



Thursday, 3 January 1952, at 3.45 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856) (continued)	231
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Enrique Muñoz Meany, Head of the Guatemalan delegation.....	235

Chairman: Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)
(continued)

[Item 12]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY YUGOSLAVIA
(A/C.4/L.165, A/C.4/L.165/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.183,
A/C.4/L.184) (concluded)

1. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) stated that the recent informal consultations on the Yugoslav draft resolution concerning the examination of petitions (A/C.4/L.165) had resulted in a measure of agreement on all disputed points. A revised text would be distributed when ready.

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested a short recess until the revised text could be made available.

The meeting adjourned at 3.55 p.m. and was resumed at 4.5 p.m.

3. Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Committee) read out the revised text of the Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.4/L.165/Rev.1).

4. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) and Mr. PIGNON (France), in a spirit of compromise similar to that shown by the Yugoslav representative, withdrew their amendments (A/C.4/L.183 and A/C.4/L.184, respectively).

5. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) welcomed and endorsed the new text and commended the spirit of compromise shown by all concerned in its preparation.

6. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) also expressed his delegation's support of the compromise text. However, he asked that the exact intention of the phrase "as soon as possible whenever necessary", which had been inserted in paragraph 1 (a) of the operative part, should be explained.

7. Mr. TREBINJAC (Yugoslavia) said that those words had been introduced to meet various objections to the original wording. It had been contended that the original wording obliged the proposed standing committee to meet between and during sessions of the Trusteeship Council. The standing committee should, however, be convened only if it had enough business to transact, and if special representatives of the Administering Authorities could be present during the discussion of petitions. He had accordingly agreed to the amendment.

8. Mr. MANI (India) associated himself with the Iraqi representative in welcoming and endorsing the amended text. The changes, which took account of practical obstacles to the efficient working of the proposed standing committee, greatly strengthened the draft resolution.

9. Answering the Brazilian representative, he added that the change in paragraph 1 (a) met two possible difficulties. It would preclude unwarranted meetings of the proposed standing committee, and at the same time safeguard the Administering Authorities' legitimate rights and the convenience of the standing committee. Moreover, the words "as soon as possible" were almost mandatory, being intended to prevent indefinite postponement of meetings.

10. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) expressed his thanks for the explanation. He still thought the somewhat cumbersome addition unnecessary, but was prepared to support the revised draft resolution.

11. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that he would have been prepared to support an invitation to the Trusteeship Council to continue consideration, in the light of the discussion at the present General Assembly session, of possible means of improving its procedures for the examination of petitions. Furthermore, if the normal number of petitions proved too great to be dealt with during the regular session of the

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

Trusteeship Council, he would have been ready to endorse a change in the Council's rules of procedure on the lines indicated in the Yugoslav proposal. Under Article 90 of the Charter, however, the Council was given sole competence to adopt its own rules of procedure, and any attempt by the General Assembly to impose changes would show disrespect for one of the principal organs of the United Nations.

12. One point in the revised text seemed somewhat obscure. The proposed standing committee was to examine each petition in a preliminary way within a prescribed period of time. On the other hand, its meetings were supposed to be contingent upon there being a sufficient number of petitions awaiting examination. He therefore wondered which of the two factors would prevail. In any case the Belgian Government would hardly be willing to forego its right, under rule 92 of the Council's rules of procedure, to have a special representative present during discussion of any petition from the Trust Territory under its administration. He was therefore unable, without specific instructions from his Government, to support the draft resolution, and would accordingly abstain from voting.

13. Mr. TREBINJAC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the addition to paragraph 1 (a) covered the point raised by the Belgian representative. Moreover, the difficulty would never arise in practice, since the number of petitions received in any given period was usually substantial.

14. Mr. BALLARD (Australia), while acknowledging the spirit of compromise shown by all concerned, felt bound to say that the proposal as revised did not remove all his difficulties. He still feared that such a resolution might be construed as unwarranted interference with the right of the Trusteeship Council to adopt its own rules of procedure. Secondly, the phrase inserted into paragraph 1 (a) was either unnecessary or in conflict with the time-table for the examination of petitions set out in paragraph 1 (b). Lastly, the reference to any other responsible source of information on petitions seemed to him out of place. All requisite information could be supplied by the petitioners themselves and by the Administering Authority. For all those reasons the Australian delegation felt obliged to abstain in the vote.

15. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) said that his delegation's general support for the intention of the Yugoslav draft resolution had already been indicated and that he would therefore vote for the amended text. He would, however, like to have an explanation of the phrase "any other official or responsible source", in paragraph 1 (b).

