

97. The PRESIDENT suggested that article 41 be provisionally accepted without change and that it should be included in the transitory provisions.

*It was so agreed.*

#### *Article 42 : Capitulations*

98. The PRESIDENT asked the members of the Council whether article 42 could not also be included in the transitory provisions.

99. Mr. DE LEUSSE (France) was of the opinion that it must remain in the Statute.

100. The PRESIDENT suggested that article 42 be provisionally accepted without amendment.

*It was so agreed.*

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

#### 268th meeting

### SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 22 March 1950, at 3 p.m.*

*President : Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA  
(Dominican Republic), Vice-President.*

*Present :* The representatives of the following countries : Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Observers from the following countries : Israel, Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, Syria.

#### **113. Question of an international regime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places (General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949) (T/118/Rev.2, T/423 and T/L.35) (continued)**

*SECOND READING OF THE DRAFT STATUTE FOR  
JERUSALEM (T/Rev.118/Rev.2 and T/L.35) (continued)*

#### *Article 44 : Re-examination of the Statute*

1. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) proposed that article 44 be replaced by the following text :

"1. This Statute shall remain in force in the first instance for a period of ten years, unless the Trusteeship Council amends it before the expiration of this period.

"2. On the expiration of this period of ten years, the whole Statute shall be subject to re-examination by the Trusteeship Council. The residents of the City shall then be free to express by means of a referendum their wishes as to possible modifications of the regime of the City. The Trusteeship Council shall in due course lay down the procedure by which this referendum shall be conducted."

2. In regard to the second paragraph, he considered it obvious that the Council would at all times act in the light of the experience acquired.

3. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that he would not be able to say definitely whether he was in favour of the text proposed by the Belgian representative until he had examined its exact implications and satisfied himself that it would not give the impression that the Statute was intended to serve only as a provisional constitution.

4. Mr. HOOD (Australia) recalled that during the first reading of the Statute it had been suggested that the inhabitants of the City should be associated with any amendment made to the Statute before the expiration of the ten years' period. He proposed the insertion of the words "in consultation with the Legislative Council" after the words "unless the Trusteeship Council" in the text proposed by the representative of Belgium.

5. Mr. AGUIÑO (Philippines) said the Council should adopt the amendment proposed by the representative of Australia which would make the article more democratic. Consequent changes would then have to be made to the second sentence in paragraph 2, which in its present form appeared to mean that the wishes of the residents of the City in regard to amendments to the Statute should not be consulted until the expiration of the ten years' period.

6. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) recalled that it had been understood that at the end of the initial period of ten years the whole question should be re-examined and that no decision should then be taken before the local population had been consulted. It had, however, also been understood that during the initial ten-year period the Council would be under no obligation to consult the local population. Indeed, it had been anticipated that the local population might not agree with some of the Council's decisions.

7. In addition, article 23 laid down that "bills and resolutions may be introduced in the Legislative Council by any member thereof". The power to adopt any resolutions it wished already belonged therefore to the Legislative Council, and it was unnecessary for Article 44 to contain precise provisions for that purpose. Obviously, if the Trusteeship Council should have before it a resolution of the Legislative Council calling upon it to re-examine an article of the Statute, it would not fail to pay due attention to that request.

8. The referendum, however, was an entirely different matter. After the end of the ten-year period, it would not be the Legislative Council but all the citizens who would be able to express their opinion on possible changes.

9. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that article 44 in the form in which it appeared in the draft Statute was misleading and would not ensure stability in the City. It should be amended by inserting clauses to the effect that (a) no amendment should be made to the Statute during the first three years after its entry-into-force, (b) no amendment to it should be made on the recommendation of the Legislative Council unless that amendment had been adopted by at least a two-thirds majority of the Legislative Council and (c) that no amendment should be made which was not in accordance with the fundamental principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 303

tion of the Trusteeship Council about the proposed amendments to the Statute. There was no reason why there should be reluctance to include such a provision which would make the article more democratic, because the Trusteeship Council would always be free to reject the advice of the Legislative Council.

32. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that in view of the doubts raised in connexion with his amendment to paragraph 1 of the Belgian representative's text, he would withdraw it.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council might accept the wording proposed by the Belgian representative for substitution for paragraph 2 of the original text of article 44. That wording read as follows: "On the expiration of this period of ten years, the whole Statute shall be subject to re-examination by the Trusteeship Council. The residents of the City shall then be free to express by means of a referendum their wishes as to possible modifications of the regime of the City. The Trusteeship Council shall in due course lay down the procedure by which this referendum shall be conducted."

