

be obliged to submit certain suggestions to the Council after having compared the English and French texts of the draft Statute. There would undoubtedly be a number of points requiring clarification. For example, whereas the preamble referred to guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places both within the City and outside it, the Council had decided when discussing article 37 in the course of the second reading, not to deal with the question of the Holy Places outside Jerusalem. The preamble would therefore have to be amended accordingly.

75. The PRESIDENT said that it was precisely with a view to ensuring corrections of that description that he had requested the representatives of France and of the United Kingdom to re-examine the French and English texts of the draft Statute.

76. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) expressed pleasure that the French representative had brought up the question of the Holy Places outside Jerusalem. It had been generally agreed at the sixty-seventh meeting that that question should not be dealt with in the Statute, but that it might be dealt with separately, perhaps in the Council's instructions to the Governor. He wished to know when the Council would proceed with that task.

77. The PRESIDENT recalled that at the sixty-seventh meeting the Council had come close to deciding to submit a resolution to the General Assembly on that point. A draft resolution should be drawn up during the third reading of the draft Statute.

78. Mr. DE LEUSSE (France) said that, in view of the preamble, he would prefer the Statute to include an article giving the Governor the right to deal with Holy Places outside Jerusalem.

79. The PRESIDENT replied that the Council would have to re-examine that question during the third reading of the Statute.

80. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that the question of the instructions of the Trusteeship Council to the Governor had been referred to on a number of occasions; he wished to know what was the exact position with regard to them.

81. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council would probably not be in a position during the session in progress to consider those instructions. They would form a very large document which it would take a long time to prepare.

82. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) asked whether the draft Instructions to the Governor¹ provisionally adopted by the Council at the second part of its second session in 1948 in conjunction with the draft Statute could be circulated either before the close of the present session or in the interval before the next session.

83. The PRESIDENT replied that the document would be communicated to Council members to enable them to study it before the next session.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

¹ See document T/144.

275th meeting

SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 28 March 1950, at 3 p.m.*

President : Mr. Roger GARREAU.

Present : Representatives of the following countries : Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Philippines, United Kingdom, United States of America.

124. Political, economic, social and educational advancement in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolutions 320 (IV), 322 (IV), 323 (IV) and 324 (IV) of 15 November 1949) (T/L.7, T/L.40 and T/L.41)

PETITIONS AND VISITING MISSIONS (General Assembly Resolution 321 (IV) of 15 November 1949)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the five General Assembly resolutions adopted at its fourth session concerning Trust Territories. The Council had before it a draft resolution (T/L.7) submitted jointly by the delegation of Iraq and the United States of America, an amendment thereto submitted jointly by the delegations of Argentina and the Philippines (T/L.40) and a draft resolution (T/L.41) submitted jointly by the latter two delegations.

2. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) stated that before preparing their draft resolution, the Iraqi and United States delegations had thoroughly examined the five relevant General Assembly resolutions in order to select the provisions in which a desire was expressed that the Trusteeship Council should take some action.

3. The draft resolution took note of the recommendations of the General Assembly contained in the five resolutions, and noted that steps had already been taken, or were being taken, by the Council to carry out the provisions of those recommendations. The authors of the draft resolution had had in mind a number of matters, such as the recommendation in General Assembly resolution 321 (IV) that the Trusteeship Council should take such measures as it might deem appropriate with a view to facilitating and accelerating the examination and disposal of petitions, and the action taken by the Council in setting up an *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions which was seeking the best method of speeding up the work on petitions. In that connexion, he drew the attention of the Council to document T/L.8 containing interim report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure of which the section relating to petitions had already been adopted and put into effect.

4. With regard to the General Assembly recommendation on visiting missions, contained in resolution 321 (IV), paragraph 2, the Council would recollect the resolution¹ it had adopted concerning the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific.

¹ See *Official Records of the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council*, supplement No.1, resolution 115 (VI).

5. Again, when the Council had submitted its report to the General Assembly after the seventh session, effect would have been given to the General Assembly recommendation in resolution 320 (IV) that the Trusteeship Council should include in its annual reports to the General Assembly information in a special section dealing with the implementation by the Administering Authorities of the Council's recommendations concerning the measures adopted to grant the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories a larger degree of self-government.

6. Thus paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution was quite comprehensive.

7. The General Assembly had also made certain specific recommendations in the resolution 323 (IV). The recommendation in paragraph 2 relating to corporal punishment was covered by paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution. The recommendation in paragraph 3 relating to migrant labour and penal sanctions was dealt with in paragraph 4 of the joint draft resolution and the sponsors had tried to cover the position by suggesting reference of the problem to the International Labour Organisation, which was directly concerned with such matters, and without whose advice the Council would be ill-advised to take action. The recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 5 concerning discriminatory laws and practices were dealt with in paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution.

8. As a measure of precaution, the authors of the joint draft resolution had thought fit to add a paragraph 6, with the object of bringing the five General Assembly resolutions to the attention of the Administering Authorities, and of urging the latter to take such steps as might seem necessary to give them effect. The Council would note the forceful language of the phrase "urges the Administering Authorities . . .".

9. Mr. Muñoz (Argentina) did not think that the procedure proposed in the Iraqi-United States joint draft resolution provided the best means of dealing with the five General Assembly resolutions under consideration; as examination of those resolutions would show, an "omnibus" resolution would not cover the whole field.

10. General Assembly resolution 321 (IV) recommended to the Trusteeship Council that it take such measures as it might deem appropriate, with a view to facilitating and accelerating the examination and disposal of petitions, and that it should direct Visiting Missions to report fully on the steps taken towards the realization of the objectives set forth in Article 76 b of the Charter. With regard to the first of those recommendations, it seemed fitting that the Council should include in its report to the General Assembly an account of the action it had taken in setting up the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions, and in modifying its rules of procedure in order to speed up the handling of petitions. Quite different action, however, was required with regard to the second recommendation. In that connexion, the Council should include in the terms of reference of all Visiting Missions the recommendation it had been asked by the General Assembly to make. If the

Council judged it desirable to give formal effect to that recommendation, it would adopt a resolution deciding to include in the terms of reference of Visiting Missions and appropriate provision.

11. Paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 320 (IV) took note of decisions already taken by the Trusteeship Council, and paragraph 2 recommended that the Trusteeship Council include in its annual reports to the General Assembly a separate section on the implementation of the Council's recommendations regarding measures to be taken for greater autonomy in Trust Territories. It only remained for the Council to comply with that recommendation.

