

TRUSTEESHIP 2 JUN 1952

COUNCIL



Wednesday, 26 March 1952, at 2 p.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Revision of the Provisional Questionnaire: report of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire (<i>continued</i>)	169
Participation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories in the work of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 554 (VI)) (T/L.239, T/L.240/Rev.1) (<i>continued</i>)	172
Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the period ended 31 December 1950 (T/941, T/942 and Add.1) (<i>continued</i>) Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.231 and Corr.1, T/L.248)	173
Examination of petitions (<i>continued</i>) First report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.247): petitions concerning New Guinea	176
Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (<i>continued</i>)	176

President: Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present:

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representative of the following State non-member of the Trusteeship Council: Italy.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Revision of the Provisional Questionnaire: report of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire (*continued*)

[Agenda item 6]

1. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of Iraq, Chairman of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire, to introduce the Committee's report (T/L.246 and Corr.1).
2. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) was glad to report that the Drafting Committee had finished its work. The revised questionnaire was annexed to the Committee's report; both texts had been adopted unanimously.
3. The Drafting Committee had adopted most of the suggestions received from the delegations of the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Belgium, France, the Italian observer to the United Nations, members of the Fourth Committee, the specialized agencies and the Secretary-General. Australian suggestions tending to eliminate a great deal of the information required had not been adopted, however, since their adoption would have

altered the scope of the revised questionnaire to a considerable extent.

4. The observer of the Italian Government to the United Nations had asked whether question 18 (c) referred to the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration. That question had not been decided by the Committee, which had left the Council to give its own interpretation.

5. The statistical appendices had been approved on the understanding that, for the time being, the Administering Authorities would include such statistics as were available, as far as possible in the form set out in the appendices. The ultimate aim to supply full statistics in the specified form as soon as the requisite statistical services could be developed.

6. He proposed that the Trusteeship Council should approve the revised questionnaire as set forth in the annex to document T/246 and Corr.1.

7. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) drew the Council's attention to paragraph 8 of the Committee's report, setting out the views of the United Kingdom delegation. Those views might be summarized as follows: first, the Administering Authorities might submit their reports in the narrative form and not in the form of answers to each question in the revised questionnaire, provided that each question was covered and that the report contained an index showing where each answer could be found; secondly, at least five years should be allowed to elapse before the questionnaire was revised again, as officers in the Trust Territories who used it in preparing annual reports became accustomed to a given questionnaire; thirdly, there was no need for certain material which did not vary from year to year to be repeated in each annual report,

provided that reference was made to the report in which the information had been contained; lastly, if the Administering Authorities had already transmitted the information required to one of the specialized agencies, they should be allowed to append their report to the specialized agency to the annual report rather than repeat the information *in toto* in the body of the latter. Nevertheless, the most important recipient of the annual reports was the Trusteeship Council and they should be drafted to meet its requirements rather than those of some other international body. His delegation did not, however, attach such great importance to the last point.

8. He would be prepared to vote for the adoption of the Committee's report and the revised questionnaire subject to the reservations that he had just outlined and which were contained in paragraph 8 of the report. He suggested that in accordance with the practice followed in the case of the Provisional Questionnaire (T/44), the report of the Drafting Committee should be printed with the revised questionnaire.

9. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) pointed out that the Committee's report had been distributed very recently and that a number of delegations had not had time to study it thoroughly. He therefore proposed that adoption of the Committee's report and the revised questionnaire should be deferred to the eleventh session of the Council. In the meantime the Secretary-General should transmit the questionnaire to each member of the Trusteeship Council for their suggestions and comments. He hoped that the final questionnaire would obtain the unanimous approval of the Council.

10. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) presented a draft resolution which read:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Having considered the report of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire,

"1. Approves the Questionnaire as set forth in the annex to document T/L.246 and Corr.1;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the Questionnaire to all the Administering Authorities."

11. He observed that, in view of the remarks of the United States representative, that text might not be final.

12. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) and Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) supported the point of view of the United States representative.

13. Mr. PIGNON (France) agreed with the last speakers and pointed out that it was extremely difficult for his delegation to study such an important document when the French text was not available. Furthermore, his delegation was not convinced of the need to modify the Provisional Questionnaire, which had proved quite adequate and with which the Administering Authorities were familiar.

