

Following the reconstitution of the Special Committee for 1949, the Fourth Committee elected eight non-administering members (Brazil, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, Soviet Union, Sweden, and Venezuela) to balance the eight administering States.

Report of Trusteeship Council

The report of the Trusteeship Council on its second and third sessions contained the observations and recommendations of the Council on three annual reports (New Guinea, Tanganyika, and Ruanda Urundi) as well as an account of the action taken by the Council on various petitions received, of which the two most important were those from the leaders and representatives of Western Samoa and from the Ewe people of Togoland.

In addition, the Council reported on two questions which, although outside its normal scope of activities, the General Assembly had specifically referred to it—namely, the report on the administration of South-west Africa for 1946 (transmitted by the Government of the Union of South Africa for the information of the United Nations) and the question of the draft statute for the City of Jerusalem (Part III of the Plan of Partition for Palestine—General Assembly resolution of 29 November, 1947). This last question was, however, under discussion by the First Committee, and accordingly the Fourth Committee took no action on it.

The President of the Council, Mr Liu Chieh of *China*, in presenting the report, perhaps best summed up what the majority of the Committee thought should be the primary purpose of the Trusteeship Council: it should be “the guardian of the separate political entity of the trusteeship territories” and should “supervise the administration of such territories and submit it to a careful and critical analysis.”

Some of the representatives of administering Powers, however, criticized present tendencies in the Council. The *United Kingdom* delegate (Mr Grantley Adams, a Negro lawyer and labour leader who is Leader of the Barbados House of Assembly) warned that unless the Council could rid itself of “certain false notions” which had already begun to mar its work it would prove itself unequal to its responsibilities under the Charter. The colonial peoples were becoming “disillusioned, even somewhat cynical,” about the practical contributions the United Nations could make to their advancement and welfare while these matters were being discussed within the context of Power politics and rival ideologies. Mr Adams appealed to the Council to avoid the passing of “*ex cathedra* doctrinaire judgments on many important problems to whose solution the administering authorities bring years of experience and endeavour.”

Slav delegations, on the other hand, attacked the Council's report because it did not go nearly far enough. Criticism was concentrated particularly upon the trust territories in Africa, where the colonial