16. Mr. TREBINJAC (Yugoslavia) replied that it had been felt that all official and responsible sources of information likely to aid in the consideration of petitions should be canvassed—for example, relevant reports of visiting missions, governmental bodies or specialized agencies, or any official publication or study relating to the subject-matter of a petition.

17. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) thanked the Yugoslav representative for his explanation.

18. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation had always taken the clear and unequivocal stand that the right of petition, as established by the Charter, was one of the pillars of the International Trusteeship System. He deplored the tendency in the Committee to depreciate the Trusteeship Council's previous work on procedures for the examination of petitions. The important fact was that the Council was, rightly, keeping those procedures under constant review. The helpfulness of a General Assembly resolution on the subject at the present stage was therefore doubtful. His delegation did not believe that the General Assembly should seek to make detailed recommendations to the Council, which was one of the principal organs of the United Nations and was empowered by Article 90 of the Charter to adopt its own rules of procedure. Broad suggestions which the Council could examine in the light of its own technical knowledge and practical experience would be more appropriate. However, since the examination of petitions was so fundamental to the operation of the International Trusteeship System, he would not vote against the draft resolution.

19. He also found some difficulty in understanding the meaning of the reference in the text to "any other official or responsible source" of information. The Yugoslav representative had not distinguished in his explanation between official and responsible sources. Secondly, the request contained in paragraph 2 of the operative part might more appropriately have been addressed to the Trusteeship Council. He would therefore abstain in the vote.

20. At the request of Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) the CHAIRMAN called for a roll-call vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.165/Rev.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour : Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Against : Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining : Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The revised Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.4/L.165/Rev. 1) was approved by 39 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

21. Mr. PIGNON (France) explained that, although his delegation would have been glad to support the draft resolution in a spirit of compromise, as a member of the Trusteeship Council it was unable to endorse any resolution which might be construed as criticizing the Council's work.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY SYRIA (A/C.4/L.170)

22. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution concerning information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System submitted by the Syrian delegation (A/C.4/L.170).

23. Mr. ATTAR (Syria) explained that the organization of information was one of the prime factors in the evolution of peoples in the Trust Territories. Much had been done but much still remained to do.

24. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) supported the draft resolution, which seemed to his delegation to be in accordance with the desires and practice of the Trusteeship Council.

25. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested that the resolution should be entitled "Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories".

26. Mr. ATTAR (Syria) agreed to that title.

27. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said he had already more than once emphasized the need to extend the dissemination in Trust Territories of information concerning the United Nations. The first paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution gave the impression that nothing had yet been done. On the contrary, the Secretariat had given much publicity in the Trust Territories to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. He suggested that, in the first paragraph of the preamble, the words "be informed of" should be replaced by the words "receive adequate information concerning".

28. Mr. ATTAR (Syria) accepted that proposal.

29. Mr. MANI (India), while supporting the draft resolution in general, proposed that the word "disseminating" should be substituted for the word "organizing" in the second paragraph of the preamble, and the word "disseminate" for the word "organize" in paragraph 1 of the operative part since the present words had a specific connotation.

30. Mr. ATTAR (Syria) agreed to that proposal.

31. After Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands), Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Mr. ZIAUD-DIN (Pakistan), Mr. MANI (India) and Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) had proposed various drafting changes to the phrase in paragraph 2 of the operative part, "among the various classes of the population and in the schools", Mr. ATTAR (Syria) agreed to delete from that paragraph the words "the various classes of".

32. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the Belgian delegation's affirmative vote should not be interpreted as a criticism of the Trusteeship Council, which had done everything necessary to spread information about the United Nations. To recommend to the Trusteeship Council to include in its report information on that subject would be redundant, since it already did so. Subject to that reservation, he would vote in favour of the Syrian draft resolution.

33. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution submitted by Syria (A/C.4/L.170), as amended, to the vote.

The draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 48 votes to none.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY INDIA (A/C.4/L.173)

34. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation on educational advancement in Trust Territories (A/C.4/L.173).

35. Mr. MANI (India) said, in introducing the draft resolution, that it was a sequel to earlier remarks by the Indian delegation (221st meeting) stressing the value of offering scholarships to students in Trust Territories in order to fit them to play, responsible parts on their return home. The draft resolution, which was self-explanatory, recalled Trusteeship Council resolution III (V) on the award of scholarships to students from the Trust Territories, but it went further.

