

57. Announcement by the President

51. The PRESIDENT announced that he had received the following telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel: "In reply your cable 11 February have honour to inform you Aubrey S. Eban, Israel's permanent representative to United Nations, has been instructed to present to Trusteeship Council views of Government of Israel on question of Jerusalem".

52. The Council had received affirmative replies from both Governments concerned and there was every reason to hope that the representatives of those two States would be present when the Council resumed its discussion on the draft Statute for the City of Jerusalem on 20 February.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

229th meeting

TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 20 February 1950, at 11 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.

58. Examination of annual reports on the administration of Trust Territories (resumed from the preceding meeting)

TANGANYIKA, 1948 : REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON ANNUAL REPORTS (T/L.21)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report (T/L.21) of the Drafting Committee on annual reports containing parts of the section relating to the annual report of the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika for the year 1948,¹ for inclusion in the report of the Council to the General Assembly covering its sixth and seventh sessions. He pointed out that the Council had before it only parts I and II of the section ; part III, which was being made as brief as possible, would be submitted for approval at a later date.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lamb, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, took his place at the Council table.

2. Mr. LIU (China) doubted whether the conclusion in the eighteenth sub-section (Standard of Living) of part II reading "The Council notes with satisfaction the general improvement in the standard of living in the Territory during the year under review" was well-

founded ; he was not aware that the Administering Authority had studied the cost of living or family budgets in the Territory, and no cost-of-living index for the Territory had been prepared. Data on the point were limited to the meagre information given in the table in appendix XI (page 289) of the Administering Authority's annual report for 1948, which showed retail prices of the chief staple foodstuffs and certain other items in Dar-es-Salaam and disclosed, in particular, increases in the cost of mixed meal from 23 cents per kilogramme in 1947 to 28 cents in 1948, in that of groundnuts from 21 cents per pound in 1947 to 28 cents in 1948, and in that of coconut oil from 37 cents per pound in 1947 to 57 cents in 1948.

3. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that it was true that the prices of certain goods had risen in the Territory, but wages had risen simultaneously, and large quantities of consumer goods which had not been available in 1947 had come on to the market in 1948. There was surely no reason to doubt that the average standard of living in Tanganyika had risen.

4. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that the situation referred to by the Drafting Committee in its report was similar to that obtaining in many other territories producing raw materials, for instance, in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. The figures quoted by the representative of China showed the origin of the improvement in the standard of living. The products he had mentioned were all grown by the indigenous inhabitants themselves, who therefore benefited directly by any increase in the prices of such products which, for the most part, were sold to employers of labour.

5. Replying to the PRESIDENT, Mr. LIU (China) said that he would not insist that a vote be taken on whether the conclusion should be deleted or otherwise amended, although he still doubted whether the expression of satisfaction was well-founded.

6. The PRESIDENT asked whether any representative wished to comment further on either part I or part II.

7. There was no other comment.

The Council unanimously adopted parts I and II of the section for inclusion in its report to the General Assembly in the report of the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports (T/L.21).

8. The PRESIDENT reminded members that delegations had been requested to submit to the Secretariat suggestions relating to the deletion of unnecessary paragraphs from part III.

9. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) asked whether it was considered necessary that the Council should approve part III, which contained summaries of the opinions expressed by individual members of the Council.

10. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) said that it had been agreed at the fourth meeting² of the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports that neither that Committee nor the Council need concern itself with the drafting of part III. It had been further agreed that the Secre-

¹ See Report by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Tanganyika for the Year 1948 : His Majesty's Stationery Office 1949, Colonial No. 242.

² No record of this meeting was issued.

tariat should revise part III, deleting those observations which the responsible delegation did not insist on retaining.