12. In resolution 322 (IV), the General Assembly had expressed concern that the lack of budgetary autonomy in some cases, and the scarcity of data in others, did not allow the Trusteeship Council to make a thorough examination of the financial situation of certain Trust Territories. It had further recommended that the Council include in its annual reports to the General Assembly a special section on the implementation by Administering Authorities of its recommendations on the economic advancement of the Trust Territories. Thus, two kinds of action by the Council seemed to be called for. In the first place, the Council should recommend to Administering Authorities that the Trust Territories should enjoy sufficient budgetary autonomy and that their annual reports should include information that would enable the Council and the General Assembly to weigh up the financial situation in those Territories; and in the second, it should include in its reports to the General Assembly a special section on the economic development of the Trust Territories.

13. General Assembly resolution 323 (IV) also required different types of action by the Council. The recommendation in paragraph 2 of that resolution concerning the abolition of corporal punishment could either be incorporated in an omnibus resolution, as proposed in the joint draft resolution submitted by the Iraqi and United States delegations or be included in the sections on the Territories concerned, contained in the Council's report to the General Assembly. Paragraph 3 recommended the adoption of measures for solving the social problems of migrant labour and penal sanctions for breach of labour contracts by indigenous inhabitants, and paragraph 4 recommended the abolition of discriminatory laws and practices which conflicted with the principles of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements. Those two recommendations required considerable study by the Council before action could be taken to give effect to them. The Council might, therefore, set up a committee to make such a study between sessions and to provide the Council with suitable documentation at the seventh session. The Secretariat should be requested to assist that committee, and the specialized agencies interested in the subject should also be asked to submit papers which in their view would facilitate the work of the committee, and to send representatives to participate in its work.

14. The Council should also include in the relevant sections of its reports to the General Assembly a

special section dealing with the implementation by the Administering Authorities of the Assembly's recommendations concerning the improvement of social conditions in Trust Territories, in accordance with paragraph 6 of resolution 323 (IV).

15. In its resolution 324 (IV), the General Assembly had expressed a desire for more detailed information on the implementation of previous Council resolutions relating in particular to free education, the training of indigenous teachers, higher education and the dissemination of information about the United Nations. The Council should therefore include in the relevant sections of its reports to the General Assembly statements on the measures taken by Administering Authorities to implement those resolutions; such information could be obtained from the annual reports of the Administering Authorities for 1949, or from the statements of their representatives or special representatives. The recommendations in paragraphs 2 and 5 of General Assembly resolution 324 (IV) relating to the inclusion in school curricula in Trust Territories of instruction on the United Nations, the international trusteeship system and the special status of Trust Territories, and to the intensification of measures for the establishment in Africa of educational institutions of university standard and systems of scholarships allowing indigenous students to complete their university training in other countries, should form the subject of special recommendations by the Council to the Administering Authorities concerned.

16. Different types of action were therefore required on the five General Assembly resolutions before the Council; and there were various ways of approaching the problem. The Council could adopt four or five separate resolutions, each dealing with one of the subjects he had enumerated. Alternatively, it could adopt one resolution setting up between sessions a committee to look into the problem of discriminatory practices; a second resolution recommending the adoption by Administering Authorities of the measures suggested by the General Assembly for the abolition of corporal punishment; and a third dealing with the inclusion in school curricula of instruction on United Nations, international trusteeship system and the special status of Trust Territories. As a further alternative, the Council could cover all the points in one single resolution with sections devoted to each of the five General Assembly resolutions.

17. It was to that end that the Philippines and Argentine delegations had submitted the proposals set out in documents T/L.40 and T/L.41.

18. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) observed that, as the joint proposal of the Argentine and Philippines delegations contained in document T/L.40 was in the form of an amendment to the Iraqi and United States draft resolution (T/L.7), the former would be put to the vote first.

19. While he thought that there was much to be said for the Argentine-Philippines amendments, he wished

to reply to several points raised by the Argentine representative.

20. It was true that there were different ways of giving effect to the five General Assembly resolutions. The Iraqi and United States delegations had suggested one way, the Argentine and Philippines delegations, another. But he would vote against the Argentine-Philippines amendment for the following reasons.

21. The first paragraph of that amendment by which the Trusteeship Council "Resolves to give effect" to the recommendations of the General Assembly contained in its five resolutions seemed to him to be meaningless. The phraseology was too vague to be of any real value, and he preferred the text of his own draft resolution to the effect that the Council "Takes note" of the recommendations of the General Assembly contained in the resolutions in question. The next paragraph of the amendment noted that steps had already been taken by the Council to carry out some of the provisions of those recommendations. The drafting was unfortunate, for it suggested that the Council was paying attention only to some, and not to all, of the General Assembly recommendations.

22. Again, the wording of section A, paragraph 1, of the amendment, relating to the question of budgetary autonomy of the Trust Territories, appeared to be ambiguous. Although the phrase "budgetary autonomy" had been used in the General Assembly resolution, he still did not know exactly what it meant. With regard to section B, paragraph 1, dealing with the question of the abolition of corporal punishment and the initiation of strong and effective measures to that end, he preferred the wording used in paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution itself.

23. Again, he greatly preferred the text of paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution to that proposed by the Argentine and Philippines representatives in section B, paragraph 2, of their amendment, in which it was proposed to establish a committee composed of six members to make a preliminary study of all laws, statutes and ordinances, as well as their application, in the Trust Territories, in order to enable the Council to make positive recommendations to the Administering Authorities concerned with a view to the abolition of all discriminatory provisions and practices which conflicted with the principles of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements. Such a study would be either thorough or cursory; if cursory, it would have no value; if thorough, it would take years to complete, because of the breadth of the legislative field to be covered and of the fact that discrimination arose not so much as a result of legislation itself, as from its application and interpretation.

24. Section B, paragraph 3, of the amendment proposed that the Administering Authorities concerned be invited to collaborate with the aforementioned committee. He felt that any such invitation would be unnecessarily irritating for an Administering Authority. It was hardly for the Trusteeship Council to ask an Administering Authority to collaborate with a com-

mittee of that sort. A decision to issue such an invitation would be most unfortunate, for even a vague insinuation that an Administering Authority was not collaborating adequately with the Council should be avoided. If ever the latter did find that an Administering Authority was not collaborating sufficiently, more effective action than would result from the adoption of such a vague resolution as was contained in that paragraph of the joint amendment would have to be taken.