*The Belgian representative's proposal was provisionally accepted.*

*Mr. Abdul Hady (Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, Mr. Eban (Israel) and Mr. Shukairy (Syria) withdrew.*

#### **114. Examination of annual reports on the administration of Trust Territories (resumed from the 63rd meeting)**

CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION, 1948 :  
REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.62)

34. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to examine the report (T/L.62) of the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports containing the section in the Cameroons under British administration, for inclusion in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

He suggested that part II containing the conclusions and recommendations approved by the Council be examined first.

#### *Differences between northern and southern sections*

35. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) questioned the advisability of including the recommendation in question in part II. The wording might give the impression that the Trusteeship Council was reprimanding the Administering Authority for ignoring its earlier recommendations made at the fourth session, whereas, in fact, those recommendations had reached the said Authority after the end of the year under review. Furthermore, since the same situation arose year after year when reports were being examined, he suggested that the Trusteeship Council should merely confirm its earlier recommendations, in so far as they had not already been implemented by the Administering Authority.

36. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) said that the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports had discussed the subject

at length. The text under discussion was a compromise formula representing different opinions. He hoped that the representative of Belgium would not press his point.

37. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that he doubted whether it was advisable for the Council to repeat recommendations made by it at previous sessions, in particular recommendations which had not been brought to the notice of the Administering Authority before the latter had submitted its next annual report. If the Council reiterated one recommendation and not others which it had made at previous sessions, it might be thought that the Council no longer wished the recommendations it did not re-affirm to be followed. He believed that all recommendations by the Council remained in force unless they were superseded by new recommendations on the same subject. If the Council decided to mention the recommendation it had adopted at its fourth session, he hoped that it would use, in place of the word "reiterates" the word "recalls", which was less emphatic.

38. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said the substitution of the word "recalls" would change the meaning of the paragraph, and it would not be clear to whom the Council wished to recall the recommendation; it should reiterate the recommendation for the benefit of the Administering Authority.

39. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) agreed with the Iraqi representative.

40. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that he would not object to the retention of the word "reiterates"; the representative of Belgium had advocated the deletion of the whole reference to the recommendation made by the Council at its fourth session, not merely the deletion of the word "reiterates"; if as appeared to be the case, the Council wished such a reference to be made, it was of little importance whether the word "reiterates" was used or not.

41. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) suggested the substitution in place of the word "reiterates" of the word "reaffirms", which was the word normally used by the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies when they wished to lay down that a recommendation they had made on a previous occasion should be kept in mind.

42. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) and Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) said that they would agree to the Argentine representative's suggestion.

43. The PRESIDENT asked if it was agreed that the word "re-affirms" should be substituted for the word "reiterates".

*It was so agreed.*

#### *General administration*

44. Mr. HOOD (Australia) suggested that the word "the" before the words "increasing responsibilities of administration" should be deleted.

*It was so agreed.*

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) suggested as a consequent amendment in the French text, the substitution of the words: "*des responsabilités croissantes dans l'administration*" for the words: "*les responsabilités croissantes de l'administration*".

*It was so agreed.*

46. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) enquired whether it was in fact correct to state that "a Commissioner has been appointed for the Cameroons". Had he not been appointed for the southern part of the Trust Territory only?

47. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that the Commissioner, who was Brigadier Gibbons, was responsible for the direct administration of the southern part of the Trust Territory and was responsible in matters relating to the trusteeship system for the whole of the Trust Territory.

#### *Administrative integration of the Territory with Nigeria*

48. Mr. GERIG (United States of America), referring to the first paragraph, doubted whether the Council should record the fact that it proposed to take no action on a certain problem. The Council's recommendations were usually couched in a positive form. He would therefore suggest the deletion of that paragraph.

49. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) recalled that that question of procedure had first been raised in connexion with the section on the Territory of Tanganyika and that the United Kingdom representative had then taken the view that the Council was entitled to refer to a matter, even if it did so negatively, because its silence might betoken that it did not intend to make a pronouncement on the subject in the future. Nor would readers of the section under discussion necessarily be aware of the fact that the Council had not yet considered General Assembly resolution 326 (IV), which was referred to in that paragraph. For those reasons, his delegation would prefer that the text be retained.

50. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand) pointed out that as the question of administrative unions would also be dealt with in the Council's report to the Assembly the paragraph in question might, in the light of future action, become inaccurate. He suggested that the text be re-drafted so as to indicate that the Council had decided that the question of the administrative integration of the Cameroons under British administration with Nigeria would be discussed within the general framework of the wider question of administrative unions which would be considered in accordance with General Assembly resolution 326 (IV).

51. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), agreeing with the New Zealand representative, believed that the best solution would be for the organ which studied the problem of administrative unions—whether the Council itself or a committee of the Council—to refer in its report to the General Assembly to the Council's decision to defer making any recommendations in connexion with the administrative integration of Tanganyika with Kenya and Uganda and of the Cameroons under British admini-

nistration with Nigeria until the problem of integration was considered as a whole.

52. The whole paragraph should be maintained in fairness both to the Administering Authority concerned and to the General Assembly which had given the Council instructions on the problem of administrative unions. Although it was true that the Council had left many other questions pending, that particular problem did deserve specific mention because it was the subject of a specific General Assembly resolution.

53. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) supported the United Kingdom and Iraqi representatives. Since, at the request of the former, reference to administrative integration had been made in the section on the Territory of Tanganyika, it should also be made in the section on the Cameroons under British administration. The paragraph in question would only become out of date if, at its seventh session, the Council made a definite pronouncement on administrative unions. Should it do so, the General Assembly's attention could be drawn to a decision which would naturally supersede that referred to in the paragraph under consideration.

54. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) recalled once more that, when the Council had first considered the question of so-called administrative unions at its fourth session, his delegation had stated that, in its view, there were two separate problems involved. At the third session of the General Assembly in 1948, discussions had centred on the administrative arrangements made in East Africa. When the Fourth Committee had wished to extend its examination of the problem to the arrangements in West Africa, the United Kingdom representative, while raising no objection in principle, had suggested that those arrangements should be treated as a separate problem. That was the position of his Government, which took the view that the arrangements in East Africa and in West Africa were governed by wholly different articles in the respective Trusteeship Agreements. Subject to that reservation, he did not object to the text of the paragraph, which was merely a statement of fact.

55. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that if the paragraph were retained, he would prefer it to be re-worded in accordance with the suggestions of the New Zealand representative.

56. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand) proposed that the text of the first paragraph of the sub-section on administrative integration be replaced by the following words: "The Council decides that the question of the administrative integration of the Territory with Nigeria shall be considered and any necessary recommendations formulated in connexion with a discussion on the general question of administrative unions in accordance with the General Assembly resolution 326 (IV)."

57. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) supported the text proposed by the representative of New Zealand.

58. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said he was prepared to accept the New Zealand representa-

tive's text, subject to the reservation which he had made.

59. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) feared that the New Zealand representative's text did not sufficiently take into account the United Kingdom position, which raised a matter of substance.

*The text proposed by the New Zealand representative was adopted.*

#### *Legislative and Executive Councils*

60. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) considered that the sub-section on legislative and executive councils was closely linked with the first paragraph of the sub-section on administrative integration in which the Council had referred to its decision to defer consideration of the problem. It followed therefore that the problem of legislative and executive councils should also be deferred until the Council had taken a decision on the wider issue of integration.

61. He would recall that a similar recommendation had been rejected at the fifth session of the Council for the very reason that it was connected with the issue of integration. The situation remained unchanged and the considerations which had governed the Council's decision had not been invalidated.

62. He would therefore suggest that the Council make no recommendation at the present.

63. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) recalled that the recommendation embodied in the sub-section on legislative and executive councils had been submitted by his delegation. He must advocate its retention because, quite apart from the administrative relationship of a Trust Territory to neighbouring territories, the population should be represented on such legislative and executive bodies as were concerned with administering the Territory. The observance of that principle was the more necessary at a time when proposals for reform, with which the inhabitants must be actively associated, were being considered. He failed to see any inconsistency between the two paragraphs and found it difficult to believe that any member of the Council would not wish to endorse a principle which was of fundamental importance in the policy of self-government.

64. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) considered that the benefits which the United States representative believed would accrue to the inhabitants of the Territory from such a recommendation, would be wholly illusory in that their larger interests would be prejudiced. If the Council deferred consideration of the wider issue, it must defer consideration of a question which formed only one part of that issue. The question of the Territory's representation on the legislative and executive councils concerned with its government was bound up with the problem of administrative unions or administrative integration, since such representation would tend to strengthen those administrative ties concerning which the people of the Territory had time and again expressed their misgivings.

65. The General Assembly had stated that, in considering the problem of administrative unions, the Council should be guided by the principles set out in subparagraphs (a) to (e) of paragraph 1 of resolution 326 (IV). The recommendation contained in the sub-section on legislative and executive councils conflicted with those principles. In his view, therefore, the Council should be consistent and delete the recommendation.

66. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) agreed with the Philippines representative and emphasized that the Council's recommendation was in direct contradiction with subparagraph (d) of paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 326 (IV), wherein the Council had been instructed to pay particular attention to the desirability of establishing a separate legislative body in each Trust Territory.

67. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) repeated that, in his Government's view, the Trusteeship Council was competent to investigate the administrative arrangements both in East Africa and in West Africa and to satisfy itself that they conformed to the relevant articles of the respective Trusteeship Agreements. The United Kingdom Government had contended—and its position remained unchanged—that the two problems were completely separate. Anyone who had studied them would appreciate that point.

68. The United Kingdom Government maintained that the administrative arrangements made for the Cameroons and Togoland under British administration had existed before the Trusteeship Agreements were signed and had been incorporated in those Agreements and that their continuation had been fully in compliance with them. It was in order to clarify his Government's position that he had, at the fifty-first meeting of the Council, quoted Mr. Ivor Thomas' speech almost *in extenso*.

69. His Government was not prepared to accept the Philippines representative's suggestion that the people of the Territory were opposed to integration. No evidence in support of that argument had been produced; petitions had been submitted to the Trusteeship Council asking for more schools and more hospitals as well as for representation on the legislative and executive councils of Nigeria. He was under the impression that there were petitions suggesting the abolition of the frontier of the Trust Territory, but, as Sir Alan Burns had said on a previous occasion, the United Kingdom Government intended to administer the Territory of the Cameroons strictly in accordance with the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement.

70. It was not for him to urge the Council to adopt the recommendation. But he must point out that if the Council decided against its adoption, it would fail to encourage the political development of the people of the Territory. For its part, the Administering Authority felt bound to do so under the terms of the Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreement, believing that it was not only its duty but also its obligation to proceed, wherever and whenever practicable, with the progressive policy

of increasing representation on the legislative and executive councils responsible for administering the Trust Territory. At the present time, when the whole constitutional structure of Nigeria, and, therefore, of the Cameroons, was under review his Government attached the greatest importance to the fact that Africans drawn from every area concerned, the Trust Territory included, should be associated with the difficult task of making recommendations for constitutional reforms. Whatever the Council's decision, the United Kingdom Government, as the Administering Authority, would maintain and pursue its policy of increasing the people's representation on the legislative and executive councils.

71. Mr. LIU (China) agreed with the Philippines and Argentine representatives and was in favour of the deletion of the sub-section on legislative and executive councils.

72. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) expressed his delegation's complete confidence that, whatever action was taken by the Council in the present case, the Administering Authority would pursue its aim of carrying out progressive reforms in the Territory.

73. Since the choice lay either between jeopardizing the fundamental issue of integration or accepting the Administering Authority's assurances his delegation preferred, for the time being, to rely upon the latter.

74. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) appreciated the validity of both points of view and moved the adoption of a text which reflected them both. He suggested that the sub-section be amended to read as follows: "The Council, while, in principle, of the opinion that, in any proposal for reforms, due attention should be given to representation of the Cameroons on any councils concerned with the government of the Trust Territory, will reserve final discussion on this matter, pending a discussion in this Council on General Assembly resolutions 326 (IV)".

75. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) recalled that he had, on several occasions, criticized the Administering Authority because the various councils included no Cameroonian representatives. Similarly, he had criticized the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea because it had not made obligatory representation of the populations of the Territory in the Common Council. He was therefore bound to support the recommendation contained in the paragraph under discussion.

76. The fact that the Trusteeship Council might subsequently decide that the integration of the Territory with Nigeria was incompatible with the Trusteeship Agreement and the interests of the local populations could in no way alter the attitude of the Belgian delegation as to the representation of the local populations in these councils.

77. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand) also appreciated the pertinence of the Philippines representative's arguments but considered that they led of necessity to the logical conclusion that, in view of the frequently reiterated assurances given by the Administering Authority with regard to the matters dealt with in that

part should be deleted *in toto*, the first commendatory paragraph excepted. Since, however, the Council had adopted the procedure of re-iterating its recommendations from year to year, without necessarily giving the Administering Authorities the time and opportunity of carrying them out, the Council would surely be placed in a somewhat invidious position if it voted against the recommendation contained in the sub-section on legislative and executive councils. Whatever the reasons governing the Council's decision, he doubted whether its deletion would be properly understood by the inhabitants of the Territory. In his view, that recommendation had no direct bearing on the question of administrative unions and he would be unable to associate himself with a decision to delete it. The principle that the people of the Territory should be given increased representation in the various legislative and executive bodies was entirely unexceptionable.

78. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) drew the attention of the New Zealand representative to the fact that the relationship between that recommendation and the issue of integration was clearly established in resolution 326 (IV).