14. In conclusion, he wished to associate himself with the reservations contained in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Committee's report.

15. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic), supported by Mr. S. S. LIU (China), said that his

delegation was in favour of the adoption of the revised questionnaire in the form submitted by the Drafting Committee, and could not agree to any suggestion that it should be shortened or to any reservations being made with regard to its adoption.

16. The delegation of the Dominican Republic was opposed to the narrative form for the submission of reports, because it was easier and simpler for the Council to obtain a true picture of the situation from direct answers to direct questions. Furthermore, only by such questions and answers would the Administering Authorities meet the provisions of Article 88 of the Charter. That Article stated that the Council should produce a questionnaire and that the Administering Authorities had the obligation to answer it. In stressing that point, he believed that he was also speaking for a great number of the other delegations represented on the Fourth Committee. The reports, according to Article 88 of the Charter, were prepared for the use of the General Assembly in order for it to obtain a clear picture of the activities of the Administering Authorities in the Territories.

17. His delegation was not opposed, in principle, to the suggestion that the questionnaire should not be revised again for five years, but it was opposed to including any such rigid time-limit in the Drafting Committee's report. The need for further revision of the questionnaire could be decided only in the light of experience and to lay down any arbitrary time-limit would be to preclude any future revision by the Council. In support of his objection, he quoted rule 69 of the rules of procedure, according to which the Council might at any time revise the questionnaire.

18. Article 88 of the Charter specifically stated that the Trusteeship Council should formulate questionnaires for each Trust Territory. While it might be difficult for the Council to formulate the eleven separate questionnaires now required and while the Provisional Questionnaire had proved more or less applicable to all the Trust Territories, the Administering Authorities had frequently complained that certain questions were very difficult to answer, since they were not strictly applicable to the particular Territory for which they were responsible. He therefore insisted that the General Assembly should be asked for its interpretation of Article 88, and suggested that there should be a master questionnaire, such as that submitted by the Drafting Committee, with several variations, several "tailored" questionnaires which would meet the needs of each Territory.

19. He could not accept the United Kingdom suggestion that information already included in reports to specialized agencies might merely be appended to the annual reports. Not only was that suggestion inconsistent with the very valid principle stressed by the United Kingdom representative—namely, that each annual report should be prepared as a single entity—but it subordinated the principal obligation of the Administering Authorities to answer all the questions in the questionnaire to a purely informative obligation to the specialized agencies. The Administering Authorities must remember that their obligations to the General Assembly, and thus to the Council, came before their obligations to the specialized agencies. The Administering Authorities might refer the specialized agencies to

the reports submitted to the United Nations, but never vice versa.

20. His delegation, as it had already stated in the Drafting Committee, was firmly opposed to the non-inclusion in the annual reports of information of a static nature. If the suggestion that when the situation remained unchanged reference should merely be made to an earlier report containing the relevant information were put to the vote, his delegation would be obliged to vote against it. The report, as he had stated before, was an entity, and the delegations to the General Assembly and to the Trusteeship Council—in particular, new delegations to the Council—could not be asked to refer back to former reports which were not always readily available.

21. With reference to the suggestion to postpone the adoption of the revised questionnaire, he said that the Drafting Committee had been working on the revision of the questionnaire for two years and it would be illogical, as well as impolite to the Drafting Committee, not to adopt the revised questionnaire without further waste of time.

22. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) said that his delegation, too, would like further time to consider the revised questionnaire, particularly since the French text was not available.

23. His delegation had originally considered that there was no need to amend the Provisional Questionnaire, since it had served its purpose perfectly. A complete picture of the situation in the Trust Territories had been obtained from the annual reports, the reports of the visiting missions and the replies of the special representatives. Nevertheless, the Council having decided otherwise, the Belgian delegation was prepared to accept the revised questionnaire, in principle, subject to the United Kingdom's reservations, which were of a purely formal nature. In that connexion, he said he thought that it was the first time there had been any criticism in the Council of the narrative form of presentation.

24. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) stated that his delegation, which represented a non-administering member of the Council and which wanted to make sure that the Charter was properly applied by the Administering Authorities, attached great importance to the questionnaire.

