, the representative of Haiti had been unable to promise that his Government would contribute to a special fund for Somaliland. His Government's

position had not changed and his delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain when the amendments to the draft resolution were put to the vote. That abstention should not be interpreted as a refusal to aid the Government of Somalia. His delegation fervently hoped that Governments would extend effective aid to Somaliland and that it would accept their aid. Somaliland would have to co-ordinate the financial and technical aid granted, but that did not warrant the special study envisaged by the amendments.

32. If the amendments were adopted, the Haitian delegation would, however, still vote for the draft resolution because what it disapproved was not the aims sought but the means suggested for attaining them. The United Nations had a particular responsibility towards Somaliland, but that did not warrant the creation of a variety of channels for dispensing the international aid provided by the United Nations. There was no serious justification for according different treatment to Somaliland than to Togoland, for example, in the matter of United Nations assistance. All the Trust Territories should have equal attention from the United Nations.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) took the Chair.

33. Mr. COHEN (Chile) believed that the recommendation made by the Mission of the International Bank in its report on Somaliland could only be interpreted as advice to a future Somali Government to ensure the internal co-ordination of financial and technical assistance received from various outside sources; the Mission had certainly not contemplated the establishment of a fund under United Nations auspices for the centralized administration of the financial and technical assistance granted to Somaliland. Moreover, at the time the Prime Minister of the Somali Government had made his statement to the 1957 Visiting Mission the Special Fund had not been in existence. International assistance necessitated internal co-ordination on the part of all recipient countries, but that co-ordination should not involve additional expenditure for the bodies providing the assistance. He hoped that those considerations, added to the points made by the representative of Ireland, would prompt the members of the Committee to vote for the draft resolution in its original form.

34. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) expressed his pleasure that the amendments submitted by his delegation together with the delegations of India and Guatemala had led to a detailed discussion of the economic aid to be granted to Somalia. The approaching independence of that country and the seriousness of the problems it would have to face made that discussion particularly important.

35. The opponents of the amendments to the draft resolution seemed to fear United Nations interference in a matter which was regarded as the exclusive concern of Italy and Somaliland. Those amendments did not, however, affect operative paragraph 2 relating to the statement of the representative of Italy. The international assistance which the sponsors of the amendments wished Somalia to receive did not preclude the acceptance of Italian aid.

36. Some representatives had said that the amendments would tie the hands of the Somali Government whereas it should be able to decide for itself, in full sovereignty, what measures and forms of international assistance it should have recourse to. Far from in-

terfering in Somalia's internal affairs, the sponsors of the amendments were fully prepared to let the decision rest with the Somali Government. That Government had only to declare the proposed study to be pointless, and they would comply and refrain from recommending it. However, in view of the statement by the Somali Minister for Economic Affairs to the Trusteeship Council during its twenty-second session, in which he had welcomed the establishment of a special United Nations fund, it was unlikely that the Somali Government would declare the proposed study to be of no value.

37. It would be an infringement of the Somali Government's freedom for the United Nations to deny an opportunity for a study such as that advocated and to impose on Somaliland a form of aid concerning which that Government might have some doubt. Past experience of bilateral aid unfortunately gave grounds for apprehension. Governments which had received such aid since the Second World War had often questioned the motives of the countries providing it. Bilateral aid was an anachronism in a world which sought to promote understanding among nations. On the other hand, international aid created an atmosphere of confidence conducive to the development of international understanding. Countries granting aid on an individual basis had to take into account a variety of political considerations which were not involved in United Nations decisions on aid. Moreover, bilateral aid could not be fully relied on because its amount and the manner in which it was given were reconsidered each year when parliaments discussed their budgets.

38. He announced that, in a spirit of conciliation, the delegations of Guatemala, India and Iraq were prepared to withdraw their amendments if the Committee agreed to insert in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, after the words "from the specialized agencies", the phrase "particularly the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to study the feasibility of channelling financial assistance through the United Nations and report thereon".

39. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) felt that the discussion had gone somewhat astray. It was not a question of arguing the relative merits of multilateral and bilateral aid but of deciding the means by which international technical and financial aid should be furnished to Somalia. A large number of delegations in the Committee, including his own, believed in multilateral aid, and operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution were entirely concerned with that form of aid. The United Kingdom delegation was in favour of using existing funds in the belief that countries would be more likely to furnish assistance by that means. It would vote against the proposal just made by the representative of Iraq.

40. Mr. HILALY (Pakistan) thought that little could be added to the guarantees of assistance which were ensured to Somaliland in the draft resolution. The Committee had heard the reassuring statement of the Italian representative with regard to the various sources from which assistance had been secured or was in prospect. It was quite reasonable that the General Assembly should welcome that statement. Somaliland would be able to profit from the usual forms of assistance provided by the United Nations and the specialized agencies within the framework of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, as was stated in

operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Furthermore, as that assistance might be insufficient, the General Assembly was being asked to request the Trusteeship Council to consider the prospects of further assistance from the Special Fund, from the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and from the specialized agencies. The study which was recommended by the sponsors of the amendment did not seem to provide Somaliland with any further guarantees, and, as the Irish representative had explained, it might create more difficulties than it solved. In addition, the Government of Somalia would be able after 1960 to choose freely the forms in which it could accept further assistance. Pakistan, as one of the less developed countries, considered that any assistance was useful, whether multilateral or bilateral, and that one form of assistance did not exclude another. There was no reason for an independent Somalia, when it attained that status, to refuse the aid that some Governments might be prepared to offer it on a bilateral basis. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendment submitted by Guatemala, India and Iraq in the conviction that it was unnecessary at the present time.

41. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) moved the closure of the debate.

42. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) and Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) opposed that motion.

The motion for closure was adopted by 31 votes to 19, with 12 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendments jointly submitted by Guatemala, India and Iraq (A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1) to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1).

44. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that in a spirit of compromise his delegation and the Guatemalan and Indian delegations had orally proposed an amendment to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. If that amendment was adopted, the three delegations were prepared to withdraw their amendments in document A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1.

45. After an exchange of views in which Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), Mr. KELLY (Australia), Mr. COHEN (Chile) and Mr. VELA (Guatemala) took part, the CHAIRMAN read out the amendment orally submitted by the three delegations.

46. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) pointed out that, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure, the Committee should normally vote on the amendments in document A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1 before voting on the oral amendment. He accordingly believed that the order of the vote could be changed only by a decision by the Committee.

47. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that the three delegations were withdrawing their amendments in document A/C.4/L.553 and Add.1.

48. The CHAIRMAN declared that the only amendment now before the Committee was an oral amendment to the effect that the words "particularly the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to study the feasibility of channelling financial assistance through the United Nations and report thereon" should be inserted in paragraph 4 after the words "specialized agencies". He put that amendment to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 29, with 7 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.549/Rev.1).

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

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

49. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) read out the text of a draft resolution which his delegation was submitting but which had not yet been circulated. According to that draft the General Assembly would request the Administering Authority to transmit to the Government of Somalia the summary records of the discussion in the Fourth Committee on the question of economic aid to the Trust Territories, which had been considered at the thirteenth session.

50. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) regretted the action taken by the representative of the United Arab Republic, because there was no reason for it. The Italian Government had always seen to it that the Somali Government was kept informed on the proceedings of the Fourth Committee.

51. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he was not in any way questioning the goodwill of the Administering Authority.

52. Mr. FELD (United States of America) and Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that in such event they saw no need for the draft resolution.

53. Mr. KELLY (Australia) requested the representative of the United Arab Republic to withdraw his draft resolution in view of the assurances given by the Italian representative.

54. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that the Committee should state in its report that, in consideration of a suggestion by the representative of the United Arab Republic and a statement by the Administering Authority, it was the Committee's understanding that the relevant summary records would be transmitted to the Government of Somalia.

55. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) withdrew his draft resolution.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections to the procedure advocated by the Yugoslav representative, he would declare that procedure adopted.

Draft resolution on the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/C.4/L.547)

57. The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee was ready to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.547.

58. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that, as there were still some points to be examined with regard to the report of the Trusteeship Council, it would be preferable to postpone the vote on the draft resolution.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at midnight.