

101. Mr. LEROY (special representative) was convinced that racial distinctions would gradually disappear. Members of the Council would have gathered from the Visiting Mission's report that such discrimination occurred in four fields: residence in urban districts, the control of alcoholic liquor, the possession of arms and the prison system. The Administering Authority intended to do away completely with racial discrimination in the matter of the possession of arms and the control of alcoholic liquor. Discrimination in the case of the prison system really only existed according to the letter of the law. In practice, Asiatics and Europeans were on a footing of absolute equality. It was intended to replace the old laws by a new one and the Minister for the Colonies was at present studying the draft thereof.

45. Tentative time-table for remainder of the sixth session

102. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) drew attention to the fact that the tentative time-table (Conference room paper No. 13) submitted by the Secretariat did not allow for the full observance of the six-week period which, as requested by him at the second meeting, should be allowed to governments for drafting their comments on the reports of Visiting Missions. However, if the Council wished to adopt that time-table, he, for his part, would endeavour to secure his Government's comments in time, and to ensure that the special representatives were present on the dates suggested.

103. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that as it was impossible to tell how much time would be required for the question of Jerusalem, it had not been possible to draw up a final time-table. The dates in the paper which had been circulated could therefore only be considered as approximate.

104. Replying to the point raised by the United Kingdom representative, that an interval of six weeks had not been entirely provided for, he explained that that was due to the fact that it was difficult to foretell the exact course the session would take. Nevertheless, in the case of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons and of Togoland under British and French administration, respectively, the Governments might instruct their special representatives to be at the Council's disposal on the dates shown in the time-table.

46. Statement by the President on the telegram from the Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

105. The PRESIDENT read out a telegram sent on 11 February to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents, which read as follows:

"The Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents formally protests against the release at Lake Success in advance of Geneva of the report to the Trusteeship Council of the Visiting Mission to West Africa. The Association reiterates its strongest objec-

tions to the killing of Geneva news stories for Geneva correspondents provoked by the present policy of the Department of Public Information of placing an embargo on material originating in Geneva so that it can be simultaneously released at Lake Success and elsewhere. The world's leading telegraphic services and newspapers now maintain a staff of correspondents at Geneva, but if the policy of the Department of Public Information remains unchanged and Geneva continues to be short-circuited as the point of origin of United Nations news at Geneva, the international Press corps here will cease to exist. The Association can find no possible excuse for simultaneous release elsewhere of a purely Geneva story such as the report of the Visiting Mission, and urgently hopes that you will be able to take immediate steps to prevent any recurrence. — (Signed) Victor LUSINCHI (President)."

106. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), speaking as ex-Chairman of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, said that there had been a leakage, and that he wholly supported the attitude of the Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents. He had written to the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories and would propose that the Council await a statement from the latter before passing judgment.

107. The only other comment he would make at the present stage was that, although he completely sympathised with the Geneva Association, the fault did not lie with the New York Press.

108. The PRESIDENT said that enquiries would be made into the matter. He hoped that steps would be taken to prevent any recurrence. Unquestionably, the Visiting Mission alone could decide when its report should be published and communicated to the Press, either in whole or in part.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

225th meeting

TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 14 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.

Observer from the following country: Egypt.

47. **Question of an international régime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places (General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949) (T/118/Rev.2 and T/423) (resumed from the 21st meeting)**

1. The PRESIDENT requested members of the Council to refer to the draft Statute for Jerusalem prepared

by the Trusteeship Council in April 1948 (T/118/Rev.2), and pointed out that it had to be amended in accordance with General Assembly resolution 303 (IV).