36. It was generally recognized that at some time in the near future all the Trust Territories would become self-governing and independent. It was thus essential that people in those Territories should be properly equipped to deal with that situation, and one of the ways of equipping them to do so would be to familiarize them with foreign countries. India had made a beginning in that direction and would like to do more, but resources were limited and calls many. His Government had, however, invited a few students from Africa to visit India, and they had greatly benefited by their stay there. Students who spent some time in countries other than their own would receive an object lesson in political methods which would enable them to form groups of leaders fitted to take over control of affairs in the Trust Territories when the time came. They would also have opportunities of contrasting methods of education, sanitation and political administration with those in their own countries and would thus be able to make constructive suggestions for improvement.

37. The Fourth Committee should recommend all Member States to offer scholarships. It was essential to go forward with the development of the Trust Territories, and the offer of scholarships would be a striking example of the United Nations' concern for the welfare of the people in those Territories.

38. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) congratulated the Indian delegation on its courageous and generous action. There could be no difference of opinion about the importance of education; it was one of the few subjects which usually found general agreement in the Trusteeship Council. Education of the population was an essential preliminary to advancement in the Trust Territories. The Administering Authorities had done much and would like to do more, but they were faced with almost unsurmountable difficulties, including lack of teachers. Hence the Indian proposal was particularly valuable, and he would give it his whole-hearted support.

39. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom), in view of the admiration that all must feel for the action taken by the Indian Government, regretted that he could not give unconditional support to the draft resolution.

40. The need for greater educational opportunities for the inhabitants of the Trust Territories was generally recognized, and the United Kingdom Government

and the governments of the Trust Territories were all doing their utmost to fill that need. Educational advancement must be the basis of all sound political and economic progress. For that reason the United Kingdom had been among the first to welcome the provision for the award of fellowships and scholarships to students from under-developed countries under the Technical Assistance Programme. The United Kingdom had encouraged the governments of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories to make known the opportunities thus afforded to promising students to pursue higher studies in other countries Members of the United Nations. The response from the Territories had been encouraging and it was hoped that more and more students would be able to satisfy the requirements of the Technical Assistance Administration.

41. A programme such as that envisaged in the draft resolution was, however, another matter. The most notable feature of the work of the United Nations was its universality. Where the need was greatest, there assistance should flow. It might be argued that the United Nations had a special responsibility towards the Trust Territories, but that could be recognized by administrative emphasis within the programmes already in operation. Neither the draft resolution before the Committee nor the sponsor's explanation had made clear what administrative arrangements were proposed.

42. The valuable programme established by India for African students did not require a United Nations resolution to make it effective and fruitful. Countries which wished to offer educational assistance to inhabitants of less-favoured countries could do so by means of the Technical Assistance Programme. To draw up a special programme for the Trust Territories appeared cumbersome and unnecessary. Nevertheless, if the Committee wished to do so, the United Kingdom would not oppose it. His Government assumed that those delegations who voted for the draft resolution would be indicating by their vote the intention of their governments to take practical steps to implement the resolution, including the making of the necessary financial contributions to provide scholarships, etc. His delegation would decide from the amount of support forthcoming for the draft resolution whether to vote against it or to abstain.

43. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that all delegations were in sympathy with the motives of the draft resolution. The United States in particular regarded education as a need of prime importance. He felt the force of some of the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative, but the interest of the United States Government in education was very great and would support the draft resolution. He pointed out that fellowships and internships in the United States were normally granted by private institutions, and that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution should not be construed to imply any obligation on the part of the United States Government. He expressed his appreciation of the action already taken by the Government of India and stressed again the value of the cause which it was promoting.

44. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) paid a tribute to the generous intention of the Indian draft resolution. He felt, however, that its full implications had not been thought out, and his immediate reaction was not favourable. The result of the resolution would be to afford the Trust Territories a privileged position in technical assistance with education. The number of experts working in education in the Trust Territories compared favourably with the number of experts available to the Technical Assistance Administration in the entire field of technical assistance throughout the world. He wondered whether the Joint Second and Third Committee, which was concerned with the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, would wish the Trust Territories, which already enjoyed the assistance of advanced countries, to have further special treatment. It could be argued that the United Nations bore a special responsibility to the Trust Territories; but that responsibility was specified in the Charter and was limited to supervising their administration and the fulfilment of the Administering Authorities' obligations. It was doubtful whether the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, who already enjoyed more technical assistance than many other peoples of under-developed countries, should be placed in a special position with regard to educational assistance.