25. Contrary to the suggestion contained in section B, paragraph 4, of the joint amendment, he still held the view that it would be preferable for the Council to approach the International Labour Organisation direct for its advice, as suggested in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Moreover, in unofficial conversations with representatives of the International Labour Office he had found that they endorsed his views on the matter.

26. Turning to section C of the joint amendment, he pointed out that as would be seen from page 4 of the Council's report to the Assembly on its second and third sessions² the action envisaged in section C, paragraph 1, had already been taken.

27. With regard to section C, paragraph 2, it would be remembered that the Council had at its fourth session appointed the Committee on Higher Education in Trust Territories to look into the question of the establishment in Africa of educational institutions of university standard and of scholarship systems. On the basis of that Committee's report (T/369), which had been very valuable, positive action had been taken. It would therefore appear unnecessary to begin all over again.

28. Finally, the subject matter of the last two paragraphs of the joint amendment would be covered by the Council's annual reports to the General Assembly and in its instructions to Visiting Missions.

29. For all those reasons, he preferred the draft resolution proposed jointly by the Iraqi representative and himself.

30. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) observed that the Argentine and Philippines delegations had presented two proposals, one contained in document T/L.40, which was intended as an amendment to certain paragraphs of the joint Iraqi-United States draft resolution, and the other contained in document T/L.41, which was intended to cover a recommendation repeated in the four General Assembly resolutions mentioned in its first paragraph, a recommendation to which there was no reference in the joint draft resolution. As the Council would presumably wish to proceed first with the consideration of the joint draft resolution, he would confine his remarks to that proposal and to document T/L.40.

31. When the joint draft resolution had first been tabled, his delegation had pointed out that by merely

taking note of the recommendations of the General Assembly without taking steps to implement them, the Council might expose itself to the charge of discourtesy towards, or lack of respect for, the General Assembly. The question was whether the Council would or would not give effect to the resolutions or recommendations of the General Assembly; hence, the proposal to amend paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution to read "Resolves to give effect to the recommendations . . .". With regard to the charges of vagueness, he confessed he could not see how to make his amendment clearer; and he would point out that that paragraph of the amendment was to be considered in conjunction with paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution. His delegation submitted that the wording of paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution was ambiguous and might mislead the General Assembly. Cases where certain recommendations of the General Assembly had not been adopted by the Council, could be cited in support of that argument. He therefore considered it would be more honest and more in keeping with the facts to amend that paragraph to say that the Council noted that steps had already been taken or were being taken by the Council to carry out some of the provisions of these recommendations.

32. The joint amendment contained reference to other General Assembly recommendations which it had been suggested the Council should implement, but on which it had hitherto taken no action. Those recommendations were supplementary to the points covered by the joint draft resolution. The Argentine and Philippines delegations had therefore thought fit to divide the operative part of the amendment into various sections, each covering one recommendation of the General Assembly.

33. Under the heading of economic advancement, the amendment merely adopted the language used in General Assembly resolution 322 (IV), in view of the concern expressed by the General Assembly in that resolution that the lack of budgetary autonomy in some cases and the scarcity of data in others did not allow the Trusteeship Council to make a thorough examination of the financial situation of certain territories. Moreover, that point was not covered by the joint draft resolution. Section B, paragraph 1, of the amendment was merely a modification of paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution to make it conform more closely to the wording of General Assembly resolution 323 (IV).

34. Section B, paragraphs 2 and 3, proposed the establishment of a committee to make a preliminary study of law, statutes and ordinances, etc., and that Administering Authorities be invited to collaborate with that committee.

35. He shared the view of the United States representative that the study proposed in section B, paragraph 2, if made at all, must be thorough. For that reason, it should be begun immediately, by setting up a committee as suggested. Exception had also been taken to the terms of section B, paragraph 3. However, the underlying idea of that paragraph was the same

² See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly*, supplement No.4.

as that contained in paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution, where Administering Authorities were urged to include in their next annual reports all data needed to enable the Council to make any further positive recommendations on the subject of discriminatory laws or practices which it might deem necessary, in order to give effect to the recommendations of the General Assembly. The only difference between the two proposals was that by the amendment the furnishing of information would not be tied to the furnishing of annual reports. His delegation considered that Administering Authorities should provide such information separately. The reason was that undue delay would arise in considering the important problem of discriminatory laws and practices in Trust Territories if the Council had to wait until the annual reports for 1950 came before the Council in 1952.

36. With regard to the recommendation in General Assembly resolution 323 (IV), concerning the adoption of suitable measures for solving such important social problems as migrant labour and penal sanctions for breach of labour contracts by indigenous inhabitants, he recalled that the joint draft resolution proposed that the advice of the International Labour Organisation be sought and that action in the matter be deferred until such advice had been received. According to the statement made by the Director-General of the International Labour Office at the sixty-eighth meeting of the Council, that Organisation would not be in a position to give advice on the problem of penal sanctions before the tenth session of the Council. It had further been stated that the International Labour Office was studying the question of migrant labour and would continue to do so during 1950 and 1951, and that some further principles of policy might perhaps emerge from its deliberations. It was, however, important to remember that the Trusteeship Council had been seized of the problem of migrant labour and penal sanctions at almost all its sessions. While he believed that the International Labour Office could give useful advice on the subject, the Trusteeship Council should not postpone the work assigned to it by the General Assembly until the International Labour Office's advice was available. In his view, it would suffice if the Council requested the proposed committee to obtain factual information and perhaps copies of the relevant laws, all of which would be available through the Administering Authorities. His delegation submitted that the Council was already properly equipped to perform the task assigned to it by the General Assembly. Moreover, it was the Council, and not the International Labour Organisation, that had been chosen for the task, and the former was not supposed to transmit to the General Assembly the opinions of the latter, no matter how valuable they might be.

37. His delegation desired to emphasize that the International Labour Office was engaged in the study of the subject on a world-wide scale. Hence the delay it experienced in arriving at decisions. The Council, on the other hand, was engaged in studying conditions particular to Trust Territories. It had also to be borne in mind that whereas the International Labour Organi-

sation was confronted with the problem of overcoming the inertia due to its wide membership, the Trusteeship Council had a limited membership and dealt with more specific problems. Again, the International Labour Organisation dealt with the question of labour in isolation, whereas the Council was concerned with that question in its relation to the economic, social and political fields. The Council could therefore proceed with the task, contenting itself with such assistance as could be provided by the International Labour Office within the time at the Council's disposal.

