



CONTENTS

	Page
Programme of work	159
Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the year ending 31 March 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on Western Samoa (T/800, T/792 and T/825) (<i>continued</i>)	
Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.133 and T/L.134) (<i>continued</i>)	159

President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Programme of work

1. Mr. HAY (Australia) informed the Trusteeship Council that the special representative for the Trust Territory of New Guinea was ill and would therefore not be able to attend the meeting. He hoped to be present the following day, Tuesday, 6 March.

2. The PRESIDENT said that in that case the Council might examine the Drafting Committee's report on the report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of Western Samoa (T/L.133).

Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the year ending 31 March 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on Western Samoa (T/800, T/792 and T/825) (*continued*)

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.133 and T/L.134) (*continued*)

3. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at a previous meeting (333rd meeting) the Council had considered the form of its report to the General Assembly and, in particular, the manner in which it should present representatives' views. Some delegations had suggested that the proposals and comments of various members which had not been adopted should appear as footnotes at the end of each section. Others had suggested including them in the body of the report. The USSR delegation would like to know when the Council would decide the question.

4. The PRESIDENT thought that it could be decided at once, during the consideration of the Drafting Committee's report on Western Samoa.

5. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) proposed that the Council should adopt the Drafting Committee's recommendation that, in the chapter on Western Samoa, the observations of individual members which the Council might consider useful should be inserted in the form of footnotes to the relevant sections of the chapter.

6. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) asked whether the Belgian representative's proposal involved a question of principle. In General Assembly resolution 433 (IV) adopted on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, the Trusteeship Council was asked to set out the individual observations and proposals of members of the Council not as footnotes, but in the body of the report. Footnotes were liable to be overlooked. Minority views should be fairly stated and not relegated to second place. That was certainly not the General Assembly's intention.

7. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) said that that matter had been discussed at length in the Fourth Committee, and finally the Assembly had adopted resolution 433 (IV), recommending that the Trusteeship Council, in preparing its future annual reports, should take into consideration documents A/C.4/L.93 and A/C.4/L.94, the texts of which would be of assistance in making clear the structure of the annual report which the General Assembly hoped the Council would adopt. Those documents had been prepared by the representatives of Belgium and the Dominican Republic, both members of the Council. The President might be able to reconcile the views they expressed.

8. Minority views should be given on an equal footing with majority views, as the General Assembly wished. The Drafting Committee's recommendation in no way affected that principle; the question was mainly one of typography.

9. The PRESIDENT remarked that the proposals submitted to the Fourth Committee by the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Belgium had

nothing to do with the question of footnotes, which was new.

10. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not accept the Drafting Committee's proposal that individual observations of members that the Council considered useful should be inserted as footnotes in the Council's report to the General Assembly. Such a procedure would infringe delegations' rights. Moreover, no organ of the United Nations had ever followed such a course. The opinions of representatives of Member States of the United Nations always appeared in the body of the organs' reports to the General Assembly, and so far the Trusteeship Council had always conformed to that rule. He wondered why the Drafting Committee had felt obliged to depart from it. It was true that proposals to change the form of Trusteeship Council reports had been made in the Fourth Committee, particularly in regard to the presentation of the opinions of individual members; but there had never been any question of presenting such opinions as footnotes. The Council would save much time by simply adopting the form recommended in General Assembly resolution 433 (V) for its report to the Assembly.

11. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) said that it was not a matter of suppressing individual observations, but of making the Council's report at once complete, clear, concise and readable. The Fourth Committee had therefore suggested that all questions related to the same subject should be grouped together. The Council should consider how it could comply with the General Assembly's wishes. There was no question of trying to subordinate the minority's views to those of the majority. The point was to decide how the opinions of individual members of the Council could be most clearly presented.

12. There were three possible solutions to the problem. First, individual opinions could be grouped at the end of the report under a suitable heading and in the same type as the report itself. Secondly, as several members of the Council had just suggested, they could be included in the body of the report in the same type as the part of the report containing the Visiting Mission's conclusions, the Administering Authority's observations and the conclusions of the majority of the Council. That solution, however, had the serious drawback that the report would be confused and difficult to read because of the length of the observations. Moreover, the distinction between the Council's conclusions and the observations of individual members of the Council would not always be clear; that would be most regrettable and even dangerous. Finally, there was a third solution, which the Drafting Committee had recommended: the insertion of such individual observations as the Council considered useful as footnotes. That proposal was worth considering, as it would meet both the requirements of members of the Council and the wishes of the General Assembly.

