



## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-second Session

## OFFICIAL RECORDS

933rd Meeting

Tuesday, 29 July 1958,  
at 2.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1959 . . . . .	295
Effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 1210 (XII)) (concluded). . . . .	296
Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories: report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions . . . . .	298
Examination of petitions (continued):	
Two hundred and twenty-first report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning New Guinea . . . . .	298
Two hundred and twenty-second report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Western Samoa . . . . .	299
Revision of rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council . . . . .	299

**President:** Mr. Alfred CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium).**Present:**

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

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

**Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1959 (T/1387, T/1400)**

[Agenda item 7]

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that in its memorandum (T/1387) the Government of New Zealand suggested that a separate visiting mission with special terms of reference should be sent to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. The Secretary-General had submitted a note to the Council on the financial implications of that suggestion (T/1400). There did not seem to be any objection to the sending of two visiting missions to the Pacific Trust Territories in 1959.

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect the four Member States that would constitute the visiting mission to Western Samoa.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	13
---------------------------------	----

<u>Invalid ballots:</u>	0
-------------------------	---

<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	13
---------------------------------	----

Number of votes obtained:

France . . . . .	12
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . .	12
India . . . . .	11
United Arab Republic . . . . .	10
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	3
Haiti . . . . .	1
France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, India and the United Arab Republic were elected members of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, 1959.	

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council elect the four Member States that would constitute the visiting mission to the other Trust Territories in the Pacific.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	13
---------------------------------	----

<u>Invalid ballots:</u>	0
-------------------------	---

<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	13
---------------------------------	----

Number of votes obtained:

Burma . . . . .	12
Italy . . . . .	12
Belgium . . . . .	11
China . . . . .	9
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	3
Guatemala . . . . .	2

Burma, Italy, Belgium and China were elected members of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959.

4. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that as a result of the efforts of the Administering Authorities one permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, which had never participated in a visiting mission, had once again been excluded. That member of the Council had never had the opportunity of visiting the Trust Territories in order to assess their needs on the spot, to hear the wishes of their peoples and to make its contribution to their progress towards independence. The "voting machine" so often abused by certain Powers in the Council had once again been employed to subvert the basic principles of the International Trusteeship System. The actions of the Administering Authorities in the Trust Territories must be reprehensible indeed to justify recourse to such flagrant violations of the principles of the Trusteeship System.

5. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) expressed his Government's gratitude to the Council for its adoption of the suggestion that a separate visiting mission with special terms of reference should be sent to Western Samoa in 1959. He assured the Council that the Samoans would welcome the Visiting Mission and that the Administering Authority and the Territorial Government would do all in their power to assist it in its task.

6. Mr. JAIPAL (India) had hoped that the Soviet Union would be elected a member of one of the visiting missions. The Council was, of course, free to make its own choice, but the exclusion of a permanent member from all visiting missions was anomalous and regrettable; it affected the operation of the Trusteeship System. His delegation therefore hoped that the General Assembly, under whose authority the Trusteeship Council functioned, would examine that matter at a later date.

7. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) did not think that either the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreements obliged members of the Council to vote for the Soviet Union. The results of the voting, moreover, showed that the Administering Authorities were not the only countries which had failed to vote for the Soviet Union.

8. U THANT (Burma) said that his delegation had been unable to participate in the voting but would have voted for the Soviet Union. He endorsed the remarks made by the representative of India, for his delegation considered the Soviet Union's claims justified and would support any subsequent proposal for the election of the Soviet Union as a member of a visiting mission.

9. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that the remarks of the United Kingdom representative merely emphasized the abnormal character of the situation. Not only was one seat in the Council illegally occupied, but certain delegations were subjected to pressure that was quite apparent.

10. Mr. OSMAN (United Arab Republic) recalled that the system of visiting missions had been instituted to enable members of the Council to gain a more direct and objective view of the situation in the Trust Territories. It was for that reason that his delegation regretted that the Soviet Union, which was a permanent member of the Council, had not up to now been given the opportunity of participating in such missions.

11. Mr. KELLY (Australia) expressed regret that any representative should have described the Council as a "notorious voting machine", used in a "most gross manner." He asked for the withdrawal of those words, which were uncalled for.

12. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the practice followed by certain members of the Council did not permit him to withdraw his remarks.

13. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) pointed out that under the rules of procedure, the ballot just taken had been secret. The French delegation would have no objection to an election by open ballot, but so long as the rules of procedure had not been amended, it considered explanations of vote to be out of order.

**Effects of the European Economic Community on the development of certain Trust Territories (General Assembly resolution 1210 (XII)) (T/L.865 and Add.1, T/L.873) (concluded)\***

[Agenda item 16]

14. Mr. JAIPAL (India) introduced the draft text (T/L.873) which the delegations of Guatemala and India wished to have inserted in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly.

The Council would note that in the absence of detailed information of a fundamental character, it was not yet in a position to express its views on the effects of the association of the Trust Territories with the European Economic Community. In view of the importance of the question, it would request the Administering Authorities of the Trust Territories affected to submit to it at the earliest possible moment detailed information on the association of those Territories with the European Economic Community, thus enabling it to undertake a thorough study of the question.

15. Mr. KIANG (China) said that while the draft conclusion and recommendation was quite reasonable, he nevertheless had some doubt regarding the second paragraph. The association of the overseas Territories with the European Common Market was to take place through the establishment of a free trade area and through participation by the European States in the financing of public works in the Territories. The free trade area envisaged would become effective only after twelve or fifteen years. During that transitional period, the six States members of the Common Market would attempt to establish uniform tariffs for imports and eliminate duties on goods from the overseas Territories. During that period, there might be an increase in, and diversification of, production in those Territories. In any event, it should be borne in mind that the association would be one of industrial countries with primary-producing countries. In the circumstances, it would be very difficult for the Council, as early as 1959, to express a considered opinion on the effects of that association. The Chinese delegation would therefore vote in favour of the second paragraph, but with a reservation.

16. Mr. OSMAN (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation attached great importance to the question of the effects of the European Economic Community on the development of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. That was why it was in complete agreement with the ideas which had been expressed by the representative of India and which formed the basis of the draft text submitted by Guatemala and India (T/L.873). Nevertheless, in order to bring that text more closely into line with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1210 (XII), he proposed the deletion of the first sentence of the second paragraph of the draft conclusion and recommendation and a re-drafting of the second sentence of that paragraph as follows:

"In this connexion, the Council requests the Administering Authorities of the Trust Territories affected to submit at the earliest possible moment, detailed information on the association of those Territories with the European Economic Community and on the possible effects of such association on their development for consideration by the General Assembly at its thirteenth session, in accordance with resolution 1210 (XII)."

17. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) recalled that the General Assembly, in resolution 1210 (XII), had requested the Trusteeship Council to include in its report to the General Assembly at its thirteenth session a separate section dealing with the effects that the association of certain Trust Territories with the Community might have on the development of those Territories

\* Resumed from the 926th meeting.

taking into account in particular the information provided by the Administering Authorities as well as certain surveys of the problem which might be made. However, as had been noted by the representative of India, that information was not available. Although some delegations, and particularly the Soviet delegation, were surprised, the French delegation had foreseen that the information requested could not be provided and had for that reason voted against resolution 1210 (XII). Since the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community was not to take effect in 1958, that year having been set aside for the establishment of the relevant institutions, there could be no discussion of the effects of the application of the Treaty. It would therefore be pointless to speculate on a situation which did not exist.

18. The representative of the Soviet Union had accused the Administering Authority of acting contrary to the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements and of delaying the economic development of the Territories. As, however, the Treaty establishing the Community provided for co-operation between the signatory States and the United Nations, it could not conflict with the Trusteeship Agreements. With regard to the economic development of the Trust Territories, it would be recalled that at the meetings of the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and even of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the Administering Authorities had been criticized because undue advantages had been accorded to those Territories.

19. Since the French delegation could not accept certain parts of the draft text submitted by Guatemala and India, it would ask for a separate vote on each paragraph.

20. Mr. JAIPAL (India) shared to some extent the views of the representatives of China and France. However, even though the proposed association had not yet come into effect, the Administering Authorities should be in a position to indicate the anticipated effects of the European Economic Community on the development of the Territories concerned.

21. For technical reasons, he requested a separate vote on the amendment of the United Arab Republic. If a separate vote was taken on the amendment, he would vote in favour of it.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

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

23. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the first sentence of the second paragraph of the draft conclusion and recommendation.

24. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council would vote first on the first paragraph of the draft conclusion and recommendation, then on the first sentence of the second paragraph and, finally, on the remainder of the second paragraph.

The first paragraph was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The first sentence of the second paragraph was rejected by 7 votes to 5 with 2 abstentions.

25. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the first sentence of the second paragraph because, according to that sentence, the Council would submit its report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session. That conflicted with the provisions of Assembly resolution 1210 (XII) under which the Council was to submit its report to the thirteenth session.

26. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the end of the second paragraph of the draft conclusion and recommendation.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

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

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. The end of the second paragraph was not adopted.

27. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation had voted against adopting the end of the second paragraph because the Administering Authorities were being asked to submit to the Council at the earliest possible moment information on the "possible effects" of the proposed association on the development of the Trust Territories. The Administering Authorities could not supply information on events which had not yet occurred. Nevertheless, he wished to point out that his country was not refusing to co-operate with the Council and would, at the appropriate time, provide what information was available.

28. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against adopting the end of the second paragraph because, as the United Kingdom delegation had told the Fourth Committee (682nd meeting) during the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the question referred to in that paragraph should be considered in the appropriate economic organs.

29. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that the first paragraph of the text did no more than confirm a situation foreseen by the signatories to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community. The Belgian delegation, therefore, had voted in favour of that paragraph. It had, on the other hand, been unable to vote for the second paragraph because it considered it impossible at the present stage to predict the effects of the European Economic Community on the Trust Territories and, in the present circumstances, it could not undertake to furnish the Council any information on that subject in its next annual report on Ruanda-Urundi. For the same reasons it had also voted against the amendment submitted by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

30. Mr. PLAJA (Italy) explained that his delegation had voted against the second paragraph of the text because it considered the wording unacceptable. Italy would nevertheless furnish the Council with any information at its disposal concerning the association of the Territories with the European Common Market.

31. Mr. JAIPAL (India) regretted that the second paragraph of the text had not been adopted. However, he noted with satisfaction that it was the intention of the Administering Authorities concerned to furnish the Council, at a proper time, with information con-

cerning the association of the Territories with the European Economic Community.

**Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories:  
Report of the Standing Committee on Administrative  
Unions (T/L.868)**

[Agenda item 8]

32. Mr. THORP (New Zealand), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, introduced the Committee's report on the administrative union between the Trust Territory of New Guinea and Papua. (T/L.868).

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the Committee's report, the conclusions of which were contained in paragraph 21.

34. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the President's suggestion should be put to a vote.

35. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked whether the Standing Committee's report would be communicated to the General Assembly as a part of the Council's report or was merely submitted to the Council for its information. In the past, the Standing Committee had submitted draft recommendations to the Council for adoption or rejection. In the present case, the Committee had submitted no recommendation to the Council, because, apparently it had nothing new to add to its previous recommendations. He asked whether that was the situation.

36. Mr. THORP (New Zealand), Chairman of the Standing Committee, replied that the situation was not a new one. The Standing Committee had never considered that it was incumbent on it to submit draft recommendations to the Council for approval.

37. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked what the Council's position would be, in that case, so far as reporting to the General Assembly was concerned.

38. The PRESIDENT replied that when the Standing Committee submitted recommendations or resolutions, the latter were incorporated in the section of the Council's report dealing with the Trust Territory in question. When, as in the present case, the Committee made no recommendation, the Council simply reproduced the Committee's conclusions in the section of its report on administrative unions affecting Trust Territories.

39. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the Council took note of the Committee's report it would be approving the paragraph in the report containing the Committee's conclusions.

The Trusteeship Council took note of the report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (T/L.868) by 9 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions.

40. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted against the proposal for the reasons he had stated during the general debate on conditions in New Guinea (912th meeting). His delegation considered that the Standing Committee's conclusions were not justified, since the Committee had failed to take into account many statements made during the discussion and since it had also unjustifiably ignored the joint communiqué issued by the Netherlands and Australia proclaiming the general principles underlying the policies of the two Powers in re-

spect of all of New Guinea, including West Irian, which was an inalienable part of the sovereign state of Indonesia. The joint communiqué had aimed at legalizing the colonial status of West Irian and was inconsistent with the Trusteeship Agreement on New Guinea.