38. With regard to section C of the joint amendment, paragraphs 1 and 2 were a repetition of the wording of General Assembly resolution 324 (IV).

39. With regard to the recommendation to Visiting Missions contained in section D of the joint amendment, it was true that the General Assembly's resolution in the matter had already been discussed. However, the representative of Iraq had already indicated that the directives given by the Council to the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific had not conformed strictly to the General Assembly's recommendation. Besides, General Assembly recommendations were addressed to the Council, inviting it to request all missions to do one thing or another. It would therefore be proper for the Council to adopt a resolution of a general nature, such as that suggested in section D of the amendment, so that it would not have to repeat the wording in the terms of reference of each of the Visiting Missions.

40. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said he did not propose to defend the joint draft resolution. When introducing the text, the representative of the United States had put forward arguments which appeared to be convincing.

41. On the amendment to that draft resolution submitted by the Argentine and Philippines delegations, he wished to make two comments, once concerning section A, dealing with economic advancement, and the other concerning paragraph 4 of section B, dealing with co-operation with the International Labour Organisation.

42. So far as the question of economic advancement was concerned, the text proposed by the delegations of Argentina and the Philippines did not follow General Assembly resolution No. 322 (IV) of 15 November 1949, in which the General Assembly had resolved "to express its concern that the lack of budgetary autonomy in some cases and the scarcity of data in others did not allow the Trusteeship Council to make a thorough examination of the financial situation of certain Territories". It was undoubtedly natural to consider suitable ways of allaying the General Assembly's anxieties with regard to the lack of budgetary autonomy in certain Trust Territories, but the way in which that idea was expressed in section A, paragraph 1, of the joint amendment was somewhat clumsy and appeared to generalize the particular case which had probably given rise to the General Assembly resolution—namely, that of the Cameroons under British administration, whose budget was merged with that

of Nigeria. The term "to take measures to assure to the Trust Territories under their administration budgetary autonomy" meant, literally, that the Trust Territories would have to meet all their expenditure out of their own financial resources. Yet it was common knowledge that no Trust Territory was in a position to finance all its expenditure without subsidies from the Administering Authority.

43. The example of the paragraph he had just criticized gave him an opportunity of saying that the Trusteeship Council should place a practical construction on the resolutions of the General Assembly, whose decisions might be based on principles which, though excellent in themselves, had to be applied realistically by the Trusteeship Council; the French delegation therefore could not accept the drafting of section A, paragraph 1, of the joint amendment.

44. As for section B, paragraph 4, of the joint amendment, he would leave all necessary comment to the representative of the International Labour Organisation. However, he wished to point out that at first sight the terms of the joint draft resolution appeared to be more befitting to the dignity of the International Labour Organisation, for it acknowledged the fundamental and statutory autonomy of that agency, which had apparently been overlooked by the authors of the joint amendment.

45. In conclusion, he observed that the joint draft resolution appeared to reflect the concern expressed in the General Assembly resolutions much more faithfully than did the joint amendment; the French delegation would therefore support the former.

46. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), referring to the attitude to be adopted by the Trusteeship Council towards resolutions of the General Assembly, said that several cases had to be considered. The first was that in which the General Assembly backed recommendations of the Trusteeship Council with its authority, and itself drew up a recommendation which it brought to the attention of the Administering Authorities. In that case, the General Assembly was performing one of its normal functions, and the Trusteeship Council needed to take no action.

47. The second case was that in which the General Assembly called upon the Trusteeship Council to report on its action in certain matters. There, too, the General Assembly was performing one of its normal functions and the Trusteeship Council was bound to comply with its request.

48. Lastly, there was the case in which the General Assembly called upon the Trusteeship Council to take certain action and perhaps specified the steps to be taken. He wondered whether, in such a case, the General Assembly was not going beyond its normal functions. The Trusteeship Council was one of the principal organs of the United Nations and adopted resolutions in accordance with its rules of procedure and by a majority of its members. Furthermore, it sometimes happened that when the General Assembly called upon the Trusteeship Council to take specific

steps, its instructions lacked a sense of reality. A typical instance was the instruction to the Council concerning steps to be taken to secure the budgetary autonomy of Trust Territories. As the French representative had observed, to secure the budgetary autonomy of Trust Territories amounted to cutting off all financial assistance to the Territory, a step which would defeat the whole aim of the trusteeship system. Another example was the General Assembly's instruction to the Trusteeship Council in resolution 323 (IV) to "examine all laws, statutes and ordinances, as well as their application, in the Trust Territories" with the object of ascertaining any discriminatory provisions or practices which might exist in such statutes and ordinances. Consequent on those instructions, the Philippines and Argentine delegations had felt it their duty to put forward a proposal for the setting-up of a committee composed of six members to make a preliminary study of all laws, statutes, ordinances and decrees in force in the Trust Territories. That would be an immense task, entailing long and intricate research, if important conclusions carrying weight in legal circles were to be submitted. His delegation would not take part in that Committee, as it would not participate in an undertaking which would take many years to complete and was not certain to provide results enhancing the prestige of the Trusteeship Council.

49. The instruction in resolution 323 (IV) to adopt "suitable measures for solving in a broad and humanitarian spirit such important social problems as migrant labour and penal sanctions for breach of labour contracts by indigenous inhabitants" also seemed unrealistic. The Trusteeship Council had, in fact, no power to take measures for that purpose, and should confine itself to addressing to the Administering Authority concerned a recommendation inviting it to take the proper steps to solve those problems itself.

50. Generally speaking, there was no need, at that stage, for the Trusteeship Council to adopt resolutions.

51. If, however, a choice had to be made between the joint draft resolution and the joint amendment thereto, he would vote for the former. He could not agree with the Philippines representative's view that the Trusteeship Council was better qualified than the International Labour Organisation to seek a solution to the problem of migrant labour. He thought that in its particular field the prestige of the International Labour Organisation was greater than that of the Trusteeship Council. It would be unfortunate if the Trusteeship Council put itself in the position of adopting, in respect of that problem, resolutions which later proved to conflict with the conclusions reached by the International Labour Organisation on the same subject.