2. Mr. EVANGELISTA (Philippines) said that one of the principal tasks entrusted to the Council by the General Assembly in its resolution 303 (IV) was the amendment of the draft Statute in order to make it more democratic. His delegation fully agreed with the objection that the draft Statute gave too much power to the Governor to be appointed by the United Nations. Although convinced that there must be a strong executive to maintain law and order, his delegation held that it must not be maintained at the cost of weakening the legislative body, which would alone represent the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Under the draft Statute, legislative and executive power was to be vested in the Governor, with the result that the whole administration of the City of Jerusalem would, so to speak, be concentrated in his person. Paragraph 1 of article 24 enabled the Governor to legislate when the Council was suspended. Paragraph 1 of article 15, which dealt with the Governor's emergency powers, enabled him to take such measures and enact by order such legislation as he might deem necessary to restore the effective functioning of the administration. Furthermore, according to paragraph 2 of article 24, the Governor was entitled, even if no emergency existed, to declare effective any bill or resolution which the Legislative Council had failed to adopt within such time and in such form as he might think reasonable and expedient. He could thus ignore the Legislative Council, and legislate without its assistance, or even against its expressed wishes. The result of those provisions was to make the Legislative Council a purely theoretical instrument of government.

3. By paragraph 3 of article 22, the Governor was empowered temporarily to suspend the Legislative Council if in his opinion its conduct gravely imperilled the special objectives of the Statute. Moreover, paragraph 5 of article 25 empowered the Governor to prorogue, adjourn or dissolve the Legislative Council at any time. At the first reading of the draft Statute, his delegation had opposed paragraph 3 of article 22¹ on the grounds that if the Council were suspended, the people of Jerusalem would be deprived of representation for an indefinite period, whereas if the Council were dissolved, there was at least a chance of new elections being held. His views had, however, been rejected, the supporters of the text of paragraph 3 of article 22 having contended that its purpose was to prevent the delivery of inflammatory speeches in the Legislative Council. Thus, in fact, the members of that Council were deprived of their fundamental right to express free opinions.

4. Nor were the powers granted to the Governor by paragraph 5 of article 25 as innocuous as they might seem. It would be for the Legislative Council itself to fix the period of its sessions in the Standing Orders which the draft Statute empowered it to adopt, but the

powers granted to the Governor enabling him to prorogue, adjourn or dissolve it at any time by implication vitiated that right. In the case of dissolution, the holding of new elections would be left entirely to the Governor's discretion. In the original draft (T/118), the Governor had been empowered to dissolve the Legislative Council only on express instructions from the Trusteeship Council, and only in order to preserve the special objectives of the Statute. Despite his delegation's opposition, those provisions had been strengthened at the second reading² it having been argued that parliamentary usage sanctioned the dissolution of the legislative by the executive authority for the purpose of sounding public opinion on a specific issue. In fact, however, the type of government set up by the present draft resembled the presidential system far more closely than the parliamentary. The members of the Council of Administration, which it was intended should function like a cabinet or a council of ministers, would be appointed by the Governor, the Chief Secretary alone being appointed by the Trusteeship Council. Moreover, the Council of Administration would be responsible to the Governor, and not to the Legislative Council.

5. Paragraph 5 of article 25 and paragraph 3 of article 22 would have the effect of greatly weakening the position of the Legislative Council, since the Governor by threatening to suspend, prorogue, adjourn or dissolve it, might compel it to do his bidding and thus lend to his rule a semblance of popular sanction.

6. He therefore proposed the deletion of paragraph 2 of article 24, of paragraph 3 of article 22 and of paragraph 5 of article 25.

7. In general, his delegation held that the draft Statute was based on the false premiss that conditions would always be abnormal in Jerusalem, and that the Governor must consequently be invested with a great deal of residual power. But conditions had already improved since the Statute had been drafted, and even without those provisions the deletion of which he had moved, the Governor would have ample power, especially in times of emergency, to safeguard the special objectives laid down in General Assembly resolution 181 (II) and set out in the preamble to the Statute.

8. Although there existed a difference of opinion as to whether the City of Jerusalem should be considered as a Trust Territory under Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter of the United Nations, or merely as a Non-Self-Governing Territory under Chapter XI, that in no way affected the principle that the people of Jerusalem should be granted rights of self-government as extensive as those enjoyed by the inhabitants of any Trust or Non-Self-Governing-Territory. Chapter XI of the Charter covered all Non-Self-Governing Territories, regardless of whether they were administered by a government or by the United Nations; Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter, on the other hand, allowed for the possibility of the United Nations acting as the Administering Authority. Now that the United Nations was being entrusted with the

¹ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council*, second session, second part, 22nd meeting.