25. As to the reservations of the representatives of the United Kingdom and Belgium, as included in paragraph 8 of the Committee's report, he quoted Article 88 of the Charter and stated that he firmly believed that annual reports in a narrative form did not meet the conditions of the Charter. The Charter asked for specific answers to specific questions and the Administering Authorities were under the obligation to answer the questionnaire. Though, as the Administering Authorities had said, it might seem unimportant what form the annual reports had as long as all the questions were duly answered, his delegation was of the opinion that even the form of the report was prescribed by the Charter, i.e., the form of specific replies to specific questions. He did not understand why such a simple matter as the form of the report should give rise to such a strong attitude on the part of some administering members of the Council or why the adoption of their point of view might facilitate

the acceptance of the report of the Drafting Committee on the questionnaire. The conditions laid down by some of the Administering Authorities in connexion with the adoption of the revised questionnaire tended to give his delegation the impression that there must be a special reason for the Administering Authorities to emphasize the necessity of annual reports in a narrative form. The revised questionnaire was prepared in a scientific and logical way and there was no need to have a report read as a novel.

26. As to the non-inclusion of static information in the annual reports, his delegation was strongly opposed to such a policy, which would mean that members of the Council with little experience in trusteeship matters would have to read the reports for previous years. Moreover, delegations did not always have the reports in question.

27. On other points not mentioned in his speech, he was in complete agreement with the representative of the Dominican Republic.

28. He congratulated the Drafting Committee for its very good work and expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the revised questionnaire, which should be adopted by the Council without any changes.

29. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) was in full agreement with the representatives of the Dominican Republic and El Salvador. As to the narrative form of the report, he stressed that Article 88 of the Charter prescribed the way in which the reports had to be prepared. The annual reports should consist of answers to questions put to the Administering Authorities in the questionnaire.

30. With regard to the suggestion that the questionnaire should not be revised again for five years, he referred to rule 69 of the rules of procedure, and said he thought that the Council should be given discretion to modify the questionnaire whenever it wished.

31. His delegation would not be satisfied with mere reference to information contained in previous reports. The annual reports were prepared for the General Assembly and not every delegation was familiar with the work of the Council; nor could the Council expect that every delegation would refer to previous reports when considering a particular report for a particular year. All available information on the Territory should be included in each annual report.

32. The same was also true in connexion with the question of appending reports made to specialized agencies to the annual reports to the General Assembly. The Trusteeship Council was a principal organ of the United Nations and the information given to it should be the first consideration of the Administering Authorities. It would not be enough for the Administering Authorities simply to attach a document which had been prepared for a specialized agency.

33. For those reasons, he felt that the Council should not be bound by the four observations made by the United Kingdom on the points mentioned in paragraph 8 of the report of the Drafting Committee.

34. Finally, he expressed his sympathy with the request to defer the final adoption of the report of the Drafting Committee to the following session of the Council.

35. The PRESIDENT expressed the Council's thanks to the Drafting Committee and its Chairman for the work they had accomplished.

36. He then put to the vote the United States proposal to the effect that the Council should defer action on the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.246 and Corr.1) until its eleventh session and should request the Secretary-General to circulate the report to each member of the Council for comments to be submitted prior to the opening of that session.

The United States proposal was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Participation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories in the work of the Trusteeship Council (General Assembly resolution 554 (VI)) (T/L.239, T/L.240/Rev.1) (continued)

[Agenda item 12]

37. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) considered that neither the Iraqi draft resolution (T/L.240/Rev.1) nor the USSR draft resolution (T/L.239) exactly corresponded to the intention expressed by the General Assembly in resolution 554 (VI), namely, that the Council should examine the possibility of associating the indigenous inhabitants more closely with its work. While he was sympathetic to the idea that the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories should acquire a greater knowledge of the work of the Trusteeship Council, he did not feel that the General Assembly resolution called for direct and immediate action by the Council. It would be more proper for the Council to appoint a committee to study the various ways in which the indigenous inhabitants might be more closely associated with its work. The Council should study the committee's report and submit its own conclusions in time for the seventh session of the General Assembly, as the resolution required.

38. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) wished to make it clear that the question of the composition of delegations to the Trusteeship Council was one with which each government must deal itself. Governments could not delegate their powers in that respect and it might therefore be necessary for all six Administering Authorities to be represented on whatever committee was appointed. That in turn would mean that the other six members of the Council would also have to be on the committee, thus leading to a committee of twelve. Moreover, the question was of such vital importance to the Administering Authorities that he did not feel it could usefully be studied by a committee.

39. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation had opposed the resolution finally adopted by the General Assembly and had voted against it in the Fourth Committee. Since it had been adopted, however, the United Kingdom Government had carefully reviewed its position and had studied the arguments advanced by those in favour of the resolution.

40. Some representatives had apparently had in mind a form of associate membership for the indigenous inhabitants similar to that existing in certain specialized agencies. Since the Council's composition was laid down in the Charter, however, he did not feel that the

precedents established by the specialized agencies were necessarily applicable. A number of other means of associating the indigenous inhabitants with the work of the Council had also been suggested; they all presented difficulties of a greater or lesser degree. The proposal of the representative of El Salvador that a committee should be established had doubtless been inspired by the multiplicity of possible solutions, and Mr. Mathieson agreed that careful thought would have to be given to all the implications of every course of action.

41. His Government had initiated consultations with the governments of the Trust Territories with a view to exploring various alternative solutions. Those consultations were not completed and, until such time as they were completed, his delegation was not prepared to take any final position on the matter. It would be most reluctant to vote on any resolution, though it fully appreciated the spirit of compromise underlying the Iraqi proposal. Similarly it would be unable to participate fully in the work of any committee. He therefore hoped that the Council would be given further time for reflection and proposed that the final decision on the matter should be postponed until the eleventh session.

42. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) thought that with certain modifications the proposal of the representative of Iraq might offer a satisfactory solution. The subject was, however, a complex one and he would support the suggestion of the United Kingdom representative that the matter should be postponed to the eleventh session. The substantive action ultimately taken should be such as to command the widest possible support in the Council.

43. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) would agree to the postponement of the question. Although his delegation would probably wish to propose certain modifications to the proposal of the representative of Iraq, he associated himself whole-heartedly with the expressions of appreciation of Mr. Khalidy's approach to that difficult and important subject.

44. Mr. PIGNON (France) also paid a tribute to the conciliatory spirit shown by the Iraqi delegation. He thought, however, that an adjournment to give the members of the Council time for reflection would be desirable.

45. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) thought that in view of the General Assembly's resolution the Council could not merely postpone the matter. It could adopt either the Iraqi draft resolution or the USSR draft resolution, or report to the General Assembly that having examined all aspects of the problem, it had decided that it was not possible for indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories to participate in its work. He urged that an immediate decision should be taken, and submitted a formal proposal that a committee should be appointed to study the question and report to the eleventh session of the Council in time to enable the Council to report to the seventh session of the General Assembly.

46. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) pointed out that the General Assembly had not enjoined the Administering Authorities to follow any particular course of action; it had merely recommended that the Council should

examine the possibility of indigenous inhabitants' participating in its work.

47. In view of the objections that had been raised, he withdrew his draft resolution.

48. The PRESIDENT asked the representative of El Salvador to frame a definite proposal during the recess.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 p.m. and was resumed at 4.20 p.m.

49. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) proposed the following draft resolution:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"1. Decides to establish a committee composed of six members to study the possibility of associating more closely the inhabitants of the Trust Territories in the work of the Council and to examine this question in the light of resolution 554 (VI) of the General Assembly and the observations made by members of the Council during the discussion on this matter;

"2. Instructs the Committee to submit its report to the Council at its next session."

50. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) would support that draft resolution, but suggested the addition of the words "and in the light of any observations the Administering Authorities may wish to make".

51. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) accepted that amendment.

52. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution submitted by the representative of El Salvador to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

53. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had been unable to vote for the resolution because he considered that the Council should have taken an immediate decision on the matter. He hoped the committee to be set up would take into consideration the draft resolution he had submitted. He reserved the right to speak in support of the draft resolution at the eleventh session of the Council.

54. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) had supported the proposal to establish a committee in view of the fact that the United Kingdom delegation was anxious to have further time in which to complete the consultations with the governments of the Trust Territories which would be necessary before it could adopt a final position.

55. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) had abstained in the vote because although, when the proposal had first been made, he had felt doubtful whether a committee would be useful, he had not felt obliged to oppose it in its final form.

56. He wished to make quite clear the Australian Government's view that nothing in any resolution the Council might adopt could limit the absolute right of governments to determine to whom they would delegate power to act on their behalf at international conferences or on international bodies. It was a fundamental principle that the selection of representatives and members of delegations to the Trusteeship Council was entirely a

matter for the Administering Authorities, which were responsible for deciding in that connexion what was appropriate and practicable.

57. Mr. PIGNON (France) had abstained in the vote because, while appreciating the spirit in which the proposal had been made, he did not consider the problem to fall within the category of questions which could be suitably dealt with by a committee.

58. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador), in reply to the Australian representative, explained that it had been far from the intention of the delegation of El Salvador to attempt to limit the powers of governments in the matter of the appointment of representatives to international organizations. In its view, the object of the proposed study would not only be to ascertain whether it would be possible for indigenous inhabitants to be included in delegations, perhaps as advisers or in some other capacity, but also to find other means of associating the indigenous inhabitants with the work of the Council.

59. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) said that he had voted for the resolution because his Government was anxious to have the benefit of expressions of opinion by all members of the Council, and particularly by the non-administering members. He associated himself with the view that the matter was ultimately one for decision by governments.

60. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) had abstained in the vote in a spirit of conciliation, although his delegation felt that General Assembly resolution 554 (VI) would be impossible to implement, and also that a committee such as that to be established was not the best method of dealing with so important a question of principle.

61. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) had voted for the resolution because he would be in favour of any measure designed to implement the General Assembly resolution. He had made certain reservations, however, when the question had been discussed in the Fourth Committee¹.

62. With regard to the contention of the Australian representative that governments alone had power to decide on the composition of their delegations, he wished to emphasize that the governments of the Administering Authorities were not sovereign in the Trust Territories; sovereignty was vested in the people of the Territories, as was clearly stated in the Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland. He reserved the right to discuss any infringement of that principle.

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the period ended 31 December 1950 (T/941, T/942 and Add.1) (continued)

[Agenda item 3(a)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.231 and Corr.1, T/L.248)

63. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) drew attention to the fact that, whereas in its last report on the administration of Western Samoa the

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Fourth Committee, 237th meeting.*

Council had included a general commendation of the progress achieved by the Administering Authority (A/1856, p. 202), there was no such commendation in the report currently before the Council (T/L.248). He understood that the Drafting Committee had decided to make criticisms or commendations on specific matters only and to omit any general commendation. He had no objection to such a procedure, but he felt that if that policy were to be adopted it must be the declared policy of the Council as a whole and not merely of one of the drafting committees. As it was, the absence of any general commendation might well give the impression that the Council had not appreciated the work done by the Administering Authority in the period under review.

64. He proposed, therefore, that an editorial note should be added to explain the Council's policy in the matter, so that the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly would understand that the Council did not intend to make general commendations with regard to any of the Trust Territories.

65. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Western Samoa, explained that there were before the Council a number of documents to be read in conjunction one with another. Documents T/L.231 and T/L.231/Corr.1 contained the outline of conditions in the Trust Territory, prepared by the Secretariat and subsequently modified to take account of the information given by the special representative in his replies to questions put by the Council, while document T/L.248 was limited to conclusions and recommendations. The Drafting Committee had felt that the Council would probably prefer to receive a report in the form of one single document, in which the conclusions and recommendations were integrated with the outline of conditions. That, however, would have entailed the reproduction of practically the whole of documents T/L.231 and T/L.231/Corr.1 and the Committee had been informed that it was a general rule of the Secretariat that a document that had already been circulated in mimeographed form should not be reproduced in any subsequent document. Having noted that in the Council's consideration of previous reports the greater part of its work had been confined to votes on recommendations and conclusions, the Drafting Committee had concentrated its recommendations and observations in document T/L.248, where they were numbered serially for easy reference and voting.