52. The PRESIDENT considered it his duty as President to make a statement of principle concerning the relations between the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly, a question which had been raised earlier in the meeting by the Belgian representative and which he, himself, had raised, in his capacity as President

of the Trusteeship Council, before the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.

53. By the terms of the Charter, the Trusteeship Council was placed under the authority of the United Nations, but it was at the same time one of the three chief functional organs of the United Nations. It was constituted on the basis of equal representation, as between Administering and non-administering Powers, and took all its decisions by majority vote: resolutions adopted by the General Assembly recommending or requesting the Trusteeship Council to take any particular action in a given matter could in no case limit the Council's rights.

54. That point was an important one because the Council might be seized of resolutions which had not been carried unanimously in the General Assembly. The resolutions being examined by the Council were of that nature. Not only had they not been carried unanimously in the General Assembly, but certain delegations, in voting against them, had stated explicitly that they considered them to be unconstitutional. As the Trusteeship Council could only apply General Assembly resolutions if a majority of its members voted in favour of such application, it might happen that a resolution passed by the General Assembly might not commend itself to the majority of the Trusteeship Council; that would cause a regrettable conflict between the two organs.

55. For that reason, he considered that the General Assembly should exercise the greatest prudence in passing resolutions whereby it encroached upon the sphere of activity allotted to the Trusteeship Council under the Charter. He also thought that the Trusteeship Council had powers to construe General Assembly resolutions in such a way as to render them applicable in practice. The Trusteeship Council could not be regarded as an executive organ for carrying out resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, but should preserve that degree of responsibility which was laid on it by the Charter.

The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and was resumed at 5.30 p.m.

56. Mr. LIU (China) said he was in general agreement with the joint amendment to the Iraqi-United States draft resolution and had concluded from the lucid explanations given by the Argentine and Philippines representatives that the joint draft resolution was not adequate, and failed to cover all the points raised by the General Assembly resolutions in question. Those omissions were fully made good in the joint amendment.

57. Passing to some points of detail, he said that the first paragraph of the preamble to the joint amendment, in calling upon the Council to give effect to the recommendations of the General Assembly, was preferable, by virtue both of greater force and of precision, to the wording of paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution, which merely stated that the Council took note of those recommendations.

58. On several occasions in the past when doubts had been expressed as to whether the General Assembly

had authority to issue instructions to the Council, representatives of China had pointed out that the only possible interpretation of Article 87 of the Charter was that the Council was an executive organ of the General Assembly. That Article specifically stated that the Council carried out certain functions under the authority of the General Assembly and, so far as he could see, there was no ambiguity in its wording. Article 85 of the Charter also expressly stated that the Council "operating under the Authority of the General Assembly" should assist the latter in carrying out certain functions with regard to Trusteeship Agreements. He could not therefore agree with the contention that the General Assembly had been guilty of discourtesy in formulating certain instructions for the guidance of the Council. Indeed, he was of the contrary opinion—namely, that it would be extremely remiss of the Council to ignore those instructions and to fail to take action on them.

59. Some disagreement had been expressed concerning the desirability of retaining the word "some" in the second paragraph of the preamble to the joint amendment. He considered that it should be retained in recognition of the fact that not all the provisions of the recommendations made by the General Assembly had been implemented by the Council. In the light of the foregoing considerations, he declared his support for the joint amendment.

60. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) welcomed the remarks of the Belgian representative, which had introduced an element of realism hitherto noticeably absent from the discussion. The Belgian representative had pertinently pointed out the difficulties both of a substantive and of a procedural character which would arise if the Council persisted in the course it appeared to be intent on adopting. The Council would do well to bear in mind in all its deliberations the views expressed by the President concerning its relationship to the General Assembly.

61. He appreciated the efforts made by the Iraqi and United States representatives, in submitting their joint draft resolution, to sum up the suggestions made during the course of the discussions held in the General Assembly at its fourth session. His Government was in wholehearted sympathy with the objects of that draft resolution, and differed only as to the methods to be employed and the tempo envisaged for their application.

62. Confining himself to three points arising from the General Assembly resolutions which had been dealt with in the Iraqi-United States draft resolution—namely, budgetary autonomy, child marriage and corporal punishment—he stated that so far as the first was concerned, he had nothing to add to what had already been said by the Belgian and French representatives, except to recall that, during the examination of the annual report on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under British administration for 1948, the Philippines representative had urged the British Government, as the Administering Authority, to make larger sums available for the

development of the Territory, and had dismissed the suggestion of the United Kingdom representative that nothing in the Trusteeship Agreement could be interpreted as requiring the United Kingdom to make additional financial allocations to that Territory, although in fact it was doing so. The Philippines representative was now jointly sponsoring an amendment to the draft resolution calling upon the Administering Authority to introduce budgetary autonomy within the Territory. If that expression meant anything at all, it meant that the Administering Authority should cease to do that which it had been formerly accused of doing in insufficient measure. The contradiction between those two attitudes of the Philippines delegation was patent. It was evident, though not explicitly stated, that the Trust Territories referred to in section A, paragraph 1, of the joint amendment were the Territories of Togoland and the Cameroons under British administration, and the United Kingdom representative had repeatedly explained the reasons why those two Territories were administered as integral parts of the Gold Coast and Nigeria respectively. His Government could not therefore support a resolution under the terms of which it would be required to introduce budgetary autonomy, which was a measure it knew to be not only impracticable, but also not in accordance with the Trusteeship Agreements. When the question had been discussed in the General Assembly in relation to general economic advancement, the United Kingdom representative had made it clear that, apart from that major difficulty, the general principles affirmed in General Assembly resolution 322 (IV) were in entire conformity with the policy pursued by His Majesty's Government. The latter was already supplying, and would continue to supply, the Council with all available statistics and information to enable appropriate appraisals to be made of the financial and economic situation in those Territories.

