



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Nineteenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 7 May 1957,
at 2.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration for 1955 (<i>continued</i>)	
Draft resolution submitted by India and the United States of America.....	259
Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi for 1955 (<i>continued</i>)	
Report of the Drafting Committee.....	262

President: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration for 1955 (T/1300, T/1304/Add.1, T/PET.7/520, T/L.754) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 3 (c)]

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (T/L.754)

1. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the reforms introduced by the Togoland Statute would be virtually ineffective as long as the members of the Legislative Assembly were not elected by the new voting procedure—universal suffrage. That was the consideration underlying the draft resolution submitted by India and the United States (T/L.754) inviting the Administering Authority to hold the elections at an early date.

2. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said it would be preferable to postpone the consideration of the draft resolution: in its resolution 1046 (XI) the General Assembly had made itself clear on the subject of elections in Togoland. Moreover, the United Nations Commission on Togoland under French Administration would soon proceed to the Territory. While still favouring the holding of elections, he felt that the question could wait until the Commission's return, and he made a motion to that effect.

3. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that he, on the contrary, considered that a decision should be taken without delay, for otherwise the draft resolution would cease to be pertinent. He would therefore vote against the motion made by the United States representative.

4. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that, in the case of Togoland, the Council had decided at its 786th meeting

not to make recommendations relating to political matters. Admittedly, later at the same meeting, it had considered that its decision did not prevent it from discussing resolutions concerning the political situation in the Territory. That involved a certain contradiction, but if the representatives took the view that the Council should consider the draft resolution now before it, he, like the Indian representative, would be in favour of beginning the discussion at once.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the United States motion.

Syria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand.

Against: Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Burma, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy.

Abstaining: China.

The United States motion was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

5. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that since his motion had been rejected, he felt obliged to withdraw his support of the draft resolution¹ although his position as to its substance had not changed.

6. Mr. KIANG (China), explaining his vote, said that in his view it would be preferable for the Council not to vote on the particular question pending receipt of the Commission's report. Moreover, the General Assembly had already given its opinion on the subject of elections in resolution 1046 (XI). Finally, his delegation considered—and had said so before—that a freely elected Legislative Assembly would make it possible to learn the true wishes of the people of Togoland.

7. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said he saw no difference between General Assembly resolution 1046 (XI) and the draft resolution under consideration. In the circumstances, the proper course would be to give the Administering Authority time to implement the General Assembly's recommendations. A mere three months earlier the General Assembly had examined a mass of documents and heard many petitioners from different parties, and had then expressed satisfaction with the political emancipation of the Trust Territory. Hence it would be wrong for the Council to reopen the matter at that stage with a draft resolution which was based on the testimony of a single petitioner and which did not even take the Administering Authority's views into consideration. Italy had favoured and continued to favour the establishment of a democratic régime in Togoland, but it saw no need for prodding the Administering Authority constantly and systematically. His delegation would therefore vote against the Indian draft resolution. It felt, moreover, that the Council should consider France's point of view; he sincerely hoped that the French representative would give some details concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1046 (XI).

¹ See T/L.754/Corr.1, circulated subsequently.

A vote was taken on the Syrian amendment.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 2 abstentions.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

At the request of the Syrian representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: China, Italy.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 2 abstentions. The amendment was not adopted.

40. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Indian draft resolution up to and including the words "universal adult suffrage" in the operative paragraph.

At the request of the representative of India, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

Abstaining: China, Italy.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 2 abstentions.

After a brief recess, in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: China, Italy.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 2 abstentions. The first part of the draft resolution was not adopted.

41. The PRESIDENT suggested that the remainder of the draft resolution should not be put to the vote.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. KIANG (China) said that he had abstained for the same reasons as he had done in the vote on the United States proposal to postpone examination of the question.

43. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that as a matter of principle his delegation never voted on parts of texts. If the draft had been put to the vote as a whole, the Italian delegation would have voted against it.

44. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Council should adopt recommendations on all questions, including those pertaining to the political advancement of Territories. He urged that the Administering Authority should fix time-limits for the accession of the Territory to independence

and considered that democratic elections should be organized as soon as possible to promote the political advancement of the Territory.

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi for 1955 (T/1282, T/1304, T/L.735 and Add.1, T/L.735 and Add.1, T/L.758, T/L.759) (continued)

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.735 AND ADD.1, T/L.758, T/L.759)

45. Mr. MAX (France), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, presented the Committee's report (T/L.758).

46. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) drew the Council's attention to his delegation's proposal as set forth in paragraph 5 of the report. He thought that the last part of the paragraph, beginning with the words "and will remedy the deficiencies..." should be omitted, and asked that the remainder of the text should be put to the vote.

47. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) considered that the proposal was particularly inappropriate in view of the further important progress in the political field which had been accomplished in Ruanda-Urundi. He pointed out that the summary of the observations made on the Territory by members of the Trusteeship Council (T/XIX/DC.3/R.1²) contained the general opinions expressed by some ten members, with which the Syrian draft resolution was in contradiction.

48. Mr. MAX (France) said that his delegation had serious objections to the text submitted by Syria, particularly in the case of the second sentence.

49. Mr. YANG (China) requested a separate vote on the second sentence.

50. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) proposed that in the first sentence of the paragraph the word "some" should be replaced by the word "satisfactory".

51. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) withdrew his delegation's proposal.

52. The PRESIDENT said he would put the conclusions and recommendations in each sub-section of the annex to the Committee's report to the vote separately.

53. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium), referring to the recommendation in the sub-section entitled "Status of the Territory", said that the Trusteeship Agreement gave the Administering Authority a sovereign right to decide on the question of establishing a force of public order (*force publique*) made up of indigenous inhabitants. It was not obliged to take such action but could do so if it thought fit. Hence, the last sentence of the paragraph seemed incompatible with the Trusteeship Agreement.

54. He recalled that his Government was studying the possibility of incorporating inhabitants of the Territory in the force, but that a number of factors had to be taken into account, such as the high cost of a force of that kind, the disinclination of the indigenous inhabitants for military service, and so on. The result of obeying the Council's recommendations might be the formation of separate forces in the two parts of the Territory, which would run counter to the objective sought.

² Working paper circulated to members of the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi only.

The sub-section entitled "Status of the Territory" was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

55. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) proposed that, after the second paragraph of the recommendations entitled "Status of the inhabitants of the Territory", the following sentence should be inserted: The Council recommends to the Administering Authority that it consider the adoption of an official name for the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory."

56. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that if effect were given to that amendment it would probably mean having two national names for the inhabitants of the Territory.

The Guatemalan amendment was adopted by 7 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

The sub-section entitled "Status of the inhabitants of the Territory", as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

57. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that although he had voted for the Guatemalan amendment he thought that only one official name should be adopted for the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory.

58. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that he had voted for the amendment the purpose of which was in his opinion to give official standing to the names "Banyaruanda" and "Barundi".

59. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that he had voted against the Guatemalan representative's proposal because it would be preferable for the Africans to choose their own name; he did not think that the Trusteeship Council should intervene in the matter.

60. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) agreed with the United States representative.

61. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) pointed out that no name had been proposed for the inhabitants of the Territory; it was to be hoped that the Administering Authority, in consultation with local authorities, would choose the most appropriate name.

The sub-section entitled "Development of representative, executive and legislative organs and extension of their powers" was adopted by 13 votes to none, with one abstention.

The sub-section entitled "Development of universal adult suffrage and direct elections" was adopted by 13 votes to none, with one abstention.

The sub-section entitled "Public office; training and appointment of indigenous persons for positions of responsibility in the Administration" was adopted by 13 votes to none, with one abstention.

The sub-section entitled "Judicial organization" was adopted unanimously.

62. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that he had voted in favour of the sub-section concerned because the hope expressed by the Council corresponded with the policy followed by the Administering Authority. Nevertheless, it was essential that certain matters should continue to be settled on the spot by officials of the Administration and not by judges; the use of the phrase "and thus to ensure the maximum separation of the executive and judicial powers" in the paragraph seemed to take account of that need.

63. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the first sentence of the sub-section entitled "General economy: public finances, steps taken to obtain adequate public revenue".

The first sentence was adopted by 13 votes to none, with one abstention.

The remainder of the sub-section was adopted unanimously.

The sub-section as a whole was adopted unanimously.

64. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) said that although he had voted for the sub-section as a whole, he felt that it was rather a delicate matter for the Council to express an opinion on a question which was still the subject of negotiations between the Administering Authority and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

65. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) proposed that, in the last sentence of the first paragraph of the sub-section entitled "Land and agriculture", the words "processing and" should be inserted before the words "sale of their products", since certain products, and especially agricultural products, underwent prior processing (coffee, for example, could be sold either in the raw state or after roasting), and the profits of the planters were much larger if the products were sold in the processed state.

66. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) considered that the use of the word "ensure" in the sentence under consideration was not quite correct, since although the Administering Authority could encourage the indigenous population to play a more complete part in production it would be difficult for it to ensure such participation. If the word was retained he would be obliged to abstain.

