



CONTENTS

	Page
Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (<i>continued</i>)	
Report of the Committee on Visiting Missions (T/L.126).....	117
Development of a 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 494 (V)) (<i>continued</i>)..	119
Revision of the Provisional Questionnaire	
Interim report of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire (T/L.128)	120
The Ewe question	
Report of the Administering Authority on the results of the investigations carried out in Togoland under French administration (T/846)	120

President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Ryckmans (Belgium), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (*continued*)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON VISITING MISSIONS (T/L.126)

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Australian representative had suggested, with regard to the report of the Committee on Visiting Missions (T/L.126), that members of the Council might submit drafting changes for the Committee's consideration. The Council itself would take no decision on such amendments. Accordingly, the Australian representative had requested that the beginning of the sentence under point (a) of paragraph 4 of the Committee's report should be altered to read: "The Committee agreed that the time spent by missions in certain Trust Territories..."

2. Mr. HAY (Australia) confirmed the President's interpretation of his suggestion and, turning to point (b) of paragraph 4, warned the Committee that the dispatch of two separate missions in a single year to the Trust Territories in the Pacific might give rise to considerable difficulty. It would require eight specially qualified representatives and might entail the engagement of additional Secretariat staff and authorization by the General Assembly of additional expenditure.

3. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, pointed out that the Committee had expressly qualified its suggestion by the phrase "if possible" and had not intended to make it mandatory upon the Council. Obviously, before constituting a second visiting mission to the Pacific, such matters as composition, staff and costs would have to be taken into account, as well as any new circumstances which might have arisen. In the light of all those considerations the Council would exercise its judgment regarding the advisability of sending two separate missions.

4. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) supported that view. It appeared desirable, however, on the basis of the experience of the first Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in the Pacific, to send two separate groups.

5. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) also agreed that implementation of the Committee's suggestion should be subject to careful evaluation of all relevant circumstances prevailing at the time that a future visiting mission was constituted.

6. Mr. HAY (Australia) further cautioned the Committee regarding changes in the itineraries of visiting missions and emphasized the necessity for advance notice and consultation with the local administration before making such changes. The Committee had doubtless taken that factor into account in drafting point (c) of paragraph 4.

7. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), speaking as the Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, assured the Australian representative that changes in itinerary were of minor importance, that arrangements for transportation and accommodation would normally be made with local officials and that no important practical difficulties arose.

8. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested a drafting change in the final sentence under point (c): the words "should they desire" should be replaced by "should it become necessary".
9. Under point (e), he proposed the addition of the words, "some of which may not require a close examination on the spot".
10. Mr. HAY (Australia) observed, in connexion with point (h), that circulation of a general statement to explain the purpose of a visiting mission should be co-ordinated with the Administering Authority and the local administration of the Trust Territory concerned.
11. It should also be borne in mind that the statement would be addressed to peoples whose culture was sometimes extremely primitive, many of whom did not realize the balance of functions between the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council. The statement should, therefore, explain those functions very clearly. Thus, the words "which are under its supervision", in the first sentence of the first paragraph of the statement proposed in the Committee's report, appeared to contradict the opening part of the sentence; they might be replaced by "for the purpose of observing and reporting on their administration".
12. The PRESIDENT, speaking as the representative of Belgium, suggested substituting the words, "the administration of which it supervises".
13. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), as Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, accepted the modification.
14. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) questioned the advisability of binding the members of a visiting mission by a general text which could be interpreted in various ways. The draft statement in its present form was not satisfactory. While a visiting mission undoubtedly constituted the principal instrument in international supervision of the administration of Trust Territories, and while it consisted of representatives of the Trusteeship Council, not of individual governments, members of a mission should not be rigidly bound in their actions and their statements by so broad a text. The Council should have enough confidence in their political understanding and diplomatic tact to assume that they would be governed by the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System and would observe the necessary discretion.
15. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) agreed that the members of visiting missions should have a certain amount of freedom regarding what they said and did in their contacts with the indigenous population. The fact that the Committee had agreed that members should take every opportunity of informing the indigenous inhabitants of the functioning of the Trusteeship System, as the General Assembly had directed, was the principal consideration; a prepared statement was a secondary matter.
16. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, explained that the statement had been intended as an official interpretation of the provisions of the Charter relating to trusteeship; it made a clear distinction between the functions and authority of the Administering Authority and those of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. It would obviously be binding upon all members of a visiting mission.
17. The only problem which might arise was that of translating or adapting the text in order to convey its precise meaning in the indigenous language.
18. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) suggested, on that point, that it might be advisable to prepare an adequate translation in advance.
19. He strongly disagreed with the suggestions of the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Argentina regarding the freedom of action and expression to be enjoyed by individual members of a visiting mission in interpreting the purpose and functions of the mission. A concrete statement of the purpose of the visit must be made lest wrangling on divergent interpretations should reduce the mission to a debating society and thus seriously undermine the prestige of the Trusteeship Council and prejudice the interests of the indigenous population.
20. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) explained that he had no objection to an enumeration by the Trusteeship Council of directives which would govern the conduct of a visiting mission. Such specific instructions were essential. They should, however, be stated concisely and unequivocally; they should not be embodied in a general text such as the Committee had drafted.
21. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), as Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, found that suggestion perfectly acceptable. The visiting mission, as a group representing the Council, should know precisely what it was expected to explain to the indigenous population on the Council's behalf; it must therefore be instructed accordingly. Apart from those directives, each member was expected to exercise judgment in his personal conduct towards the indigenous inhabitants. Moreover, there would be no permanent set of instructions to which all missions would be subject; the Council's directives would necessarily be adapted to the particular Trust Territories which were to be visited.
22. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the second paragraph of the draft statement should be replaced by an abstract of the provisions of Article 76 of the Charter, defining the objectives of the Trusteeship System, and of the provisions of Articles 87 and 88, which set forth the functions and powers of the Trusteeship Council.
23. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested that the Committee should revise the draft statement in the light of the Council's discussion and the various amendments submitted. He would prefer a more concise and specific statement.
24. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) supported the suggestion. The USSR proposal to include a statement of basic objectives abstracted from Article 76 of the Charter had, he thought, real value.
25. Mr. HAY (Australia) also supported the Iraqi representative's proposal.
26. The PRESIDENT, speaking as the representative of Belgium, also felt that the draft statement should be reviewed by the Committee. The Administering Authority should be able to distribute a text on which the Council agreed; it should not be open to the charge

that it was giving its own version of the relationship between it and the Trusteeship Council.

27. The USSR proposal might be applicable if the relevant provisions of the Charter were expressed in language understandable to the peoples of Trust Territories. It would be necessary to adopt a text which could be translated into pidgin-English for example.

28. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) suggested that the membership of the Committee on Visiting Missions should be enlarged to include six representatives.

29. The PRESIDENT proposed that the representatives of Australia and the Dominican Republic should be added to the Committee.

It was so decided.

30. After a further exchange of views, the PRESIDENT suggested that action on the draft resolution included in the report should be deferred until the Committee had completed its work of revision.

It was so decided.

Development of a 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 494 (V)) (continued)

31. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) presented a revised text (T/L.122/Rev.1) of the draft resolution his delegation had submitted at the 320th meeting. He hoped that the new text would meet the objections to the original draft raised by the representative of Belgium and other members of the Council. The second operative paragraph of that draft had been omitted from the revised text and the preamble had been made more concise. The intention of the Dominican delegation in presenting the draft resolution was to give the Trusteeship Council an opportunity of endorsing the principles of the 20-year programme which had been approved by the General Assembly.

32. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) had no objection to the revised draft resolution as submitted by the Dominican representative, but wondered whether a resolution which called for no action but merely took note of a General Assembly resolution needed so detailed a preamble.

33. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) pointed out that the second paragraph of the preamble referred to specific parts of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/1304) and that, in view of the importance of the 20-year programme, the Council should do more than merely take note of the General Assembly resolution.

34. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) thought that in his revised draft resolution the Dominican representative had succeeded in excluding questions which did not fall within the competence of the Trusteeship Council. The text was now perfectly acceptable.

35. He could not agree with the representative of Iraq that so detailed a preamble was undesirable. The 20-year programme was extremely important and the Argentine delegation would support the revised draft resolution in its entirety.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and was resumed at 4.25 p.m.

36. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, during the discussion on the

resolution on the 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations at the fifth session of the General Assembly, the USSR delegation had taken the position¹ that that resolution was completely unacceptable because it made no attempt to deal with the substance of the problems affecting world peace or to establish the framework for settling such problems. It had merely referred the study of various crucial questions to unspecified organs of the United Nations, thus breaking up a highly integrated programme into separate, unrelated parts. The resolution was, in effect, hollow and meaningless and would serve only to divert attention from the real question of peace and prevent the adoption of a pact for peace.

37. It should further be remembered that the USSR delegation had presented an alternative draft resolution¹ which provided a satisfactory basis for peace. It advocated technical assistance for backward peoples, including all Trust Territories, in accordance with the consistent policy of the Soviet Union in favour of an expanded programme of technical assistance. It should be noted, however, that, in the opinion of the USSR, technical assistance must be so organized as to prevent foreign monopolies from controlling the economy of under-developed countries and subjecting them to pressure and interference. It was significant that the technical assistance programme was being used by United States monopolies for the economic enslavement of small countries and that the Point Four programme initiated by President Truman actually represented colonial expansion by the United States. At the close of the Second World War the United States had achieved great expansion through the Marshall Plan. The Secretary-General's memorandum was one-sided, pro-American and contrary to the interests of small nations.

38. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that attacks on the Marshall Plan and the Point Four programme were irrelevant to the item under discussion.

39. The PRESIDENT asked the USSR representative to confine himself to a discussion of the draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic.

40. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had been stating the USSR delegation's position on the resolution on a 20-year programme for achieving peace which the General Assembly had adopted on the basis of the Secretary-General's memorandum and which the Trusteeship Council was now being asked to note.

41. The Soviet Union had urged the General Assembly to adopt a technical assistance programme which would not endanger the economy of under-developed countries by allotting the function of policy-making to monopolies seeking to further their own interests. Technical assistance must be directed by the United Nations rather than by any single country or group of countries and it should seek to develop the natural resources, agriculture and industries of under-developed countries. In no case should technical assistance be granted in exchange for economic, military or political concessions.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 309th meeting.

42. The remaining sections of the Secretary-General's memorandum, to which the Dominican draft resolution referred, were vaguely worded and contained no positive recommendations for achieving the aims and objectives of the Trusteeship System. The Soviet Union delegation had therefore voted against the resolution on a 20-year programme adopted at the fifth session of the General Assembly and would similarly vote against the Dominican draft resolution calling on the Trusteeship Council to take note of the General Assembly's earlier action.

43. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the revised draft resolution (T/L.122/Rev.1) presented by the Dominican Republic.

The resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

Revision of the Provisional Questionnaire

INTERIM REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE (T/L.128)

44. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Chairman of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire, introduced the Committee's interim report (T/L.128). The Committee had felt that Administering Authorities must be given time to study the revised text of the Questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat (T/AC.32/L.1 and T/AC.32/L.1/Add.1) and to submit comments. It had therefore proposed the adoption of the draft resolution contained in its report.

45. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) said it would be difficult for his government to submit its comments by 15 April 1951, especially as the French text of the Questionnaire was not yet ready.

46. Furthermore, since the Council would have a heavy agenda at the ninth session, he wondered whether the final decision on the Questionnaire might not be deferred until the tenth session.

47. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand) and Mr. GARREAU (France) were also in favour of giving Administering Authorities more time to present their observations.

48. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) accordingly suggested that the words "before 15 April 1951" in the third paragraph of the draft resolution should be replaced by "if possible, before 15 May 1951".

It was so decided.