² *Ibid.*, 30th meeting.

administration of a dependent territory, it should set up a model administration capable of serving as an example. Now that Israel had become an independent State, it was impossible to assume that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were less capable of self-government than were the people of other territories.

9. Thus, General Assembly resolution 181 (II) could not be used as a pretext for overriding the fundamental principles of the Charter relating to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Indeed, General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) had been expressly designed to correct the shortcomings of the draft Statute.

10. Although the question of independence did not arise under the terms of the two resolutions in question, the principle of self-government was implicit in the directive of paragraph I (2) of resolution 303 (IV) which called for the amendment of the Statute so as to make it more democratic. That, too, was the purpose of paragraph 2 of article 44 of the draft Statute, by which, after ten years, the inhabitants of the city were to be given the opportunity of expressing their opinion on the régime by means of a referendum.

11. Turning to the specific suggestions made by the representatives of Churches and religious institutions who had addressed the Council, he must express his appreciation of the moderation with which they had endeavoured to assess the political effects of resolution 303 (IV). His delegation had been particularly impressed by the proposal made by the representative of the Commission of Churches on International Affairs (20th meeting) that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be safeguarded by the full application of the articles on religious liberty of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Supporting the Commission on that point, he would submit that the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration—namely, articles 18 and 19—should be incorporated in article 7 of the draft Statute. In the opinion of his delegation, it would also be appropriate to include in the Statute a proviso allowing parents to decide what religious instruction should be given to their children.

12. Following up the suggestion made by the representative of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem at the eighteenth meeting, he proposed the insertion in article 36 of a provision exempting the Holy Places, shrines, religious buildings and sites from expropriation.

13. The suggestion made by the representative of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem (20th meeting) that special judicial machinery be set up to settle disputes over existing rights in any Holy Place, shrine, site or religious building, deserved the Council's serious consideration. He would draw attention to the fact that the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Patriarchates were agreed that the members of such a special tribunal should not belong to any of the three denominations which exercised rights of guardianship over the Holy Places. The argument that the Governor of Jerusalem might have neither the time nor the qualifications necessary to examine such disputes was also of considerable force.

14. Finally, the Trusteeship Council must deal fairly and justly with the problem of those inhabitants of Jerusalem who had been forced to flee the city owing to the military operations there. That problem necessitated the modification of article 8 of the draft Statute by the terms of which refugees were not considered as residents of the City. The refugees numbered about 100,000, including the 3,000 Armenians to whom the representative of the Armenian Patriarchate had referred in his statement.

15. All property illegally seized by the Occupying Powers, including church-owned and mission-owned property, should be returned to its lawful owners.

16. He would urge the Council to exercise the utmost caution in adopting any measures which would tend to weaken the cardinal principle of the separation of Church and State. That was a fundamental principle of constitutional government, and should be fully safeguarded in the political system applied to the City of Jerusalem.

17. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) welcomed the Philippines representative's interpretation of the General Assembly's instructions to the Council to make the draft Statute more democratic. He also endorsed the proposal that the Council take positive measures to secure the return of refugees to Jerusalem and to restore church and personal property to their rightful owners.

The discussion was adjourned.

48. Tentative time-table for remainder of the sixth session (resumed from the preceding meeting)

18. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) considered that it would be of advantage to the Council if it could consider the problem of Jerusalem without interruption. He therefore proposed that henceforth the Council meet daily to consider that question.

19. Mr. HOOD (Australia) supported the Iraqi representative's proposal, although the holding of daily meetings to consider the Statute might not always be possible in view of the necessity for holding committee meetings.

20. The PRESIDENT explained that the tentative time-table he had submitted to the Council at the previous meeting (Conference room paper No. 13) had been drawn up in the light of the Council's tacit decision (15th meeting) to deal alternately with the Jerusalem question and the other items on its agenda. If the Council intended to re-draft the whole Statute and to confine the following week's meetings to that task, it should so decide without delay, and settle the dates on which it would hear the special representatives for Togoland under French administration and Togoland under British administration on the one hand, and the special representatives for the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under British administration on the other.

21. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that it was essential for the Council to complete the preparation

of the Statute for Jerusalem during the current session. If it were pressed for time it might, if necessary, defer consideration of certain other items on the agenda. Accordingly, the Belgian delegation was ready to support the Iraqi representative's proposal, if he would agree that until the Council had terminated its work on Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi it would continue to devote alternate meetings to the Jerusalem question and to the annual reports on those two Trust Territories.

22. He wished to raise a further procedural question relating to the problem mentioned by the representatives of the Philippines and Iraq—namely, the fate of the inhabitants of Jerusalem who had been compelled by hostilities to leave their homes. While the Council was bound to feel uneasy about the fate of those people, the unfortunate victims of events at Jerusalem, the question nevertheless arose as to whether the refugee problem should be considered in conjunction with the Statute for Jerusalem, or separately. He doubted whether provisions concerning refugees could be inserted in a document of a constitutional character.

23. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) stated that he would be prepared to accept the Belgian representative's amendment to his proposal.

The Iraqi representative's proposal was adopted as amended.

24. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) also felt that the Council's work would be expedited if the Statute for Jerusalem were considered in committee of the whole, and he proposed that that course be followed.

25. Mr. DE LEUSSE (France) agreed.

26. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) supported the proposal that the Council examine the draft Statute for Jerusalem in committee of the whole. If, at any time, one or other article necessitated re-drafting, a small sub-committee could be set up for that purpose.

27. The PRESIDENT asked whether the proposal of the Iraqi representative was that the committee of the whole should meet in private.

28. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that it was usual for a committee to take its own decision on that point.

29. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) wished to know, before the Council decided to set up a committee of the whole, whether in that case the representatives of States not Members of the Council, and any representatives of countries invited to take part in the Council's deliberations, would also attend meetings of the committee.

30. The PRESIDENT suggested that those representatives of States and organizations who were attending the present session of the Council without the right to vote be also entitled to attend any meetings which the Council decided to hold as a committee of the whole to consider the question of Jerusalem.

It was so agreed.

31. The PRESIDENT felt that it would be preferable for the Council, before setting up a committee of the whole, to decide whether the meetings of the committee would be public or private; he also pointed out that the Council would be deprived of verbatim records if it sat as a committee of the whole, since those records were produced only for plenary meetings of the Council. Summary records alone were provided for committee meetings. If it were decided that the committee should meet in public, the absence of verbatim records would be the only difference between its meetings and plenary meetings of the Trusteeship Council.

32. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) considered that the Council should follow the usual method of examining the draft Statute at three readings, taking it article by article at the first reading, examining the tentatively adopted articles in relation to the whole Statute at the second, and finally adopting or rejecting articles in their entirety at the third. That procedure would be equally applicable whether the Council sat in plenary or as a committee of the whole. He would favour the holding of meetings in public as a general rule. The Council could always decide to hold a given meeting in private if it so desired.

33. With regard to the choice between summary and verbatim records, he was inclined to advocate the former on the grounds that they saved both time and expense. There again, the Council could at any time request the attendance of verbatim reporters at a meeting where a verbatim record of the proceedings seemed desirable.

34. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) proposed that the Council continue forthwith its examination of the draft Statute for Jerusalem, sitting in plenary but without verbatim reporters. Once its examination of the annual report for the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi had been completed, the Council could decide whether it wished to meet twice daily.

It was so decided, and the verbatim reporters withdrew.

49. Question of an international régime for the Jerusalem area and protection of the Holy Places (General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949) (T/118/Rev.2 and T/423) (resumed from above)

35. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council would proceed to a first reading of the draft Statute for Jerusalem, article by article.

36. Mr. HOOD (Australia) asked at what stage the Council wished to hear the representatives of the two Governments which had been invited to attend.