11. The PRESIDENT, while recognizing that it had been agreed that the Secretariat should proceed with the revision of part III in consultation with the various delegations, did not, however, believe that it had been agreed that part III need not be submitted to the Council for final approval. He considered that the adoption in respect of part III of a procedure different from that followed in the case of parts I and II would constitute a dangerous precedent, particularly as serious difficulties had arisen at previous sessions in connexion with part III of analogous sections. To present the recurrence of such difficulties, the Council should formally adopt part III, as indeed it was required to do under its rules of procedure.

12. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) admitted that the point made by the President was a serious one, but agreed nevertheless with the representative of the Philippines; neither the Committee nor the Council had the right to bar from part III of such a section in the Council's report the opinion of an individual member of the Council. He asked the Secretariat to inform the Council which observations had been deleted from part III.

13. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) considered that, if part III was to be included in the Council's report, the Council should have an opportunity of discussing it in the same way as it had discussed parts I and II. It might well happen that the Secretariat's summary of the observations of a member of the Council might not be accepted as correct by other members. Such members should be afforded an opportunity of stating their case and of having corrections made where necessary. If, on the other hand, part III was only to appear as an annex, the position might be different.

14. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the object was to shorten part III and not to include in it further observations. At a previous meeting, one of the members of the Council, being of the opinion that his observations had not been fully reported, had requested their inclusion *in extenso* in part III of a section in one of the Council's reports. The result had been that the section had been completely thrown out of balance. It would therefore be unwise simply to leave the drafting of part III to the Secretariat, assisted by the various delegations. He asked whether the Secretariat agreed with the Iraqi representative's interpretation of the decision recently taken.

15. Mr. Hoo (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that no formal decision had been taken as to whether part III should be approved by the Council. If the Council formally adopted part III, its action would be procedurally correct. All members of the Council, except the Philippines representative, had informed the Secretariat which of their observations they were willing to see deleted from part III. The omission of those observations would reduce part III by one half. If the

Philippines delegation submitted its decision in time, the Secretariat could submit the new version of part III during the afternoon of the following day.

16. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that he was not opposed to the Council's adopting part III, but, as he did not attend the meetings of the Council devoted to the Jerusalem problem, he hoped that the Council would not adopt part III at a meeting when that problem was the only other item on the agenda. Furthermore, he did not feel that a special meeting to adopt it would be justified. Either procedure would certainly waste a great deal of time. He suggested, therefore, that part III might be adopted at the beginning of a meeting devoted to consideration of the draft passage on the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi for inclusion in the Council's report.

17. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether the Council had decided whether part III was to form an integral part of the report or merely an annex thereto; if not, when would the question be discussed?

18. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that the question of whether the Council would approve part III depended on its nature. He personally considered that each member of the Council was entitled to express his individual opinion on the administration of any Trust Territory but that such opinions, clearly marked as such, should merely be annexed to the report. Such an annex would not require formal approval by the Council.

19. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) asked whether there was any formal proposal before the Council that part III containing the opinions of individual members should be deleted from sections on annual reports.

20. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) urged that part III should not be included in the main body of the sections of the Council's report to the General Assembly but should form an annex thereto, to be added only after consideration and acceptance by the Council. Careless readers might overlook the present heading of part III and assume that the Council had actually adopted the observations made by the various delegations. A mistake of that kind had arisen in the case of Press release No. Trust/71, dated 16 February, relating to the seventeenth meeting, in which it was stated that the representative of the Philippines had "referred to a decision of the Belgian Senate describing wages in Ruanda-Urundi as 'scandalously low'". Actually, there was no question of a decision having been taken by the Belgian Senate and what the representative of the Philippines had said, in all good faith, was that a Commission of the Senate had expressed itself in that manner. The statement regarding wages in Ruanda-Urundi had been, in fact, the expression of the personal opinion of a member of the Senate Commission, but the Commission as a whole had not endorsed it. In practice, therefore, both an experienced statesman like Mr. Aquino and an experienced journalist—the author of the Press release—had made exactly the sort of mistake that he (Mr. Ryckmans) feared would occur were part III made an integral part of the relevant

section, despite the conviction expressed by the Philippines representative that readers of the report could be trusted to distinguish between formal decisions of the Council and individual expressions of the opinions of its members. A clear-cut distinction should be made between the decisions or recommendations made by the Council and the observations of individual members. The latter should therefore be relegated to an annex.