49. Mr. GARREAU (France) proposed, as a consequential amendment, that the words in the last paragraph, "at the beginning of the ninth session", should be replaced by "during the ninth session".

It was so decided.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

50. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had abstained because his delegation could not support a resolution which would curtail the rights of the Trusteeship Council. Under Article 88 of the Charter the Council itself was empowered to prepare the Questionnaire and it was for Administering Authorities to supply the answers, not to give their comments. The Charter nowhere said that

approval of the Questionnaire should be made dependent on the views of the Administering Authorities.

51. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) explained that he had voted in favour of the resolution because his government considered itself—rightly, he hoped—a full-fledged member of the Trusteeship Council.

The Ewe question

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY ON THE RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATIONS CARRIED OUT IN TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/846)

52. Mr. GARREAU (France) recalled that paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 441 (V) recommended that the Administering Authority of Togoland under French administration should "investigate promptly the practices complained of in the petition of the President of the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise*" and in other petitions on the subject with a view to ascertaining whether the methods of election which have been applied ensure that the views of all sections of the population are faithfully reflected". The French Government had appointed Mr. Baptiste, *Procureur général*, to conduct that investigation. Mr. Baptiste was present in the Council room and was ready to present his report (T/846).

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baptiste, Procureur général, took a place at the Council table.

53. Mr. BAPTISTE thanked the Trusteeship Council for the opportunity afforded him of addressing it.

54. The French Government had entrusted him with the task of conducting an inquiry into the elections which had taken place in Togoland under French administration in October 1950. Guiding himself by General Assembly resolution 441 (V), he had cast aside all political considerations and had endeavoured to find out whether the elections had been held under such conditions that their results might be said truly to represent the wishes of the local population.

55. He drew attention to the report which he had prepared and recapitulated the contents of the first few pages. In so doing, he introduced some additional information. Thus, he explained that the statement in his report that no sufficient majority had been obtained in certain districts at the second stage of the elections meant that the number of votes cast had fallen far short of the number to be expected. In the subdivision of Ysévié, for example, only five of the 105 electors (*grands électeurs*) had voted.

56. With reference to the grievances listed in the petition addressed by the President of the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* to the Secretary-General, he explained that the judgments which had been called partial by the *Comité* had been rendered by a first degree tribunal in cases where the legal validity of an electoral list had been challenged.

57. He added that the members of the *Comité* had supplied him with a list of persons who had been arrested and with full details of the arrests and had asked him to investigate those cases. He had visited the whole of Togoland in order to make his investiga-

² See documents T/Pet.7/160—T/Pet.6/194 and Add.1, Add.2, Add.3, Add.4 and Add.5.

tion complete in every respect, and prior to that visit he had communicated to the heads of the political parties his full programme.

58. He mentioned further that the leaders of the Togoland Progress Party (*Parti togolais du progrès*) had, in proof of their contention that the elections were free, cited the fact that in some sectors the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* had obtained as much as 95 per cent of the votes.

59. He then furnished additional explanations of the electoral system applied in the whole of French Africa, which had been established by the Act of 5 October 1946 adopted by the French National Constituent Assembly; that law clearly defined the categories of the population entitled to vote. Some persons would have liked that system to be used in the October elections. There was, however, no doubt that the two-stage system of elections, which was used in metropolitan France for elections to the Council of the Republic, was not only preferable but would be necessary in Togoland under French administration until the political maturity of the population as a whole

had reached a considerably higher level. He emphasized the fact that the electors (*grands électeurs*) had voted not in their personal capacity but as representatives of the population.

60. His finding, therefore, was that the electoral system used in the October elections had permitted the population of the north and of the south, regardless of its cultural level, to express its desires.

61. With respect to the objection that the lists of villages published were incomplete and could be altered at will, he said that his inquiry showed that no such changes could be made save by a legal decision of the Representative Assembly. He presented to the Council copies of posters containing lists of villages which had been posted in all subdivisions in accordance with law.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that Mr. Baptiste should be asked to complete his statement at the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.