37. The PRESIDENT pointed out that no reply had so far been received from either of the two Governments concerned.

Preamble

38. Replying to a point raised by Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), the PRESIDENT confirmed that the Secre-

tariat could recast the text of the preamble in the light of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV).

39. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) suggested that the clause in sub-paragraph (b) of the third paragraph of the preamble reading "in order to encourage and support the peaceful development of the mutual relations between the two Palestinian peoples throughout the Holy Land" should be omitted, since the Council was engaged in drafting a Statute for Jerusalem, not for the whole of Palestine.

40. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) pointed out that the sub-paragraph mentioned by the representative of Iraq, and also sub-paragraph (a) were identical with sub-paragraphs in General Assembly resolution 181 (II), and that they both followed on to the introductory part of the third paragraph of the preamble, which showed that they were quotations from the General Assembly resolution. He did not think it was necessary for the Council to delete the words mentioned, but if it did, it should delete the third paragraph of the preamble *in toto*.

41. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) recalled that the representative of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem had pointed out at the twentieth meeting that there were many religions and many races in Palestine; it was not therefore correct to speak of the "two Palestinian peoples". However he did not wish to alter a passage quoted from a General Assembly resolution and would not therefore press his suggestion, but he might raise the point again at the second reading.

42. Mr. HOOD (Australia) agreed that some of the words in the preamble should be reconsidered by the Council and perhaps deleted; the words "mutual relations" were, he believed, taken from the obsolete provision in General Assembly resolution 181 (II) for an economic union of the whole of Palestine.

43. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council instruct the Secretariat to submit a revised version of the preamble, taking into account all suggestions made at the present meeting and deleting those sections of the preamble which were no longer applicable.

It was so agreed.

Article 1 : Special international régime.

44. The PRESIDENT felt that modifications of a technical nature were necessary to the text of article 1, the provisions of the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 having been rendered inapplicable by the fact that the plan for partition had not been implemented. He suggested that the Council instruct the Secretariat to submit to it a revised draft of article 1 omitting the parts which were no longer applicable.

It was so agreed.

Article 2 : Boundaries of the Territory of the City

45. Abdel MONEM MOSTAFA Bey (Egypt) submitted that the wording of article 2 was out of line with the

present situation. It would be preferable to say "... the municipality as it existed at the termination of the British mandate for Palestine".

46. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) suggested that, as the Council had invited the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan and the State of Israel to send representatives to expound their views, it would be premature to close the discussion on article 2 without having heard them.

47. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council could always revert to the matter at the second reading.

48. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that the substance of article 2 of the draft Statute was identical with that of part of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV). The Council was not free to include in the Statute any clause which was not in accordance with that resolution; consequently, the absence or presence of representatives of Israel and Jordan should not be allowed to affect the substance of the article.

49. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) did not know whether the presence or absence of the Israeli and Jordan representatives would influence the Council; but he felt sure that their remarks might influence his own vote, in the sense that he would vote against the present text if he saw that it would lead to invincible hostility between the two States whereas a slightly modified text would not have that result.

50. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) pointed out that in resolution 303 (IV) the General Assembly had called upon the States concerned "to make formal undertakings, at an early date and in the light of their obligations as Members of the United Nations" that they would approach the subject of that resolution "with goodwill", and that they would "be guided by the terms of the present resolution". If neither Israel nor Jordan sent representatives to meetings of the Council, the fact that the wishes of a small group were unknown would surely be no reason for the Council's failing to carry out the wishes of the majority of the General Assembly and neglecting to take any decision on certain articles of the draft Statute.

51. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that while he was not of course suggesting that the Council should cease work on the draft Statute if the two Powers invited failed to send representatives to Geneva, he considered it a matter of courtesy, once the Council had invited them, to give them time to reply. Naturally, if the two States refused the Council's invitation, or accepted it but at the same time stated that the solution provided in article 2, even if modified, was unacceptable, the Council would have no alternative but to carry on and adopt the text as submitted to the Council by the Assembly. Should the two States come forward, however, and tell the Council that minor changes to the frontier would render acceptable an otherwise unacceptable text, he would obviously vote against the latter.