13. If the Council did not adopt any of those solutions, all it could do would be to maintain the form hitherto used for presenting the observations of members of the Trusteeship Council representing their individual opinions only.

14. The United States delegation would accept any solution likely to prevent misinterpretation of indi-

vidual observations and also to meet the General Assembly's wishes.

15. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), replying to the Soviet Union representative's remark that no United Nations document gave individual observations in the form of footnotes, said that a summary of petitions on the Ewe question recently published by the Secretariat (T/L.131) gave the views expressed by the French representative in the Fourth Committee in that form, and the French delegation had raised no objection.

16. The USSR representative had been surprised at the Drafting Committee's initiative, but the Committee had done no more than make a suggestion, which it had been bound to make under a General Assembly resolution calling for steps to alter the form of Trusteeship Council reports.

17. As the Argentine representative had rightly said, the question was mainly one of typography. The Committee had thought that the best way of presenting individual observations was to include them as footnotes, but if other members of the Council had better suggestions, they would be welcomed, provided they took account of the valid reservations of the United States representative.

18. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out to the Soviet Union representative that while delegations' proposals were recorded in the reports of the various organs of the United Nations, observations by their individual members were not. Respect for minority opinions should not be carried so far as to confuse the opinions of individual members with the majority decisions of the Council.

19. The only difference between the Drafting Committee's proposal and the proposals submitted to the Fourth Committee was that the individual observations would appear in each section as footnotes below the Council's conclusions and recommendations instead of at the end of each chapter. That would make the differences of opinion between the majority and individual members emerge more clearly.

20. As to the individual observations on section I of the draft report, which appeared in document T/L.134 prepared by the Secretariat, he hoped that all the members of the Council—with the possible exception of the Soviet Union representative, whose views differed widely from those of the majority—would agree to omit such repetitious observations.

21. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that the matter was not as complicated as it appeared. There was a General Assembly resolution; paragraph 1, subparagraph (b), stated that observations, conclusions and recommendations of the Council, as well as observations of its individual members, should be included in each section of the Trusteeship Council's report. He wondered how the Drafting Committee had managed to interpret those words as meaning that the individual observations might appear as footnotes, who had suggested the idea, and what the various members of the Committee thought about it.

22. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) replied that he himself had suggested the idea to the Committee and that it had been immediately and unanimously adopted. Moreover, it was in no way contrary to paragraph 1,

sub-paragraph (b), of the General Assembly resolution as footnotes were also part of the sections of the report.

23. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the French representative had been wrong to refer to the document on the Ewe question when making his comparison. That document was a working paper prepared by the Secretariat and not a report by an organ of the United Nations. The argument was therefore not valid.

24. The Belgian representative's assertion that the reports of the various organs of the United Nations merely recorded the positions of delegations was not correct. Such reports usually contained the observations of individual members.

25. The USSR delegation had not been prompted by selfish considerations, as it was clear from document T/L.134 that the Soviet Union delegation's individual observations were only about a tenth of the total number of observations by members of the Council while the Belgian delegation's observations were neither shorter nor fewer than those of the Soviet Union delegation.

26. In short, the USSR delegation was anxious to protect the right of individual members of the Council to inform the General Assembly of their opinions through the Trusteeship Council's report.

27. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) recalled that his delegation had raised no objection to the formula the French delegation had suggested in the Drafting Committee because the Committee had not been called upon to decide on a definite procedure, but merely to make a suggestion to the Council. Besides, the Argentine delegation had all the less reason to oppose the French delegation's suggestion as there was very little difference between the proposal to include the observations of individual members as footnotes and the suggestion to group them at the end of each section, after the Council's observations, conclusions and recommendations.

28. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) said that no question of principle was involved, but merely one of presentation. Nobody had dreamed of questioning the right of any member of the Council to express his individual views. The Council was bound to prepare its reports with due precision and clarity while excluding all extraneous matter.

29. As the representative of Iraq had said, General Assembly resolution 433 (V) did recommend that the Trusteeship Council should include in each section of its report "such relevant observations of its individual members as the Council may consider useful". But the Assembly's recommendations did not go beyond that; they could not exclude presentation of the observations as footnotes, as the footnotes would appear in each of the sections and would thus have the additional advantage of being directly related to the relevant recommendations of the Council.

30. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he had never disputed the right of any delegation to inform the General Assembly of its views. On the contrary, as the United Kingdom representative had just said, the surest and clearest method of stressing divergencies of opinion was to indicate the individual opinions of

members of the Council in a footnote immediately after the statement of the Council's opinion.