21. Naturally, such an annex should not be appended without prior consideration by the Council and without members having had an opportunity of commenting on the text.

22. The PRESIDENT said it was questionable whether any member of the Council should be completely free to introduce what amounted to real indictments of Administering Authorities which the Council would not be in a position to refute. Another point to be borne in mind was that the Administering Authority was entitled to reply to criticism included in part III. He therefore wished once again to impress upon the Council the need for avoiding the creation of an extremely dangerous precedent.

23. Mr. LIU (China) was strongly opposed to the Council's reconsidering the question of whether the observations of individual members should be placed in the main body of the sections on annual reports or relegated to an annex. It had been decided in principle at the third session³ that such observations should be included in the main body of each section; and, in view of the continued absence of one member of the Council and the consequent lack of balance in the Council's composition, it would be improper to take a contrary decision at the present session. Moreover, since the conclusions and recommendations of the Council as a whole were based on individual observations of members of the Council, he regretted that it had been decided at the fourth session⁴ that the latter observations should be recorded in a part of the section which followed, rather than preceded, the part containing the conclusions and recommendations of the Council. He would deprecate even more strongly their relegation to an annex. A decision in that sense might well be a stepping-stone to a proposal that individual observations should not be included in the Council's reports at all.

24. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had adopted parts I and II as well as the introduction to them, the last paragraph of which contained the following sentence: "Part III thereof contains summaries of views expressed by individual members of the Council, which are not necessarily shared by the Council as a whole". That sentence had been adopted in committee at the suggestion of the Australian representative, after a number of alternative proposals had been discussed.

25. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether the sentence had been proposed in plenary meeting.

³ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council*, third session, 31st to 33rd meetings.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council*, fourth session, 46th meeting.

26. The PRESIDENT replied that the Council had adopted the introduction as a whole at the same time as it had adopted parts I and II.

27. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) then asked whether the representative of China still maintained his position. In his opinion, the inclusion of part III in the main body of the report might have serious consequences for delegations by the present session, as it might give rise to misinterpretations such as the one he had previously mentioned.

28. The PRESIDENT said that it would be in order for the representative of Belgium to make that comment when part III came up for adoption. His main purpose in urging the Council to examine part III had been to enable delegations to make such observations.

29. Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic) considered that there was no reason to fear that the various delegations would insist on the inclusion of very lengthy observations in part III, which should actually consist of summaries of observations already made and not adopted by the Council; it should not, therefore, be long. Whether it took the form of an annex or became an integral part of the report, the essential point was that the Council should discuss and, even though it might not present its own views, approve it as a true account of views expressed by individual representatives. The delegation of the Dominican Republic was therefore of the opinion that part III should be retained, but in an abbreviated form. A body such as the Trusteeship Council should not be unduly influenced by mistakes in information published in the Press or elsewhere, which were to some extent inevitable.

30. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) wondered whether the last sentence in the last paragraph of the introduction, which had been tacitly adopted by the Council, provided in itself a sufficient safeguard against misunderstanding. Perhaps it would be advisable to qualify the title of part III by including, in a sub-title or in a footnote, a precise statement to the effect that the subject matter was concerned with individual opinions and not decisions of the Council.

31. The PRESIDENT said that the French representative's proposal could be considered when the Council took up the study of part III.

32. Mr. LIU (China), in reply to the Belgian representative, stated that he was bound to maintain his point of view. Whether individual observations of members of the Council were included in part III or an annex, and whatever the section containing them was called, misunderstandings on the part of the Press might still occur. They would however be exceptional, and not the rule. The inclusion in the introduction of a paragraph explaining that section would provide sufficient safeguard.

33. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said he could not share the fear that part III might be open to the misunderstanding that it represented the views of the Council, any more than it would be supposed that part I was

an outline of conditions in the Territory made by the Council, and not by the Administering Authority. He agreed with the President that it would be rash to re-open the discussion of whether or not there should be a part III containing the views expressed by individual members. A separate part containing those views had been included at the third, fourth and fifth sessions of the Council, and the only objection raised to the practice had been that of the Belgian representative who had pressed at an earlier stage of the current meeting for the Administering Authority's being accorded the right to include in what was now part III answers to the observations made therein. That right had been safeguarded; part III only included observations in the form in which they had been made in the debate, together with the replies then made to them. He urged the Council not to re-open discussion of what was a very delicate question.

34. The PRESIDENT, considering that the discussion was being unnecessarily prolonged, concluded that the Council was agreed that part III, when completed by the Secretariat, should be submitted to the Council for approval. As the representative of Iraq had requested that the study of part III should not be the occasion of a special meeting, or combined with a meeting on Jerusalem, the Council could take it up at the morning meeting the next day, or wait until the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports had submitted its report on Ruanda-Urundi.

35. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) had no objection to deferment of the discussion, provided it was understood that the Council had still to take decisions, first, on the title of part III and the wording of the relevant reference in the last paragraph of the introduction, and, secondly, on whether the text of part III had to be submitted to the Council for approval.

36. The PRESIDENT recalled that he had already pointed out that the first question had been disposed of since the introduction, which contained a reference to part III, had already been adopted. The second remained open.

37. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) felt that if such a decision had in fact been taken, it would be necessary to reconsider it, since the last paragraph in the introduction did not depict the situation correctly. The statement that part III contained summaries of views expressed by individual members of the Council, which were "not necessarily" shared by the Council as a whole, strongly implied that some of them were. Any that had been, however, would have been placed in part II (Conclusions and Recommendations).

38. Mr. HOOD (Australia) felt that any decision that had been taken on the introduction in the Committee had been subject to the understanding that representatives would be able to raise the matter again in the Council.

39. The PRESIDENT, referring to the suggestion made by the United States representative, remarked that it was for the Council to decide whether or not it wished

to reverse a previous decision. At the moment, only the introduction was in dispute.

40. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom), intervening on a point of order, stated that his understanding had been that the Council had adopted parts I and II only and, in accordance with established procedure, had deferred adoption of the introduction until it had considered all the parts, and was in a position to adopt the section as a whole.

41. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) maintained the express reservations he had made in principle concerning the adoption of part III. Reverting to the Philippines representative's mistake regarding the report of the Belgian Senate's commission of enquiry, he quoted an extract from the verbatim record of the twenty-fifth meeting (T/PV.227) where Mr. Aquino (Philippines), in good faith but mistakenly, had attributed to the commission of enquiry a conclusion which was in fact only the opinion expressed by an individual member of the commission. He pointed out that the commission had never endorsed the opinion in question and that it had been very wrong to include remarks by individual members in the commission's report.

42. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) drew attention to the verbatim record of the twenty-second meeting (T/PV. 224), where the Philippines representative was reported as saying: "It is to be noted that, on page 180 of that Commission's report, one member stated: 'We are compelled to say that the wages are insufficient in a scandalous way'". There could be no question, therefore, of the Philippines delegation having misunderstood the commission's report.

43. It was true that the Belgian and United States representatives had reserved their right to raise in the Council the question of whether part III should be retained or relegated to an annex, but they had made no reservation as regards the introduction. He was therefore opposed to the question being re-opened.

44. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), with a view to putting an end to a somewhat pointless and irksome discussion, suggested a text which he said might reconcile the various points of view. He suggested that the last sentence in the last paragraph of the introduction should be amended to read as follows: "Part III thereof contains summaries of views expressed by individual members of the Council, which were not adopted by the Council". Such a text would eliminate any possibility of misunderstanding.

45. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) pointed out that some of the observations made by individual members of the Council had in fact found general support, and had not become conclusions or recommendations of the Council purely and simply because the special representative had replied that the Administering Authority would take them into account, with which reply the member who had made the observation had been satisfied. The text of the introduction as it stood reflected the situation accurately and could give rise to no misunderstanding.

46. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) agreed with the Philippines representative. It was, in fact, quite unnecessary to include in the introduction any sentence or paragraph explaining part III, the title of which was self-explanatory.

47. The PRESIDENT asked whether the Council would be prepared to adopt the following text: "Part III contains summaries of views expressed by individual members of the Council but not by the Council as a whole".

48. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) suggested that the discussion be deferred until the text of part III was available. Such adjournment would be especially welcome to his delegation, since the special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Tanganyika hoped to leave Geneva that afternoon, but had still to be at the disposal of the Council for its consideration of the petitions relating to the Territory.

49. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) stated that he would agree to deferment of the discussion on the understanding that the Council had still to decide on the text of the last paragraph of the introduction, on the title of part III, and on the question whether part III had to be submitted to the Council.

50. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said he felt that the third point referred to by the United States representative had already been disposed of.

51. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council defer further consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports (T/L.21) until the following morning.

It was so agreed.

59. Examination of petitions (resumed from the 19th meeting)

(T/L.20, T/PET.2/59, T/PET.2/74, T/PET.2/74/Add.1, T/PET.2/74/Add.2, T/PET.2/83, T/PET.2/83/Add.1, T/PET. 2/92)

52. At the invitation of the PRESIDENT, Mr. PEACHEY (Australia), speaking as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions, drew attention to the Committee's report (T/L.20) on the four outstanding petitions concerning Tanganyika which did not relate to the Bugufi area. There had been considerable discussion in the Committee as to whether its terms of reference (rule 90 of the Council's rules of procedure as amended at the fourteenth meeting), whereby it had been instructed to undertake a preliminary examination of written petitions, made it necessary for the Committee to submit draft resolutions. The majority of the Committee had considered that they did, and he drew attention to the four draft resolutions contained in the Committee's report. He pointed out that it had been decided to incorporate in the preambles to the resolutions matter which it had been the Council's previous custom to include in the introductions to them.

53. In conclusion, he wished to state that in its very thorough examination of the subject-matter of the four petitions, the Committee had received the fullest co-operation from the special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

54. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) pointed out that the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on the question of land for the Chagga people was moderate in tone. The Council was asked to recommend, first, that "the Administering Authority make available additional ex-German estates to the Chagga people as early as compatible with the economic conditions of the Territory", and, secondly, that the Administering Authority "press forward with its land reclamation and development programme and any other measures it may deem necessary for the speediest possible solution of the problem of land shortage". The Committee had been assured by the special representative that every annual report submitted by the Administering Authority would in future contain full information on the situation of the Chagga people and of the steps taken to make additional ex-German estates available to them.

55. The Committee had heard figures which showed it how serious the situation was. Only 24.7 per cent of the total acreage of ex-German estates in the Moshi district would be returned to Africans, and only 12 per cent of the total alienated land in that district.

56. The Philippines delegation had agreed to the draft resolution in a spirit of compromise, and it hoped that the Administering Authority would make available additional ex-German estates to the Chagga people in the very near future, and that it would also provide them at an early date with other land which had previously belonged to enemy subjects of non-German nationality. Finally, he hoped that the Council, at its eighth session, would be able to take further effective action on the basis of a very complete report from the Administering Authority.

57. Mr. FRANCO Y FRANCO (Dominican Republic) remarked that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions had, in adopting its recommendations, been moved by a spirit of compromise, as indicated by the representative of the Philippines. The text was entirely acceptable to the delegation of the Dominican Republic.