52. For those reasons, he proposed that the Council reserve judgment on article 2 and pass on to the following article.

53. Replying to Mr. SAYRE (United States of America), Mr. Hoo (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the invitation to the Governments of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan had been despatched half-an-hour after the Council had decided to invite them to send representatives to meetings of the Council.
54. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that the two Governments might still require time to study the invitations before replying. Even though they had been sent promptly, two working days had not yet elapsed since the earliest date on which they could have received them.
55. Mr. HOOD (Australia) suggested that the Council should not consider it was engaged even on a first reading of the draft Statute, and that it should do no more at the present stage than determine which passages in the draft Statute were undeniably inapplicable, and request the Secretariat to redraft them.
56. The PRESIDENT noted that the Council had before it the Belgian representative's proposal and the Australian representative's suggestion.
57. The Council had sent invitations to the two Governments concerned by telegram early on Saturday afternoon, 11 February. Those Governments had doubtless discussed the matter with their own members and possibly even with each other. They might have considered it necessary to agree on the terms of an identical reply for despatch to the Council. There was nothing surprising, therefore, in the fact that the Council had not yet received a reply. It was still less surprising that the representatives of the two States were not in Geneva. If the replies of the two Governments were favourable, it would still be some time before their representatives could arrive.
58. Meanwhile, the Council could regard its examination of the draft Statute as a preliminary reading, as suggested by the Australian representative. It would not be taking a decision that day on any part of the text. It could therefore agree to examine article 2 more fully at a subsequent meeting.
59. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) repeated his proposal that the Council should not examine article 2. While it was argued that the examination would merely be of a preliminary character, it was necessary to realize the effect that would be caused by the announcement in Tel-Aviv and Amman that day of the news that the Council had approved article 2, one of those that most vitally affected the two Powers now in possession of the City of Jerusalem, without the Governments concerned having had sufficient time to reply to the Council's invitation.
60. He formally moved that article 2 should not be examined even at a preliminary reading, and that the Council should pass on to the following article.
61. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that the Council was not free to insert in the Statute any clause which was not in accordance with General Assembly resolution 303 (IV); article 2 was not so different from any other article of the draft Statute as to warrant deferment of its discussion. He did not object to the presence of representatives of the interested parties at meetings of the Council, but he would oppose any suggestion that a clause not in accordance with the General Assembly resolution be inserted in the Statute. The insertion of such a clause would cause more unrest than the adoption by the Council of article 2 could ever do. The Council had declined to alter the wording of the third paragraph of the preamble, on the grounds that it was the wording adopted by the General Assembly; for the same reason, the Council should refrain from changing article 2. He proposed that, rather than defer discussion of one article only of the draft Statute, all discussion of it be deferred until a date by which it would be reasonable to expect the Governments of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan to reply to the invitation.
62. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had before it two formal proposals, that of the Belgian representative, that consideration of article 2 alone be deferred, and that of the Iraqi representative that discussion of the draft Statute as a whole be deferred pending receipt of the replies from the two Governments. Deferment should be understood to mean postponement for at least a reasonable period.
63. The Iraqi representative's proposal was based on rule 56 (g) of the rules of procedure. The Council could either simply defer discussion on the question *sine die*, or fix a date on which it would take it up again regardless of whether replies had been received from the two Governments.
64. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that there were strong reasons for adopting the proposal of the representative of Iraq; the Council would be acting with undue haste if at the present meeting it held even a preliminary discussion on articles in the draft Statute as important as was article 2. He suggested that further discussion of the draft Statute be deferred until Monday, 20 February 1950.
65. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that no matter what decision the Council might take on the proposals before it, there was no reason why it should not forthwith instruct the Secretariat to submit a revised version of the draft Statute, from which all parts which had become undeniably inapplicable would be omitted.
66. The PRESIDENT drew the Australian representative's attention to the fact that the Council had before it formal proposals on which a vote must be taken.
67. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) agreed that the Iraqi representative's proposal was more consonant with traditions of international courtesy than his own, but pointed out that he had taken a practical view of the matter. He fully realized, for he himself would feel the same way, that the State of Israel or the State of Jordan would be deeply offended if the Council were to take even a provisional decision on article 2. They would not be in the least offended if the Council took a decision on, for example, article 3 or 4. He had proposed, in order that the Council's work might be

expedited, that some departure be made from the rules of courtesy, provided no offence was thereby given to the States concerned. Obviously, if the Council wished to conform rigidly to international etiquette, it should defer the whole discussion.