31. In reply to the USSR representative, Mr. Ryckmans pointed out that document T/L.134 had been prepared by the Secretariat and contained the observations individual members of the Council had made prior to the adoption of the Trusteeship Council's observations and recommendations. For its part, the Belgian delegation would request the insertion of its comments only on the rare occasions when it differed fundamentally from the Council.

32. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) thought that the opinions of individual members should be presented equally with the opinions of the Council. That would not be the case if they were given in footnotes; the Iraqi representative had rightly pointed out that General Assembly resolution 433 (V) did not request the Trusteeship Council to follow such a procedure.

33. The Chinese representative on the Drafting Committee had not wished formally to oppose the majority's wishes. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the French delegation's suggestion had not been put to the vote and that the absence of any objection on the part of the Chinese delegation should not be construed as support.

34. He was glad to see that the French delegation was prepared to consider the other solution of printing the observations, conclusions and recommendations of the Council in different type from the observations of individual members. The United States delegation's suggestions also deserved attention.

35. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) concluded that the Drafting Committee's suggestion could not be considered as reflecting the views of the majority of that body. The question should therefore either be referred back to the Committee or the Council should consider a compromise formula like that suggested by the United States representative.

36. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) protested against the frivolous way the Drafting Committee's report had just been interpreted. That document was a faithful statement of the Committee's deliberations. It was true that the French suggestion had not been put to the vote, but as it had met with no objection, it was permissible to say that it represented the Committee's final opinion.

37. However, if the Council preferred another solution, the French delegation would support it, provided that the new formula was as clear and precise as that before the Council.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and was resumed at 4.25 p.m.

38. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that the time had come to agree on a compromise formula. In his opinion, the best solution would be to present all the opinions of individual members at the end of each section under the heading, "Observations of members of the Trusteeship Council representing their individual opinions only". To that end he formally proposed, as an amendment to the Drafting Committee's recommendation, that the Council should decide that those observations of individual members which it might consider useful should be inserted in the chapter on

Western Samoa, not as footnotes, but at the end of the relevant sections of the chapter.

39. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) considered the Iraqi amendment very reasonable and a wise compromise.

40. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) did not think there was really any question of compromise, since in any case there was no objection to the General Assembly's recommendation that the relevant observations of individual members of the Council should appear in each section, and what remained to be decided was whether the Council wished to have the observations appear as footnotes or after each section. The Iraqi representative favoured the latter formula, while the Drafting Committee favoured the former.

41. If the Committee's proposal were accepted for the report on Western Samoa, the Belgian delegation would abstain if the Iraqi formula was proposed again when another report was considered. It would eventually be for the General Assembly to choose between the two formulas.

42. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) supported the Iraqi amendment.

43. With reference to the Belgian representative's last suggestion, he considered that it would be better immediately to settle the question of the form of the Council's reports once and for all.

44. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) thought that the distinction between the Council's conclusions and recommendations and the observations of individual members would be clearer if the Council's texts were printed in italics.

45. The PRESIDENT stated that, in the absence of any objection, the United States representative's suggestion would be considered adopted.

It was so decided.

46. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know whether the Iraqi amendment meant that the observations of individual members would appear at the end of each section and be an integral part of the report.

47. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) replied that that was so. Those observations would appear under a separate heading, after the conclusions and recommendations of the Council relating to each section.

48. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in that case, he would support the Iraqi amendment.

49. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) supported the Iraqi amendment because it adhered faithfully to General Assembly resolution 433 (V).

50. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) thought the Council should decide exactly what it meant by the words "chapter" and "section".

51. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) noted that the Drafting Committee had merely repeated the expressions the Fourth Committee had used during its discussion on the subject.¹ Actually, the Trusteeship Council's general report contained various chapters

each of which was devoted to one Trust Territory, and the chapters in turn were divided into sections devoted to general considerations and to political, economic, social and educational advancement. Thus, the Drafting Committee had been correct in referring to the "chapter" on Western Samoa and to the "sections" of that chapter.

52. The PRESIDENT confirmed the interpretation the Belgian representative had just given. He put the Iraqi amendment to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

53. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) believed that the Drafting Committee's proposal was closer to the General Assembly's recommendations. It would not be possible to express the observations of individual members of the Council as clearly under the formula just adopted.

54. As the United Kingdom delegation had not wished to oppose the suggested compromise solution, however, it had abstained.