63. His Government regarded with as much abhorrence as any other Member of the Council the existence of uncivilized practices referred to in General Assembly resolution 323 (IV), and was intent on securing their early and total elimination. However, all the experience of his Government in the administration and development of backward territories had taught it that the best method of dealing with such problems was not legislation, which tended to drive undesirable practices underground, but extended education and social persuasion. His Government's conviction in that respect had already been elaborated in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, and had been substantiated by the observations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (T/439) on the annual reports for 1948 for the Trust Territories of Tanganyika, Togoland and the Cameroons under British administration; Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration; and Ruanda Urundi under Belgian administration, in which it was stated: "Child marriage is also one of the questions on which it is dangerous to legislate in the face of local custom. Probably a gradual approach through education is to be preferred, since a law will doubtless be evaded if the culture of the group sanctions child

marriage". The truth of that conclusion had fully been borne out by the experience of the British administration. His Government could therefore not agree to a resolution enunciating the principle that legislation in such cases was the correct approach.

64. So far as the question of corporal punishment was concerned, the United Kingdom representative had already expounded the position of his Government during the debates prior to the adoption of the General Assembly resolution 323 (IV)—namely, that the policy of the United Kingdom Government was to secure the progressive reduction of corporal punishment as a sentence of the courts, with the ultimate objective of its complete abolition as soon as feasible. That had to be done gradually, especially as alternative methods of treatment had to be devised. The Administrations of the Trust Territories under British administration were at present being urged to take further steps towards restricting the use of corporal punishment for adults, so that whipping was only ordered by a Supreme Court in cases of the most serious offences against the person. As soon as it was possible to establish an effective probation service (and steps to do so were already being taken), it was confidently expected that sentences of corporal punishment on juveniles would cease to be passed. It was interesting in that connexion to note that in Singapore where an effective probation service had been introduced, it had been found possible to bring that about. So far as prison offences were concerned, it had been the experience in the United Kingdom itself that corporal punishment could not be abolished with safety for the three principal prison offences: mutiny, incitement to mutiny and violence against prison officers. The situation in the Trust Territories at present was that prisoners could not be flogged or whipped for any offence other than those three. Thus, the adoption of the Iraqi-United States draft resolution would mean in effect to recommend to His Majesty's Government, amongst others, the enactment of legislation in the Trust Territories prohibiting immediately uncivilized practices and all forms of corporal punishment, as well as the prompt introduction of budgetary autonomy, all of which measures his Government was convinced would at the moment be both injudicious and impracticable.

65. Passing from the Iraqi-United States joint draft resolution to the joint amendment, he observed that the latter went much further in an attempt to find a solution to the problems concerned. Without repeating the views already expressed by the United Kingdom representatives in the Fourth Committee, he still wished to raise certain points of detail in connexion with the joint amendment. For instance, it proposed the establishment of a committee to make a preliminary study of all laws, statutes and ordinances, as well as their application in the Trust Territories, but he doubted whether the authors of the proposal had any conception of the magnitude of such a task. Did they seriously think it could be achieved within the short interval between the end of the present session and the beginning of the next? If such a recommendation were passed the Council would run grave risk of making itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

66. It was unfortunate that the International Labour Organisation could not provide information on the social problems of migrant labour and penal sanctions for breach of labour contracts by indigenous inhabitants in Trust Territories before the seventh session of the Council, but it must be realized that the questions were of a long-term character, highly technical and called for study by experts. He did not consider that the Council could do more than request the International Labour Organisation for its views whensoever they could be furnished. He could not therefore agree with the intention of section B, paragraph 4, of the joint amendment. So far as section C of the same amendment was concerned, he considered that the measures it advocated had already been put in hand. As the United States representative had pointed out in connexion with paragraph 1 of that section, the United Kingdom had already distributed much United Nations material in its Trust Territories. As members would recall, the United Kingdom representative in the Fourth Committee had voted in favour of the Brazilian proposal that instruction be given in Trust Territories on the objectives of the United Nations and the trusteeship system. The question raised in paragraph 2 had already been discussed by the Committee on Higher Education in Trust Territories, on whose report (T/369) the Council had already taken action. He did not feel that anything further could be done to speed up the implementation of those recommendations. The injunction laid upon Administering Authorities in paragraph 3 was already provided for in the Trusteeship Agreements. For example, article 16 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Territory of Tanganyika specified that the reports of the Administering Authority to the General Assembly "shall include information concerning the measures taken to give effect to suggestions and recommendations of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council . . .". It was therefore unnecessary to repeat it in a draft resolution of the kind under discussion.

67. With respect to section D, concerning Visiting Missions, rule 94 of the Council's rules of procedure defined the purpose of Visiting Missions—namely, that they should make their visits with a view to achieving the basic objectives of the international trusteeship system—and Rule 95 laid down that the terms of reference of such Missions should be drawn up by the Council itself. Article 76 of the Charter stated that one of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system was "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the circumstances of each Territory". He doubted whether there was any justification in the departure taken by the General Assembly in its resolution 321 (IV) from the wording of the Charter by the introduction of the words "and in particular" in connexion with Visiting Missions reporting on the steps towards self-government or independence.

68. As he had already stated, these considerations had been more fully expressed in the past by representa-

tives of his Government, and therefore while appreciating the intentions of the Iraqi and United States representatives in submitting their joint draft resolution he would be unable to vote in favour of it.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gavin, representative of the International Labour Organisation, took his place at the Council table.

69. Mr. GAVIN (International Labour Organisation) thanked the Belgian representative for his complimentary references to the competence of the International Labour Organisation in certain fields, and the French representative for his observations concerning the form which the request to the International Labour Organisation in section B, paragraph 4, of the joint amendment should take. He agreed with the French representative that such requests should be addressed direct to the International Labour Organisation rather than through the Secretariat.

70. Concerning the problems of penal sanctions and migrant labour raised during the debate, he would amplify the statement made by the Director-General of the International Labour Office at the sixty-eighth meeting of the Council, when the latter had indicated the willingness of the Organisation to co-operate in certain ways in the study of those two subjects. That willingness was due not only to the interest of the Organisation itself in the matters, but also to the terms of General Assembly resolution 323 (IV). The Director-General had stated that the Organisation was ready to examine the problem of penal sanctions and hoped to be in a position to report to the Council at its spring session in 1951. References had been made to possible delays in that study, but the position was that the Penal Sanctions Convention of 1939 had been ratified by only two States, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, and those two States, in conformity with their obligations, had to furnish the Organisation with information with regard to the implementation of the Convention. Other States which had not yet ratified it were under no such obligation. However, it was possible under the provisions of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation to address direct requests to Governments for information and the Director-General had, it would be recalled, undertaken to ask for such information on the existing law and practice concerning penal sanctions in countries which had not ratified the Convention. Such a procedure would, of course, take time, but the utmost would be done to secure the necessary data by the data promised.