79. Mr. MONOD (France) agreed with the representatives of the Philippines, Argentina and China, that the details of a question could not be discussed before its basic principles had been stated. But, like the representative of Belgium, he believed that the present intentions of the Administering Authority were not in doubt, whatever decisions might be taken on the question of principle. Moreover, if the logical procedure were followed too closely, the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, for example, would not be able to discuss questions concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territories before deciding what a non-self-governing territory was. Finally, if the procedure suggested by the Philippines representative were accepted it would appear, paradoxically, that non-administering Powers were against granting the local populations the right to representation in the various territorial councils. He therefore considered that the paragraph should not be deleted.

80. Mr. HOOD (Australia) considered that the Iraqi representative's text was far from clear. Precisely on which matter would the Council reserve its final decision? He failed to see why it should do so on the question of representation in executive or legislative bodies. If, on the other hand, it was a case of reserving the decision on whether there should be such bodies, then surely the Council would be going too far and tying its hands unnecessarily.

81. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) paid tribute to the efforts of the Iraqi representative to find a compromise solution, but concurred with the Australian representative's view and pointed out that, for those who had not been present during the discussion, the meaning of the text suggested by the Iraqi representative would be that the Trusteeship Council, while supporting in principle increased participation of the indigenous population in the territorial councils, refrained for some reason unspecified from taking any decision on the subject.

96. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) asked whether the United States representative could so amend the text of the recommendation on representation as to make it clear that its adoption by the Council did not prejudice the issue of integration.

97. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) emphasized that the original United States proposal had been modified by the Drafting Committee and that he was prepared to support it in the form which had been acceptable to the members of that Committee. He was unable to fall in with the suggestion put to him by the Philippines representative since, in his view, the two ideas should not be linked. Whatever decision the Council took on integration, the need to ensure representation for the people of the Territory would remain.

98. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) proposed the addition to the sub-section of a sentence reading as follows: "This recommendation is made without prejudice to the question of administrative integration between Nigeria and the Trust Territory".

99. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested and Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) agreed, that a reference to General Assembly resolution 326 (IV) should be included in the Philippines amendment.

100. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) held that the inclusion of the proposed sentence in the text would alter the sense of the recommendation. Not only did that sentence refer to a question of substance, but it implied—that was indeed the purpose of its inclusion—that there was considerable likelihood of the Council's adopting a resolution to reverse the integration arrangements. Thus the whole approach to the question was changed.

101. In his view the proper procedure would have been for the Philippine representative to have made a statement, in which he placed on record his point of view and any doubts that he had in mind. To express the reservation in a recommendation emanating from the Council would, in his opinion, be tantamount to prejudging the Council's decision on a resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

102. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) said that his delegation wished the reservation to be included in the recommendation in order that it might be made perfectly clear that the Council would only pronounce itself on the issue of integration or administrative union after further deliberation. That was the only meaning attached to the reservation; it did not prejudice the issue.

103. The PRESIDENT put the Philippines representative's amendment to the vote.

*The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 4.*

104. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Drafting Committee's text for the sub-section on legislative and executive councils.

*The text was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

105. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that, except in matters to which the greatest importance was attached, his delegation normally abstained from voting on any recommendations or resolutions referring to Territories for which the United Kingdom Government acted as Administering Authority. He had voted on the amendment, not only because he regarded it as a matter of importance, but also because he considered that, in general, the Council should adopt texts in the form in which they were submitted to it by the Drafting Committee. His abstention on the vote on the subsection should in no way be interpreted as signifying that it did not have his Government's whole-hearted support.

106. Mr. LIU (China) said that he had voted against the subsection because, in his opinion, the recommendation embodied therein was linked to the question of administrative union or integration, consideration of which had been deferred. His negative vote, however, in no way implied that his delegation was opposed to increased representation of the inhabitants of Trust Territories on the various legislative and executive councils concerned with the government of a Trust Territory.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

## 269th meeting

### SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 23 March 1950, at 10.45 a.m.*

*President : Mr. Roger GARREAU.*

*Present :* The representatives of the following countries : Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America.

*Observers from the following countries :* Egypt, Israel, Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, Syria.

**115. Question of an international regime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places (General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949) (T/118/Rev.2, T/423, T/L.35, T/L.49, T/L.67) (resumed from the 66th meeting)**

(a) SECOND READING OF THE DRAFT STATUTE FOR THE CITY OF JERUSALEM (T/118/Rev.2 and T/L.35) (continued)

**Article 36 : Holy Places, religious buildings and sites within the City (resumed from the 65th meeting)**

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that in connexion with article 36 the United Kingdom representative had raised a question concerning recognition of the heads of the various religious communities. He had referred to the Palestine Order-in-Council under which the High Commissioner had recognized heads of communities who had been elected in accordance with the traditions or internal regulations of those communities.