55. The PRESIDENT put the Drafting Committee's recommendation, as amended, to the vote.

The recommendation, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

56. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) hoped that the Trusteeship Council would follow the procedure it had just adopted for the report on Western Samoa when it considered its reports on the other Trust Territories.

57. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) noted that the Council had decided how it would implement the recommendations in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 433 (V). He wished to know when the Council would decide on the procedure for carrying out the recommendations in sub-paragraphs (c) and (d).

58. The PRESIDENT stated that sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) did not apply to section I of the report on Western Samoa, which was entitled "General". The Council would take those Assembly recommendations into consideration when they were applicable.

59. He suggested that the Council should consider the draft report on Western Samoa (T/L.133 and T/L.134) section by section.

SECTION I. GENERAL

60. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the draft observation at the end of section I contained two points: in the first place, the Administering Authority was congratulated for the progress achieved in the administration of the Territory; and, in the second place, the opinion was expressed that the Administering Authority had been successful in retaining the beneficial elements of the social structure of Western Samoa, while extending to the inhabitants the benefits of modern civilization.

61. In connexion with the first of those points, the USSR delegation had already emphasized (324th meeting) that the Administering Authority had not fulfilled the obligations imposed on it by Article 76 of the Charter to promote the political, economic, social and

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Fourth Committee*, 164th-166th meetings.

educational advancement of the inhabitants and their progressive development towards self-government. The USSR delegation could not therefore associate itself with those congratulations.

62. With regard to the second point, the vague text of the observation might be interpreted as approval of the tribal system prevailing in the Territory. The Soviet Union delegation had pointed out that the Administering Authority had not taken the necessary steps to enable the inhabitants to progress from the tribal system to a system of self-government based on democratic principles. Since the USSR delegation was opposed to the maintenance of the tribal system, it would vote against the text which sanctioned its continuation.

63. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the observation appearing at the end of section I of the report.

The observation was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

64. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought that the Council would save time by asking each delegation to transmit to the Secretariat, within, say, twenty-four or forty-eight hours, a list of those of its observations appearing in document T/L.134 which it wished to be included in the Council's report.

65. In reply to a question by Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina), Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) explained that the fact that a delegation did not request the inclusion of its observations in the Council's report would not necessarily mean that it agreed entirely with the recommendations adopted by the Council, but merely that it did not consider the differences between its views and those of the Council to be great enough to require such a correction. In any event, the summary records of the Council's meetings contained the details of the arguments presented by every delegation.

66. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) pointed out that a delegation whose observations had been accepted by the Council and had become a Council recommendation would naturally not request the inclusion of those observations in the report. The head of the delegation in question and the members of the General Assembly might thus be unaware of or underestimate the extent of its activity. The report should therefore specify that observations which had become a Council recommendation had not been included in the Trusteeship Council's report.

67. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) entirely agreed with the representative of Iraq. To overcome the difficulty to which he had referred and to enable the General Assembly to be fully informed regarding the activities of all delegations, Mr. Ryckmans proposed that each recommendation of the Trusteeship Council should be preceded by a statement that the Council had adopted the recommendation in question as a result of observations presented by certain delegations, which would be named. The text of the recommendation would follow that note and the observations of individual members that had not concurred in the view of the Council as a whole would then be presented.

68. In reply to a question by Mr. HAY (Australia), Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that the Council would have to examine the texts of the observations transmitted by delegations to the Secretariat in order

to ensure that they corresponded exactly with the statements made by the delegations in question at meetings. It would of course be preferable to adopt the text drawn up by the Secretariat on the basis of the summary records of the Council's meetings. The Council was usually able to reach a decision in the matter without a vote, except when a delegation had made substantial changes in the Secretariat's original text.

69. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that so far it had been the practice of the Secretariat to prepare a summary of delegations' observations; the delegations had then studied the text drawn up by the Secretariat and, if necessary, corrected points of detail. Generally speaking, the Secretariat document was satisfactory; in the case in point, only minor corrections needed to be made in the Secretariat's version of the observations of the USSR delegation.

70. Any departure from the practice previously adopted might mean that the text of the observations of delegations would not faithfully reproduce the statements made at meetings. Moreover, another document would have to be produced containing the revised texts of the observations; the Council would then have to study that document and the whole proceeding might cause the Council to waste valuable time. Accordingly, although the Soviet Union delegation did not oppose the method suggested by the Belgian representative, it nevertheless preferred the former practice.

71. Mr. HAY (Australia) thought that it would be desirable if, in future, when the Council examined the draft report prepared by the drafting committee, it were to have at its disposal the revised text of the observations of the various delegations; it would then be able to settle the question of their inclusion in the report at the time of voting on the various sections with which they were concerned.

72. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that it was only after the Council had adopted a recommendation that delegations could decide whether they wished the observations they had made to be included in the report; their attitude would necessarily depend on the Council's decision.

73. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) recalled that according to a decision taken by the Council at its sixth session (resolution 123 (VI)), delegations were entitled to request the inclusion of their observations as long as the examination of the draft report on a Territory was not completed. The time limit of twenty-four or forty-eight hours suggested by the Belgian delegation did not seem to be quite consistent with that decision.

74. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, in the past, one part of the report had consisted entirely of observations by delegations; it had thus been possible to use the method referred to by the French representative.

75. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested that the consideration of the matter should be postponed to a later meeting in order to give delegations time to reflect.

76. The PRESIDENT thought that the Council's work would be facilitated if each delegation would consider what observations it wished to have included in the report and have the text ready in time for the Council's following meeting. Naturally he referred only to observations dealing with those sections of the draft

report on which the Council took a decision during the present meeting.

SECTION II. POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT

General

77. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that he had drawn attention to a number of facts which showed that the Administering Authority was not fulfilling its obligations under the Trusteeship System and that it had not taken the necessary steps to promote the development of the population towards self-government. In his analysis of the legislative system (321st meeting), he had emphasized that there was no legislative organ in which the Samoans participated. Even the elections to the purely advisory bodies—in which the number of seats reserved for the indigenous population was insufficient—were conducted according to the tribal system and not on democratic lines.

78. The USSR delegation could not therefore support the draft recommendation concerning the general political situation. On the contrary, it felt that the Administering Authority's reforms were inadequate and that it should be urged to adopt legislation which would ensure the participation of the Samoans in the legislative, executive and judicial organs and their development from the tribal system towards a democratic régime. The Soviet Union delegation would therefore vote against the recommendation.

79. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation concerning the general political situation.

The recommendation was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The executive branch

(a) Executive authority

80. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the text of the draft recommendation should be altered by substituting for the words "consider the establishment of an executive council" the words "should establish an executive council".

81. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that it was both more courteous and a more usual procedure to ask the Administering Authority to consider the establishment of such a body, rather than to recommend that an executive council should be set up without prior consideration.

82. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his proposal implied prior consideration on the part of the Administering Authority; in addition, it had the advantage of being a clear and constructive recommendation.

83. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) remarked that the wording of the Visiting Mission's recommendation on that subject (T/792) was identical with that of the draft report. He added that the Administering Authority was at present considering the matter.

84. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) was glad to hear that the matter was under consideration. He intended to vote

for the USSR amendment, in accordance with the attitude his delegation had always adopted on the matter, for he was convinced that by taking part in the work of an executive body the Samoans would acquire some experience of administration and would more rapidly become capable of self-government.

85. The PRESIDENT put the Soviet Union amendment to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

86. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation concerning executive authority.

The recommendation was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

(b) Public service of Western Samoa

87. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the first part of the recommendation, i.e. the Council's comment on the increase in the number of Samoan officers. He personally felt that it could be dispensed with.

88. The PRESIDENT put the first and the second parts of the recommendation to the vote separately.

The first part was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The second part was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

89. The PRESIDENT stated that, in the absence of any objections, he would consider the recommendation as a whole adopted.

It was so decided.

The legislative branch

(a) The Legislative Assembly

90. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for separate votes to be taken on the comment that the Legislative Assembly was functioning successfully, and on the request made by the Council to the Administering Authority.

91. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the recommendation, the second part and, finally, the recommendation as a whole.

The first part was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The second part was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation as a whole was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

92. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) wished to make it clear that he had not abstained from voting for the same reasons as the representative of the USSR, but simply because he felt he could hardly vote in favour of congratulations to his own Government on the administration of Western Samoa.

(b) The Fono of Faipule

93. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether it was true that, as the draft recommendation stated, the

High Commissioner was prepared to submit to the Legislative Assembly all matters touching upon the welfare of all sections of the community upon which the *Fono of Faipule* had taken decisions after discussion of such matters with him. He had been under the impression that the *Fono* could consider only matters which concerned the welfare of the Samoan population.

94. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) said that the text of the recommendation accurately reproduced the statements which the High Commissioner had made to the Visiting Mission.

95. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation on the *Fono of Faipule*.

The recommendation was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Local government

96. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation concerning local government.

The recommendation was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.