71. The question of migrant labour was of wider scope and greater complexity. It involved, not only Trust Territories, but other parts of Africa, and investigations on the spot would be conducted irrespective of the decision taken by the Council. That investigation was planned to take place during the coming summer, and the findings would be considered by a committee of experts which would probably not be able to meet before the autumn of 1951. The International Labour Organisation therefore could not bind itself to presenting its views on the subject to the Council for another eighteen months or two years.

Whatever suggestions were made by the committee of experts for the amelioration of conditions of migrant labourers, they would inevitably demand measures of co-operation between a large number of territories, not all of which were Trust Territories. Therefore, if the Council desired to have a general survey of the whole situation, it would be well advised to wait on the report of the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. Gavin withdrew.

72. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand) fully endorsed the declaration made by the President concerning the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, but, in spite of its important bearing on all the work of the Council, hoped it would not be necessary to discuss it at the present stage.

73. Passing to the two proposals before the Council, he expressed preference for the joint Iraqi-United States draft resolution, stating that he would support it with one reservation—namely, that paragraph 3, concerning corporal punishment, be brought into line with the General Assembly resolution 323 (IV). He only had two points to raise in connexion with the joint Argentine-Philippines amendment, since the others he would have mentioned had already been discussed by previous speakers. On the subject of the abolition of corporal punishment, neither the text of the joint draft resolution nor that of the joint amendment conformed with General Assembly resolution 323 (IV), which did not mention corporal punishment in all Trust Territories, but only in Ruanda-Urundi, the Cameroons and Togoland under British administration, and New Guinea. The Trust Territory of Nauru, and the New Zealand Trust Territory of Western Samoa were not mentioned, but he presumed that that was due to the fact that corporal punishment did not exist there. He therefore suggested that both the joint draft resolution and the joint amendment thereto should be revised in conformity with the General Assembly resolution.

74. Section B, paragraph 2, of the joint amendment mentioned the abolition of discriminatory practices, but he felt that it would be well to be more specific: for example, in Western Samoa there were two kinds of legislation; that passed by the Administering Authority and that passed by the local Legislative Assembly. If "discriminatory practices" was intended to refer to the former, then such a reference was three years out-of-date, since such practices had already been prohibited by the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements. After the conclusion of the Trusteeship Agreement for Western Samoa, his Government had reviewed all the legislation for the Territory and had repealed certain enactments on the grounds that they might be interpreted as being discriminatory. There was therefore no need to review that legislation as proposed under section B, paragraph 2, of the joint amendment. If, on the other hand, discriminatory practices envisaged the second type of legislation to which he had made reference—namely, that passed by the local Legislative Assembly, he hardly thought its examination would be very fruitful in yielding information, since it was

unlikely that the Samoans would pass discriminatory laws against themselves. So far as other Trust Territories were concerned, he supported the arguments adduced by the Belgian representative.

75. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said that some representatives had interpreted section A, paragraph 1, of the joint amendment concerning budgetary autonomy as meaning the immediate cessation of subsidies from the Administering Authorities to their Territories. He, for his part, did not consider that that was the correct interpretation of General Assembly resolution 322 (IV). The French representative had suggested that the phrase "budgetary autonomy" in that resolution was intended to mean that the Territories should have a voice in their expenditure through local organs of their own. It had been further suggested that, since the General Assembly had already made a recommendation, it was useless for the Council to take further action. However, closer examination of resolution 322 (IV) would show that the General Assembly expected the Council to make certain recommendations to Administering Authorities and he had submitted his amendment in order to give effect to the desire expressed by the General Assembly.

76. General Assembly resolution 324 (IV) drew the attention of the Council to the necessity of requesting the Administering Authorities to study the possibility of including in the curricula of schools in the Trust Territories instruction on the United Nations, the international trusteeship system and the special status of Trust Territories. He was convinced that that was a definite directive to the Council which should be carried out, as well as the injunction in paragraph 5 of the same resolution to the effect that the Council should call upon Administering Authorities to intensify measures for the establishment in Africa of educational institutions of University standard.

77. General Assembly resolution 321 (IV) recommended to the Council that it should: "Direct visiting missions to report fully on the steps taken towards the realization of the objectives set forth in Article 76 *b* of the Charter under the headings of political, economic, social and educational advancement and, in particular, on the steps taken towards self-government or independence". He was unable to see why exception should have been taken to the words "in particular" in that recommendation. The General Assembly was only making a request for necessary information, and it was incumbent upon the Council to meet its request in that matter.

78. In paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 323 (IV), the Council was asked to take suitable measures for solving in a broad and humanitarian spirit such important social problems as migrant labour and penal sanctions for breach of labour contracts by indigenous inhabitants. Both the joint draft resolution and the joint amendment sought the co-operation of the International Labour Organisation for the purpose of fulfilling that request of the General Assembly. Exception had been taken by the representative of the International Labour Organisation to the wording

of section B, paragraph 4, of the joint amendment and he (the Philippines representative) for his part, would be prepared to modify it, provided that the Argentine representative could also accept such change.

79. The Council had been informed by the representative of the International Labour Organisation that only two Administering Authorities had ratified the Penal Sanctions Convention, and that therefore information could be furnished only with respect to their territories. Perhaps the International Labour Organisation could inform the Council of the difficulties in that field facing other Administering Authorities who had not so far ratified the Convention. If nothing were done to secure that information until they had ratified, the Council would fail to carry out the task laid upon it by the General Assembly and he hoped that at least the International Labour Organisation would be in a position to indicate how far penal sanctions had been abolished or how soon they could be abolished by the two signatory States.

80. In answer to those representatives who had raised objections to the proposal in section B, paragraph 2, of the joint amendment to establish a committee for the study of all laws, statutes and ordinances with a view to enabling the Council to make positive recommendation for the abolition of discriminatory practices, he would reply that the Committee was not expected to complete that study by the next session, but merely to present an interim report. As had been pointed out, the work might take years, and it was therefore all the more essential for it to start immediately. He considered that such a proposal was more realistic than for the Council to decline to take any action at all.

81. The reason why General Assembly resolution 323 (IV) mentioned only four Trust Territories in connexion with the abolition of corporal punishment was that the reports on those Territories had happened to be under consideration by the General Assembly at the time, and he realized that the Administering Authorities of the Territories in which it did not exist might legitimately object to general wording implying that it existed in all Trust Territories. He was therefore prepared to render the meaning of section B, paragraph 1, of the joint amendment more precise by the insertion of the words "where they exist" after the words "in all Trust Territories".