41. Mr. URRUTIA APARICIO (Guatemala) said that his delegation had voted against the President's proposal for the reasons it had stated in connexion with its vote in the Standing Committee (111th meeting) on paragraph 21 of the report and on the report as a whole. His delegation continued to believe that the Committee's primary function was to study the operation of administrative unions affecting the Trust Territories in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the International Trusteeship System. As the administrative union affecting the Trust Territory of New Guinea was of a political nature and contrary to the Trusteeship System, his delegation thought that the Committee should have drawn attention to that fact in its report and pointed out that the union jeopardized the future development of the Territory

42. Mr. KELLY (Australia) thought that it would be sufficient for him to observe that article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement gave the Administering Authority the right to establish common services between the Trust Territory of New Guinea and other territories dependent on Australia, if it felt that it was in the interests of the Trust Territory and consistent with the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System to do so. In his Government's opinion, the administrative union between Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea was in the interests of the Trust Territory and perfectly consistent with the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System. Moreover, the joint declaration made by the Governments of Australia and the Netherlands with respect to the several territories in the island of New Guinea did not involve the establishment of anything in the nature of an administrative union. The observations of the representative of the Soviet Union were, therefore, completely irrelevant. In conclusion, he reaffirmed that in his Government's opinion the Netherlands exercised sovereignty in the Territory of Netherlands New Guinea. The action taken by the Administering Authority to co-operate with the Administration of that Territory was perfectly consistent with the principles of the Charter.

**Examination of petitions (T/L.861, T/L.862)  
(continued)\*\***

[Agenda item 4]

**TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST REPORT OF THE  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS  
CONCERNING NEW GUINEA (T/L.861)**

43. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution in the annex to the two hundred and twenty-first report of the Standing Committee on petitions (T/L.861).

44. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the addition of the following paragraph:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the next visiting mission to the Territory should take the petition into account, examine the operation of

\*\* Resumed from the 907th meeting.

the Tolai cocoa project at first hand, evaluate the project from the standpoint of the benefits gained by the indigenous inhabitants, and report its views thereon to the Council."

The USSR amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution in the annex to the report (T/L.861) was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

45. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted against that draft resolution because he did not consider it satisfactory. He pointed out that again the votes by the Administering Authorities had prevented the Council from adopting a simple recommendation to the effect that the next visiting mission should inquire into the petitioner's charges.

46. Mr. KELLY (Australia), observing that no indigenous inhabitant had sent a petition to the Council respecting the operations of the co-operative Tolai cocoa project, recalled that the special representative of the Trust Territory had placed before the Council during its consideration of the conditions in New Guinea, and also before the Standing Committee on Petitions, all the facts relating to the project. A reason for the vote he had recorded against the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union could be found in the circumstances that, with a complete lack of objectivity, the Soviet Union's amendment made no reference to the observations of the Administering Authority.

47. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the observations of the Administering Authority were already mentioned in the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution.

48. Mr. DE CAMARET said that he had voted for the draft resolution and against the Soviet amendment because the lengthy discussions in the Standing Committee on Petitions had clearly established that the Trusteeship Council and the United Nations were fully informed of the reasons for the Administering Authority's present policy in the Territory.

49. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation in paragraph 27 of the Committee's report (T/L.861), to the effect that the Council should decide that no special information was required concerning the action taken on the resolution.

That recommendation was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND REPORT OF THE  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS  
CONCERNING WESTERN SAMOA (T/L.862)

50. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution in the annex to the two hundred and twenty-second report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.862).

The draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

51. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation in paragraph 10 of the Committee's report (T/L.862), to the effect that the Council should decide that no special information was required concerning the action taken on the resolution.

That recommendation was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

Revision of rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the  
Trusteeship Council (T/L.871)

[Agenda item 22]

52. Mr. URRUTIA APARICIO (Guatemala) said that his delegation had requested at the 916th meeting that the revision of rule 21 of the rules of procedure should be included in the Council's agenda for a number of reasons. First, the present text of rule 21 did not provide for the replacement of a Vice-President who was temporarily acting as President in the latter's absence. In that connexion his delegation had already pointed out that rule 21 did not state that the presidency of the Council should be alternated each year between a representative of an Administering Authority and a representative of a non-administering country. Secondly, rule 21 did not make a clear distinction between temporary absence of the President, in which case the Vice-President served temporarily as President, and permanent absence of the President, in which case the Vice-President who took the President's place had no one to take his place if he wished to be absent temporarily. Lastly, it should be remembered that the balance between administering and non-administering members was destroyed whenever the Vice-President took over during the temporary absence of the President. The Belgian and Guatemalan joint draft resolution on the revision of rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the Council (T/L.871) was intended to remedy those defects.

53. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that the Guatemalan and Belgian delegations had been anxious to put forward a text that was as clear and simple as possible. In that connexion he wanted to make it quite clear that the words "the President is no longer able to act in that capacity", in paragraph 2 of the draft text of rule 21, were applicable to the death, resignation or recall of the President, but did not exclude other obvious causes of incapacity which might arise.

54. While he fully agreed with the Guatemalan representative on the interpretation of the draft resolution, he could not accept without qualification certain of the Guatemalan representative's comments on the reason for the proposed change. In his delegation's opinion, the present text of rule 21 was entirely clear and comprehensive. The Belgian delegation had joined in sponsoring the proposed revision of rule 21 primarily in order to simplify the position for the President when the Vice-President was unable to discharge his functions and for the Vice-President when he had to replace the President.

55. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that he would accept the revision of rule 21 proposed by the Belgian and Guatemalan delegations on the understanding that the revised text would come into effect on 1 January 1959.

56. The PRESIDENT observed that the question of revising rule 21 should be settled without regard to personalities.

57. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he had two comments to make on the suggested re-

vision of rule 21. His first comment related to the drafting of the French version; the revised text should be written, like the existing text, in the present rather than the future tense. His second comment related to the question of substance, the date on which the revision should come into effect. His delegation was in complete agreement with the United Kingdom delegation on that point since it shared the President's view that the question should be settled without regard to personalities.

58. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that the Belgian and Guatemalan delegations had not overlooked the problem of the tense to be employed in the revised text of rule 21. However, although the present tense was used in the French text of the existing rule 21 and in all the rules of procedure, it unfortunately was not used in the English and Spanish versions; there would thus be some difficulty in ensuring that the various texts were consistent. It was clear that the Vice-President would have the same powers and duties as the President only when he replaced the President. If the present tense were used in the French version of paragraph 1 of draft text of rule 21, it would be necessary to make a slight amendment and say: "If the President should be temporarily absent, the Vice-President shall act as President in the same conditions." The remainder of the paragraph would be deleted. He could see no objection to drafting the French text of paragraph 2 in the present tense if the French representative so desired, but the English and Spanish texts would have to remain in the future tense.

59. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he took it to be agreed unanimously that the revision of rule 21 would come into effect on 1 January 1959. With regard to the language of the proposed amendment, paragraph 2 could be held to conflict with paragraph 1. According to the first sentence of paragraph 2, if the President, for any reason including temporary absence, was no longer able to act, the Council was to elect a new President for the unexpired term. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the words "for any reason" in that sentence and in the second sentence referring to the Vice-President, might possibly be replaced by the words "for any reason other than temporary absence". Otherwise it might be thought that during the temporary absence of the President or Vice-President, the Council would be free to elect successors.

60. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) suggested that in view of the proposed changes in the text of the draft resolution, which would have to be considered by a drafting committee, it would be better to defer consideration of the matter to the Council's next session when the modified text could be submitted.

61. Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) reminded the Australian representative that if the President was only temporarily absent, he would still be able to act as President and paragraph 2 would not therefore apply. Moreover, as the Belgian delegation had already stated, the phrase "the President is no longer able to act in that capacity" in paragraph 2 referred to the President's death, resignation or recall but did not exclude other eventualities. That assurance by the sponsors of the draft resolution should be sufficient to remove the Australian representative's misgivings.

62. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he was satisfied with the Belgian representative's explanations.

63. The PRESIDENT asked the representative of New Zealand if he was making a formal proposal to defer consideration of the question to a later session.

64. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) replied that, as it seemed to be agreed that the revised rule would come into effect on 1 January 1959 and as there no longer appeared to be any difference of opinion on the revised text, he would not make a formal proposal to defer consideration of the question.

65. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution (T/L.871) as amended in accordance with the Belgian representative's suggestions, on the understanding that the revised text of rule 21 would come into effect on 1 January 1959.

The draft resolution as amended was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

66. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because he felt that the text of the previous rule 21 had been entirely satisfactory.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.