The Council agreed to defer further discussion of the draft Statute for Jerusalem until Monday, 20 February 1950.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

226th meeting

TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 15 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.

50. Telegram from the Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (resumed from the 22nd meeting)

1. Mr. Hoo (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that he had ordered an investigation into the question raised by the telegram sent by the Geneva Association of the United Nations Correspondents to the Secretary-General, read out by the President (22nd meeting). As a result, he had received the following note from the Director of the United Nations Information Centre : " With respect to the premature release at Lake Success of the first part of the report of the Trusteeship Council's Visiting Mission to West Africa, I wish to inform you that normal precautions were taken to prevent the publication of the contents of the report prior to the release date set for the Press of Tuesday, 14 February. Unfortunately, an unforeseen technical delay resulted in the fact that the report reached the Department of Public Information at Lake Success in advance of the notification letter of the embargo date. The Geneva Information Centre deeply regrets this circumstance and is taking renewed precautions to ensure that no such slip-ups occur in the future ".

2. He considered the note to be self-explanatory. He was certain that none of the other reports of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa—namely, that on the Cameroons under French administration (T/462), on Togoland under French administration (T/464), on Togoland under British administration (T/465) or its special report on the Ewe problem (T/463) which were still to be released—would be published prematurely.

3. The PRESIDENT said that from the explanation given by the Assistant Secretary-General it seemed

clear that a slip had occurred at Lake Success, since the Secretariat there should not have released to the Press information on the report without formal authorization. The protest of the Geneva Association of United Nations Correspondents thus appeared to be fully justified. He hoped that the Secretariat would take all necessary steps to prevent any premature release in future.

51. Examination of annual reports on the administration of Trust Territories (resumed from the 22nd meeting)

RUANDA-URUNDI, 1948 (T/217, T/217/Add.1, T/361, T/361/Add.1, T/L.19 and T/L.19/Corr.1) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Leroy, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, took his place at the Council table.

4. Mr. LEROY (special representative) said that he had received partial replies to the questions which had been put to him as special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Both the questions and the replies thereto were to be found in T/L.19. The Philippines representative had asked at the twenty-second meeting, in addition to question 3 put by his delegation, whether the Administering Authority intended to allow illiterates to participate in elections in Ruanda-Urundi. A telegram had just been received giving the following particulars concerning the qualifications of candidates for election to the extra-customary centre of Usumbura. Candidates had to be monogamous and at least twenty-five years of age, unless they had reached a certain educational standard. They had to have resided in the centre continuously for three years, to have had a clean record with regard to certain penalties and had to exercise an honourable profession, or hold a pension. To enjoy the right to vote the elector had to be a taxpayer, to have paid his taxes and to have resided for at least one year in the centre. He also had to have a clean record as regards certain penalties and had to exercise an honourable profession, or to have been in the service of the same man for one year, or to hold a pension.

5. Under existing electoral regulations, indigenous persons had to take out an elector's card. Elections were valid only if 70 per cent of all card holders voted. On election day, the elector's card was exchanged for three counters to be dropped in ballot boxes so placed in front of the six candidates that secrecy was ensured.

6. Generally speaking, the indigenous population had taken little interest in the elections. Most clerks had abstained from voting, only 34 out of 200 at one centre having voted.

7. He had also received a partial reply to question 14, put by the Chinese representative, to the effect that a sum of 13,600,000 francs had been received by the Territory for the year 1949 as compensation for damage to the subsoil caused by mining operations. That figure did not include the Territory's share of the profits