58. The PRESIDENT said that if no representative wished to make further comments on draft resolution I, relating to the petition from the Chagga Council (T/PET.2/59), he would consider it unanimously adopted by the Council.

Draft resolution I was adopted.

59. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution II relating to the petition from Mr. G. H. Wakefield (T/PET.2/74, T/PET.2/74/Add.1, and T/PET.2/74/Add.2).

60. There were no comments.

Draft resolution II was adopted.

61. Referring to draft resolution III, relating to the petition from Mr. Josef Ganzenhuber (T/PET.2/83, T/PET.2/83/Add.1), Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) said he wished to place on record the fact that there had been unanimous approval in the Committee⁵ of the Administering Authority's policy in respect of ex-enemy aliens.

62. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said that he wished to reaffirm the reservations made on an earlier occasion⁶ by the representative of France regarding the validity of petitions submitted by German nationals. Such petitions should normally fall within the scope of Article 107 of the Charter, and should not, therefore, call for any action on the part of the Council.

63. The PRESIDENT said that if no representative wished to make any further comments on draft resolution III, he would consider it adopted by the Council.

64. There were no further comments.

Draft resolution III was adopted.

65. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution IV, relating to the petition from Mr. D. M. Anjaria (T/PET.2/92).

66. There were no comments.

Draft resolution IV was adopted.

67. The PRESIDENT congratulated the *Ad Hoc* Committee on its excellent work.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

230th meeting

TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 20 February 1950, at 2.30 p.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.

60. 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/469) (resumed from the 23rd meeting)

1. The PRESIDENT read out the following telegram he had received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel : " I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that Mr. Aubrey Eban permanent representative of Israel to United Nations will be representative of Israel at Trusteeship Council sessions

on Jerusalem. Mr. Moshe Toff and Mr. Gideon Raphael will be alternate representatives and Dr. Menahem Kahany adviser to the delegation."

2. Thus, the Council had received from the Governments of both Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan¹ favourable replies to the invitation it had addressed to them in its resolution adopted on 11 February 1950 (T/469). Now that the representatives of the State of Israel and of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan were seated at the Council table, he would call upon them to speak, starting with the representative of Jordan, that State having been the first to announce its acceptance of the Council's invitation.

3. Mr. ROCH (Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan) thanked the Council on behalf of his Government for its invitation to participate in the discussions.

4. His Government's attitude remained unchanged, and it was unable to enter into any discussion on the internationalization of Jerusalem.

5. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq), speaking to a point of order, recalled that, according to the terms of the resolution of 11 February 1950, the representatives of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan and of Israel had been invited to attend the Council, not in order to discuss the principles underlying the internationalization of Jerusalem, but to comment in detail on the manner in which they would co-operate with the Trusteeship Council in implementing General Assembly resolution 303 (IV). That point had been stressed at the time by the Australian representative (20th meeting).

6. The PRESIDENT explained that the General Assembly had specifically instructed the Trusteeship Council to elaborate and approve the draft Statute for Jerusalem and to ensure its implementation. The Council was at present engaged in elaborating the Statute. The governments which had requested permission to participate in its work in a consultative capacity and without the right to vote were aware that the Council's deliberations would bear solely on the procedure to be adopted for implementing the provisions of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV). Although the Trusteeship Council was an executive organ, it should nevertheless endeavour to draw up provisions which, while coming within the framework of the resolution, would be likely to meet with the approval of all the parties concerned.

7. Mr. EBAN (Israel) expressed his Government's appreciation of the action of the Trusteeship Council in inviting it to send a representative to state its views on the revision of the draft Statute for Jerusalem and its implementation.

8. The history of the Jewish people had been marked for three thousand years by a profound and undying devotion to the Holy City. Attacked two years ago by a violent force which had threatened totally to destroy them, the State of Israel and the new City

⁵ See Summary Record of the second meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, T/AC.20/SR.2 (not printed).

⁶ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council*, first session, 20th meeting.

¹ For the text of the reply from the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, see 25th meeting.