66. In explanation of the rule regarding the reproduction of documents, the Secretariat had stated that for the purpose of rapid translation and circulation it was better to have a short report than one in which the material appearing in documents already before the Council was fully integrated. That was a question that the Council need not necessarily consider at the present moment but it might perhaps be taken up by the Committee on General Procedures, since it was a matter that affected the progress of the Council's work, particularly towards the close of its sessions.

67. With regard to the Thai representative's remark, he pointed out that at the 388th meeting the Council had decided to take note of the observations made during the sixth session of the General Assembly concerning the Council's last report (A/1856) and agreed

to be bound by them. Among observations that had been reiterated frequently in the Fourth Committee had been the fact that members found the frequent commendations of the Administering Authorities irritating. The Drafting Committee had therefore decided that it would not attempt to find an observation or a commendation for every section of the report but would limit itself to noting the appreciation of the Council on certain specific points only.

68. The Thai representative had proposed the addition of an editorial note to the report, to explain the new policy of the Council in that respect. If that idea were adopted, Mr. Mathieson thought it would be more appropriate to make a general reference to the matter in the Council's report to the next session of the General Assembly, stating explicitly that in its anxiety to produce a concise report the Council had not thought it necessary to preface its report on each Trust Territory with an encomium or criticism in broad general terms but had confined its praise or blame to specific points.

69. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) declared that his delegation was quite content with the fact that during the examination of the report on Western Samoa all the members of the Trusteeship Council, with the exception of the USSR representative, had expressed approval of the New Zealand Government's administration of the Territory. He felt, however, that if there was to be no general commendation in the Council's report on the administration of Western Samoa, that rule should apply to reports on all Trust Territories.

70. The Council would recall that he had invited an expression of the Council's opinion on a question which was at present under consideration by the Administering Authority, namely, whether the adoption of universal suffrage and the secret ballot should be regarded as conditions precedent to the granting of self-government. That appeared to be a difficult matter to which the Council was unable to give its attention at the moment, but he would like a reference to the matter to be included in the summary of individual observations.

71. The PRESIDENT stated that, since he understood that a different policy had been followed in the report of the Drafting Committee on one of the other Trust Territories, he had asked to see a copy of that report, which had not yet been mimeographed. In the meantime, he proposed that the Council should proceed to vote upon the documents before it, on the understanding that they would if necessary be amended when the Council was informed of the contents of the other report for which he had asked.

72. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that the outline of conditions in Western Samoa had been drawn up in total disregard of the views that had been expressed in the Council, particularly those of the USSR delegation, and that it did not give a true picture of the situation. The recommendations that the Drafting Committee had proposed for adoption by the Council did not take into account the recommendations that the USSR delegation had put forward during the discussion on the Administering Authority's report; they were of a general nature and were not aimed at the implementa-

tion of the provisions of the Charter, which called upon the Administering Authorities to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence. The recommendations proposed would do nothing to improve the situation of the indigenous inhabitants.

73. The USSR delegation could not, therefore, vote in favour of the draft report submitted by the Drafting Committee. With regard to the recommendations, it found the majority quite unacceptable, but if they were put to the vote separately it would vote for or against them individually.

The Council adopted the outline of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa (T/L.231 and Corr.1) by 9 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote, one by one, the draft recommendations proposed by the Drafting Committee, as set out in document T/L.248.

Recommendation 1 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 2 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

75. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the "administrative personnel" referred to in recommendation 3 were indigenous or European personnel.

76. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom), speaking as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Western Samoa, explained that the recommendation was intended to apply to all administrative personnel employed in Western Samoa, whether indigenous or otherwise. The Drafting Committee had not wanted any advantages that might be offered to be limited to the indigenous personnel.

77. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that it was the duty of the Administering Authority to create a situation in which it would be possible for the indigenous inhabitants to administer their own Territory; hence, one of the primary tasks of the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council was to ensure that indigenous inhabitants received the necessary training for that work. Recommendation 3 was so worded as to refer to all administrative personnel in the Territory, whereas the accent should be placed upon indigenous personnel.

78. He therefore proposed that the recommendation should be amended by the addition, after the word "personnel", of the words "from among the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory".

79. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) pointed out that page 19 of the report on Western Samoa² showed that of the 1,164 administrative personnel employed in the Territory, 76 only had been recruited overseas, the remaining 1,088 having been recruited locally.

² See Report by the New Zealand Government to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Western Samoa for the period of nine months from 1st April to 31st December, 1950, Department of Island Territories, Wellington, 1951.

80. The PRESIDENT put the USSR amendment to the vote.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

81. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted against the USSR amendment, not because he objected to the training of the indigenous inhabitants, but because he considered that there should be no discrimination among the members of the public service in Western Samoa.

Recommendation 3 was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

Recommendation 4 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Recommendation 5 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 6 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Recommendation 7 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 8 was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Recommendation 9 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 10 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 11 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 12 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 13 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Recommendation 14 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

82. At the request of Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the PRESIDENT put the two sentences that comprised recommendation 15 to the vote separately.

The first sentence of recommendation 15 was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The remainder of recommendation 15 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Recommendation 15 as a whole was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

Recommendation 16 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

83. At the request of Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the PRESIDENT put recommendation 17 to the vote in two parts, the first ending with the word "system".

The first part of recommendation 17 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The remainder of recommendation 17 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Recommendation 17 as a whole was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

84. At the request of Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the PRESIDENT put recommendation 18 to the vote in two parts, the first ending with the word "night-school".

The first part of recommendation 18 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The remainder of recommendation 18 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Recommendation 18 as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

85. The PRESIDENT announced that he had just received a copy of the draft report that was to be produced on the Trust Territory of Nauru (T/L.250) and he noted that the first recommendation ran as follows:

"The Trusteeship Council notes that continued progress was made during the year under review, but expresses the hope that future reports will give more detailed information with regard to all aspects of the administration of the Territory."

86. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) found little divergence in the effect of the two draft reports, since the commendation with regard to the progress made was accompanied by a suggestion that the information supplied had been inadequate.

87. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) proposed that the phrase "notes that continued progress was made during the year under review" should be added to the report on Western Samoa.

88. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) pointed out that if such a general statement were added in the case of every report it would tend to detract from the value of the real commendations made in respect of specific matters. If, on the other hand, it were omitted from some reports, it would be regarded as a serious reflection upon the administration of the Territory in question.

89. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) explained that the Drafting Committee had been anxious to avoid any criticism by the General Assembly to the effect that the Trusteeship Council's report on the Trust Territories was overloaded with routine words of congratulation and recommendation. It had therefore limited its words of commendation to specific points, where there was some extraordinary cause for congratulation. It was a question of policy, to which the Council should give its attention.

90. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) stated that he was not objecting to the policy adopted by the Drafting Committee on Western Samoa; he was only urging that if that policy was adopted by one Drafting Committee, it must be adopted by all.

91. The PRESIDENT pointed out that a final decision on the report on Western Samoa was to be taken by the Council at a later stage. It was essential that the Council should adopt a consistent policy for all the reports on the Trust Territories. He therefore proposed that no final decision should be taken with regard to the addition to the report on Western Samoa of the sentence noting progress until such time as the Council had before it all the reports on the Trust Territories that had been considered during the current session.

It was so decided.

Examination of petitions (continued)

[Agenda item 4]

FIRST REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/L.247): PETITIONS CONCERNING NEW GUINEA

92. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that while appreciating what had been done by the Standing Committee on Petitions with regard to the petition from the New Guinea Chinese Union, Rabaul, and the Overseas Chinese Association, Kavieng (T/Pet.8/4 and Add.1 and 2), his delegation felt that the draft resolution appended to the report did not go far enough to meet its wishes. It would, however, accept it with the reservation that the matter should be kept under review by the Council pending the submission of further information by the Administering Authority.

93. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.247, para. 25).

The resolution was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (continued)

[Agenda item 2]

94. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he would be obliged to vote against the adoption of the Secretary-General's report on credentials (T/972) inasmuch as the persons listed as members of the Chinese delegation were not legal representatives of the Chinese people.

95. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) felt that it was unnecessary to reply to remarks which were absolutely unfounded and contrary to a decision of the Council (386th meeting) by which the USSR representative ought to abide.

The report (T/972) was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.