82. He did not share the President's view of the position of the Trusteeship Council *vis-à-vis* the General Assembly, which he believed to have been made in a personal capacity. The relationship was clearly defined in the Charter and the action taken by the General Assembly concerning Trust Territories had been taken by majority decision. It was unfortunate that a minority in the General Assembly happened to have secured a majority in the Council. Endorsement of the President's interpretation would be tantamount to accepting the revolutionary doctrine of conceding the right to a minority to overthrow the will of the majority. Such a principle, if adopted, would eventually lead to the collapse of the United Nations.

83. The PRESIDENT wished to make it clear to the representative of the Philippines that he had expressly made the statement in his capacity as President, and not in his personal capacity. He could not in any circumstances accept a different interpretation.

84. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), replying to one of the remarks made by the representative of the Philippines, pointed out that in General Assembly resolution 322 (IV) the expression "budgetary autonomy" had been wrongly used, for it was incorrect to say that it was the absence of budgetary autonomy which prevented the Council from making a thorough examination of the financial situation of certain Territories. He regretted that the joint amendment used the same unsuitable expression but in an even less justifiable manner, in that the proposal asked the Council "to recommend to the Administering Authorities concerned to take measures to assure to the Trust Territories under their administration budgetary autonomy". That was not what the General Assembly had asked, for if there had to be budgetary autonomy in the Trust Territories it would no longer be possible to administer them. That was why, in the circumstances, he wished, as several of his colleagues had already done, to express the entire agreement of his delegation with the President regarding the interpretation which should be given to the role of the Trusteeship Council. It was clear that if the latter were merely to regurgitate General Assembly resolutions, complete with errors of drafting, it would be a body serving no useful purpose. He would revert later to that point, which was not the subject under discussion, but he thought that it was one of the examples which provided a perfect illustration of the truth of the President's remarks.

85. Mr. LAKING (New Zealand), in reply to the Philippines representative's explanation that the General Assembly resolution 323 (IV) mentioned four Trust Territories in paragraph 2 because their reports had happened to be under consideration at the time, pointed out that nevertheless in the first paragraph of the preamble, the Cameroons and Togoland under British administration, the Cameroons and Togoland under French administration, Western Samoa, New Guinea and Nauru were all mentioned, and it could therefore be legitimately assumed that the remainder of the operative part of the resolution related to all the Trust Territories mentioned in the first paragraph of the preamble. It was to that fact that he had wished to draw attention.

86. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) added that in the course of the same session, the General Assembly had congratulated the Administering Authorities on the satisfactory financial situation of Western Samoa and Nauru. The Members of the General Assembly must have read the relevant annual reports.

87. Mr. HOOD (Australia) stated that the question of the abolition of corporal punishment had been the subject of more than one amendment during its consideration in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, and he considered that it was necessary to take account of the fact that, although it was on the statute

book of New Guinea, it had not been enforced for many years and therefore could be deemed no longer to exist there. He agreed that an amendment should be made to the Iraqi-United States draft resolution to meet the point raised by the New Zealand representative making it clear that corporal punishment did not exist in all Trust Territories.

88. Mr. SAYRE (United States), in reply to the Australian representative, said that if the Iraqi representative were willing, he would be ready to insert the words "where they still exist" after the words "whipping in Trust Territories" in paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution.

89. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) signified his agreement to the amendment proposed by the United States representative.

90. At the request of Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) the PRESIDENT then put to the vote the joint Argentine-Philippines amendment (T/L.40) paragraph by paragraph.

The preamble was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Section A was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

91. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) stated that in view of the United States amendment to paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution, the Argentine delegation and his own had decided to withdraw section B, paragraph 1, in favour of paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution.

Section B, paragraph 2, was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

92. At the suggestion of the New Zealand representative who pointed out that paragraph 3 had become redundant after paragraph 2 had been rejected, no vote was taken on paragraph 3.

Section B, paragraph 4, was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Section C, paragraph 1, was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with no abstentions.

Section C, paragraph 2, was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

Section C, paragraph 3, was rejected by 5 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Section D, paragraph 1, was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

93. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) explained that he had voted against certain of those amendments as amendments, and not because he was opposed to the ideas which they embodied. He considered that the draft resolution submitted jointly by the Iraqi and United States delegations adequately expressed the feeling of the Council.

94. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Iraqi-United States joint draft resolution (T/L.7) as amended.

The draft resolution was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

276th meeting

SEVENTY-FOURTH MEETING

*Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 29 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.

125. Political, economic, social and educational advancement in Trust Territories (General Assembly resolutions 320 (IV), 322 (IV), 323 (IV) and 324 (IV) (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL BY THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY

Consideration of joint draft resolution submitted by the Argentine and Philippines delegations (T/L.41)

1. The PRESIDENT invited comments on the draft resolution (T/L.41) submitted jointly by the delegations of Argentina and the Philippines in connexion with the General Assembly's requests in its resolutions 320 (IV), 322 (IV), 323 (IV) and 324 (IV) for the inclusion of special sections on the implementation by the Administering Authorities of the Council's recommendations on political, economic, social and educational advancement in Trust Territories.

2. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) considered the joint proposal pointless; the Council did not need to adopt a formal resolution to carry out the wishes of the Assembly.

3. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said that, despite the general attitude of the representative of Belgium towards General Assembly resolutions, the remarks he had just made had, to say the least, surprised him. In resolutions 320 (IV), 322 (IV), 323 (IV) and 324 (IV), the General Assembly had asked the Trusteeship Council to include in its annual reports to the General Assembly "a special section dealing with the implementation by the Administering Authorities of the Council's recommendations concerning the measures adopted to grant the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories a larger degree of self-government through participation in the legislative, executive and judicial organs and procedures of the Trust Territories", "a special section on the implementation by the Administering Authorities of its recommendations on the economic advancement of the Trust Territories", "a special section dealing with the implementation by the Administering Authorities of its recommendations concerning the improvement of social conditions in Trust Territories . . ." and "a special section . . . on the implementation of the Council's recommendations in the field of education". The draft resolution submitted jointly by the Argentine and Philippines delegations suggested an orderly and logical method of imple-