The Guatemalan amendment was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

67. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that he would abstain from the vote on the sub-section. In Ruanda-Urundi agriculture was not based on a single crop. Having introduced the cultivation of coffee and cotton, the Administering Authority was now encouraging the farmers to produce potatoes, barley, wheat, sugar cane, etc. Its efforts to develop export crops had not always been successful, but that was due solely to the high cost of transport for those products.

The sub-section entitled "Land and agriculture" was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The sub-section entitled "Industry" was adopted unanimously.

The sub-section entitled "Commerce and trade" was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

68. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that as the Drafting Committee had been unable to reach agreement on recommendations to be submitted on the subject of public finance, his delegation proposed that the following text should be inserted in the report:

"Noting that public revenue does not fully cover the ordinary expenditure, the Council emphasizes the need for strict budgetary discipline. It also expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will continue its efforts to increase public revenue by utilizing fully the various resources of all the elements of the population in order to achieve this end, taking due account of the profits received by the various elements of the population."

69. That text had been drafted with a view to sound management of the budget and an eventual increase in the revenue required to meet expenses, for it was not desirable that the Administering Authority should seek to balance the budget by decreasing such expenditure as that for social purposes.

70. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that he would be willing to accept the text proposed by the Syrian delegation up to and including the words "to achieve this end". The last part of the sentence, however, seemed to him to have more bearing on the expenditure of budgetary resources than on the gathering of revenue. He therefore asked that the two parts of the sentence should be voted on separately.

71. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) feared that the words "the need for strict budgetary discipline" might so restrict the Administering Authority as to deprive the budget of the necessary flexibility. He proposed that the Syrian text should be modified to read: "Noting that public revenue does not fully cover the ordinary expenditure, the Council expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will continue its efforts to increase public revenue ..." If that change were not accepted his delegation would request a separate vote on the words "the Council emphasizes the need for strict budgetary discipline".

72. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) observed that no one had ever had occasion to doubt that the Administering Authority exercised discipline with regard to the budget and reminded the Council that the Belgian Government granted the Territory each year an interest-free loan of 400 million Belgian francs with a view to accelerating implementation of the ten-year plan. While revenue did not fully cover expenditure, it should be remembered that in a new Territory like Ruanda-Urundi, where large-scale investment was needed, the extraordinary budget was extremely important.

73. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) wished to maintain the text which he had proposed. He requested that the last part of the sentence should be voted on first, since his delegation attached great importance to it and he might withdraw the entire text if that phrase were not adopted. He had no objection to a separate vote on that part of the sentence concerning budgetary discipline.

74. Mr. JAIPAL (India) proposed that the beginning of the Syrian text should be amended to read as follows: "Noting that public revenue does not fully cover the ordinary expenditure, the Council emphasizes the need for continued efforts to increase public revenue ..."

75. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) accepted the Indian amendment.

76. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) thought that the latter part of the opening sentence in the text proposed by the Syrian representative was superfluous. Direct taxes paid by the indigenous inhabitants amounted to 164 million francs, representing about 40 francs per head per annum, while direct taxes from other sources totalled 75 million francs, representing about 9,000 francs per year paid by non-indigenous inhabitants. Thus the Administering Authority was already taking due account of the profits received by the various elements of the population.

77. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that as the wealth of the Territory was in the hands of a small minority it would be inaccurate to base conclusions solely on such figures.

The latter part of the last sentence of the Syrian amendment, beginning with the words "taking due account of ...", was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

78. Mr. YANG (China) said that although he had not been opposed to the latter part of the last sentence

of the paragraph proposed by the Syrian representative it had seemed to him that it was not in harmony with the general tenor of the paragraph and he had therefore abstained.

79. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) withdrew the text which he had proposed.

80. Mr. JAIPAL (India) reintroduced, on behalf of his own delegation, the text proposed by Syria as modified by India and by the Council's rejection of the last part of the last sentence.

81. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that he would abstain from voting on the proposal.

The Indian proposal was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

82. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) drew attention to the latter part of the second paragraph of the sub-section entitled "Human rights and fundamental freedoms", which dealt with the curfew still in effect at Usumbura and expressed the hope that restrictions on freedom of movement would be completely removed without delay. As the Administering Authority had satisfactorily explained why it had retained those measures, he proposed that the words "removed without delay" should be replaced by the words "removed as soon as possible".

The Italian amendment was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

83. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that he would vote for the text proposed by the Drafting Committee on the understanding that the expression "discriminatory practices" referred only to a social situation, which education would gradually eliminate, and not to racial discrimination, to which the Belgian Government had always been strongly opposed.