45. Mr. TREBINJAC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution whole-heartedly. The Government of Yugoslavia would do all in its power to participate in such a valuable undertaking. He considered that the resolution would prove the desire of the United Nations to contribute to the advancement of the peoples of the Trust Territories.

46. Mr. LARSON (Canada) said that his delegation was in favour of advancing education everywhere. However, scholarships were available under the Technical Assistance Programme, and the Administering Authorities were taking full advantage of them. He was afraid that the draft resolution would duplicate work which was already being done. He would only be able to vote in favour of the resolution if the vote were postponed until the Secretariat was able to supply information making clear the part to be played by the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. If a vote were taken at once, he would be obliged to abstain.

47. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that universality was the keynote of United Nations programmes. He quoted paragraph 9 (a) of Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX) to show that contributions to the Technical Assistance Programme could not be earmarked for any specific country. He felt that paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Indian draft resolution conflicted with that stipulation and that Members of the United Nations could not be asked to provide scholarships under technical assistance specifically for students from Trust Territories.

48. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) emphasized that the draft resolution had no connexion whatever with the Technical Assistance Programme. It simply invited those Member

States willing to do so to offer scholarships at their own expense to students from Trust Territories.

49. Mr. MANI (India) confirmed that the Indian draft resolution was not connected with the Technical Assistance Programme. It merely appealed to Members to make scholarships available to students from Trust Territories in public or private institutions. By adopting the draft resolution, Member States would be creating conditions of public opinion conducive to the award of scholarships to students from Trust Territories. It was true that the Trust Territories had already benefited from educational assistance under the Technical Assistance Programme; but much more was needed. The adoption of the draft resolution would establish the desire of the United Nations to promote the welfare of the peoples of the Trust Territories. He felt that an adverse vote would create a bad impression.

50. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) regretted that he could not participate in the voting. He felt that the matter had not been fully discussed and that the draft resolution as it stood was not sufficiently clear.

51. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) found himself obliged to abstain from voting. His impression had been that the draft resolution was connected with the Technical Assistance Programme and would be administered by the United Nations. He would be glad if the vote could be postponed to give time for reflection and the possible submission of amendments.

52. Mr. MANI (India) felt that the draft resolution was self-explanatory and clearly had no connexion with the Technical Assistance Programme. He was disappointed by the critical comments that had been made but realized that views were bound to be divergent. He was unwilling to postpone the vote.

53. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the draft resolution referred to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the machinery of the Technical Assistance Administration in paragraph 2 of its operative part. There was also an indirect link, for if countries with limited resources were to give the Trust Territories priority in the allocation of scholarships, the number of scholarships available for the Technical Assistance Programme would undoubtedly be affected. The matter should be discussed with the Joint Second and Third Committee.

54. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) re-emphasized that the draft resolution bore no real relation to the Technical Assistance Programme. It was straightforward and actuated by the best motives. He had expected the Committee to agree on so clearly valuable an aim as the advancement of education. He was in favour of an immediate vote.

55. Mr. DE PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) wished to examine the implications of the statement that the draft resolution had no connexion with the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. If that were so, it might perhaps be advisable to delete paragraph 2 of the operative part, which referred to the Technical Assistance Administration and thus led to confusion. He also felt that the

reference in that paragraph to arrangements for ensuring the efficient administration of offers of scholarships must necessarily have financial implications for the United Nations. Lastly, there was the legal question whether governments could in fact fulfil requests for scholarships for training in private institutions. With further time for reflection, those points could perhaps be cleared up. He therefore formally proposed the adjournment of the meeting.

The proposal was rejected by 18 votes to 18, with 9 abstentions.

56. At the request of Mr. MANI (India), the CHAIRMAN called for a roll-call vote on the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.173).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour : Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria.

Abstaining : United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Netherlands, New Zealand.

The draft resolution was approved by 39 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

57. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) said that a school of public administration with a highly-trained international staff was about to be established in the Netherlands, and as that undertaking had cost the Netherlands Government about one million guilders, it was unable to undertake further expense for that purpose for the time being. That was the reason why he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

58. Mr. PINTO (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was convinced of the utility of education in the Trust Territories. The form of the resolution left something to be desired, but his delegation trusted that the objectives would be limited to genuine educational activities.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Enrique Muñoz Meany, Head of the Guatemalan delegation

59. The CHAIRMAN paid a tribute to the late Mr. Muñoz Meany, and on behalf of the Committee offered his condolences to the Guatemalan delegation.

60. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) thanked the Chairman, and the Committee for their expression of sympathy.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.