The sub-section entitled "Human rights and fundamental freedoms", as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

84. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained from voting because of the Italian representative's amendment to the text.

The sub-section entitled "Labour" was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The sub-section entitled "Housing" was adopted unanimously.

The sub-section entitled "Medical and health services" was adopted unanimously.

85. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium), referring to the sub-section entitled "Penal system", reiterated the explanations which he had already furnished with regard to corporal punishment in the Territory. Corporal punishment was no longer administered as a punishment but only as a disciplinary measure with a view to maintaining order in prisons. The Administering Authority hoped within a short time to be able to eliminate entirely that survival of practices antedating its presence in the Territory. It had already made experiments in that connexion in three penal institutions.

The sub-section entitled "Penal system" was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

86. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that he had abstained because he had not entirely understood the meaning of certain expressions, such as "measures for the prevention of delinquency".

87. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) wished it to be recorded that he had abstained.

The section entitled "Educational advancement" was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

88. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Council to examine paragraph 6 of the Committee's report (T/L.758) which set forth a draft resolution submitted by the USSR.

89. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) pointed out the inconsistency between the draft resolution, which envisaged the attainment by the Trust Territory of independence or self-government within a period of not more than five years, and the statement made by the USSR representative (761st meeting) to the effect that the majority of the Territory's population continued to live in Stone-Age conditions. Furthermore, the present draft only reintroduced the proposal the USSR delegation had submitted to the Fourth Committee during the eleventh session of the General Assembly (A/C.4/L.472 and Rev.1). It would be recalled that the objections raised by the members of the Committee at that time had finally persuaded the USSR representative to abandon the idea of fixing a period of three to five years.³

90. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that his delegation had never withdrawn its proposal that precise target dates for the accession of the Territories to self-government should be set. It had not opposed the amendments to the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee because some delegations had appeared to hope that the Administering Authority would itself set the target dates, and it had been necessary to let them see for themselves that nothing would come of it. That assumption had been justified, since the Administering Authority for Ruanda-Urundi had still not given any information about the setting of a target date. The USSR delegation therefore believed that the Council should itself deal with the matter.

91. Mr. JAIPAL (India) reminded the Council that, while attaching great importance to the setting of target dates, the Indian delegation had always held the opinion that it would be best, for many reasons, for the Administering Authority itself to propose the final dates for termination of the trusteeship after consultation with the people concerned and in the light of the conditions prevailing in each Territory. It did not believe that the United Nations itself should assume that responsibility for the present, except in very special circumstances. That being so, it would be obliged to abstain in the vote.

92. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that he would vote for the draft resolution, having carefully weighed the arguments advanced for and against it.

The USSR draft resolution was rejected by 8 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

93. The PRESIDENT called upon the Council to consider the amendment submitted by India (T/L.759) to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.758).

94. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that paragraph 1 of the Indian amendment reproduced the paragraph adopted at the previous meeting by the Council in its discussion of the report of the Drafting Committee on the Cameroons under British administration (T/L.757, annex II, para. 1). In paragraph 2, the first sub-paragraph recalled a recommendation made by the Council at its seventeenth session (A/3170, p. 86), the second

noted a factual situation and the third was self-explanatory.

95. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) proposed that the words "and recommends its implementation accordingly" at the end of the last paragraph of the amendment should be replaced by the phrase "and recommends that the Administering Authority consider its implementation accordingly".

96. Mr. JAIPAL (India) accepted that amendment.

97. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) proposed the addition to the last paragraph of the Indian amendment of the phrase "in particular, by setting time-limits for the attainment of the intermediate targets referred to above". Although the Indian amendment referred to intermediate targets, it did not request the Administering Authority to set final dates for their attainment, as recommended by the Council at its seventeenth session and by the General Assembly in its resolution 558 (VI).

98. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) wished first of all to point out, with regard to the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 of the Indian amendment, that the Administering Authority had never made any proposals for the reorganization of the Council of the Vice-Government-General. The Administering Authority's representative had stated that it would make such arrangements in the very near future, and a royal decree to reorganize the Council had in fact appeared in the official gazette of Ruanda-Urundi since the general debate had ended. Hence, in place of "Noting the proposals of the Administering Authority..." it would be better to say "Noting the arrangements made by the Administering Authority...".

99. Furthermore, the second part of that sub-paragraph was not clear and it would be better to substitute the following wording: "... and the fact that the members of the sub-chiefdom councils have been indirectly elected by universal male adult suffrage".

100. Mr. JAIPAL (India) proposed that the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 might accordingly be drafted: "Noting the reorganization of the Council of the Vice-Government-General, and the fact that the population, on the basis of male adult suffrage, has indirectly elected representatives to the sub-chiefdom councils".

101. He thought that the Syrian representative's suggestion embodied an idea which already appeared in the Indian text. According to the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 2, the Council would recall that it had recommended to the Administering Authority that it should set not only intermediate targets but also dates. As it was not possible to set a target without at the same time setting a date, the Indian delegation had not considered it necessary to be specific. It was prepared to accept the Syrian amendment provided that the word "time-limits" was replaced by the word "dates", so that the text would correspond more closely to the English text of the Council's previous recommendation.

102. In reply to a question by Mr. SEARS (United States of America), Mr. MUFTI (Syria) explained that his delegation wanted a final date to be set, if not for self-government or independence, at least for the intermediate stages. He would accept the replacement of the word "time-limits" by the word "dates" in his proposal.

103. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that he was prepared to vote for the Indian amendment

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Fourth Committee, 637th to 639th meetings.*

if it did not embody the amendment proposed by the Syrian representative.

104. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that it was not out of the question that the Administering Authority might, at the proper time and after consulting the indigenous inhabitants, establish a central legislative body and extend adult suffrage to elections for all representative bodies. Those assumptions were, however, premature, to say the least. The decree which had appeared in the official gazette of Ruanda-Urundi for the broadening of the Council of the Vice-Government-General had not yet come into force, and it was already being recommended that the Council's powers should be extended and that its members should be appointed by a different system. It would be better to wait until one experiment had been successfully concluded before passing on to the next. Moreover, the draft recommendation appeared to prejudge to some extent the opinion of the people, who in the future might quite well view the political structure of their country and the final form of their institutions in a different light. The Belgian delegation would therefore be unable to vote either for the Indian amendment or for the sub-amendment submitted by Syria.

105. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that in order to facilitate the adoption of the Indian amendment, he would withdraw his suggestion.

106. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) challenged the statement in paragraph 1 of the Indian amendment. The Administering Authority had in fact made a specific statement on the subject in the annual report,⁴ as could be seen from the first paragraph of the section entitled "Consultations with the inhabitants in regard to the measures taken or contemplated towards self-government" in the working paper on conditions in the Territory (T/L.735). Moreover, a further specific statement had been made by the representative of the Administering Authority during the general debate and appeared in the official record of the 761st meeting. Suppression of those statements of the Administering Authority could not be justified.

107. Secondly, he thought the "appropriate targets" referred to in the third sub-paragraph could scarcely be less appropriate. The first of them was the establishment of a central legislative institution. In a recommendation adopted earlier during the meeting, the Council had expressed the hope that the Administering Authority would progressively increase the African membership of the Council of the Vice-Government-

⁴ *Rapport soumis par le Gouvernement belge à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies au sujet de l'administration du Ruanda-Urundi pendant l'année 1955* (Brussels, Imprimerie Fr. Van Muysewinkel, 1956). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1282.

General so that its powers would be extended and in such a way as to transform it into a legislative body within a short time. The Council had thus itself suggested that the transformation should be conditional upon a previous progressive increase in the African representation.

108. The second of the "appropriate targets" would be the extension of adult suffrage to elections for all representative bodies, which would presumably mean universal suffrage; yet the Administering Authority had made it quite clear that the introduction of universal adult suffrage, including women's suffrage, depended entirely on its acceptance by the indigenous people themselves.

109. Finally, since the targets were supposed to be "appropriate" to the implementation of the Council's previous recommendation, and since that recommendation had referred to intermediate targets and dates which would create the pre-conditions for self-government or independence, the conclusion might be drawn that those who supported the Indian amendment believed that the establishment of a central legislative institution and the extension of adult suffrage to elections for all representative bodies would in themselves constitute the necessary pre-conditions for self-government or independence, which was an entirely novel view.

110. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that his delegation had always been concerned with the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of self-government or independence. He would therefore vote for the Indian amendment, on the understanding that the targets mentioned in it were some and not all of the targets which seemed appropriate for the attainment of the objectives defined in the previous recommendations of the General Assembly and the Council.

At the request of Mr. Mufti (Syria), a vote on the Indian amendment (T/L.759), as amended, was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, China, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Against: France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium.

The Indian amendment (T/L.759), as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 6.

111. The PRESIDENT called upon the Council to vote on the recommendation in paragraph 9 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.758).

The recommendation was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.