

United Nations

Nations Unies

ANALYSTS 1076
UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 164
25 March 1949
English

45

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING
(Transcription from sound recording)

Lake Success, New York
Friday, 25 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President: Mr. LIU CHIEH China

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the forty-eighth meeting of the fourth session of the Trusteeship Council.

The Council is aware that it desired to wind up the present session if possible this afternoon. We have on our agenda several draft reports to consider, and I understand that there are some observations and counter-observations which some representatives may propose to be added on to the Part concerning "Observations of Individual Representatives".

Some of these counter-observations will have to be inserted only with the consent of the Council, but I would suggest that representatives on the Council deny themselves the right to debate on these observations, inasmuch as the substance of these questions has already been thoroughly discussed during the present session and the observations to be added on represent only observations of individual representatives without implying any endorsement on the part of the Council. It seems to me that it would be in the interests of the expedition of business if the Council would agree in general not to enter into debates of the substance of the problems raised, but as far as possible to proceed to a vote immediately these additions are proposed.

Is that agreeable to the Council?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR has quite clearly stated its point of view on this question, which is that it would not be wise and would be a violation of the procedure which we have adopted to include any additional comments or observations which had not been made earlier in the debates of the Council on any specific report, because this would only serve to delay the work of the Council and to hamper its effective operation.

If, however, a decision is taken to the effect that such comments should be included in the present Part III of the report on any given Territory, in that case it would be incorrect to say that these comments or observations made by individual representatives on the Council are subject to a vote of the Council, since this sort of procedure would mean that some comments which had not earlier been made in the Council would be included in the report, while other comments which would simply be clarifications of observations made

/earlier

earlier and would be based on new comments, might find themselves excluded from the report. I find that this sort of procedure is not acceptable.

Since we are speaking of observations which have been proposed by the representative of France in reply to comments made by the USSR delegation when speaking on the Report on Togoland and the Cameroons under French Administration, the Soviet delegation is particularly interested in seeing that the procedure which would be adopted in this respect would be the proper one in order that the rights and privileges of any delegation do not suffer in the process.

I do not want to hold the Council up on this matter, but I simply wanted to say quite clearly that there is no need to include in Part III of the Council's report any comments which had not earlier been made in the Council's debates. If any delegation feels that it wants to add something to the report, it can avail itself of rule 54 of the rules of procedure and append such observations as a minority report. Therefore, any delegation could add these comments to the report and say therewith that these comments had not been made in the debate, but that it felt that they were necessary in view of what had been said on the subject and that it was adding these as a minority report.

Of course, it is up to the Soviet delegation whether it wants to add its views in the form of a minority report. We have no particular desire to add a special minority report on either the British or the French Trust Territories.

The PRESIDENT: It was agreed upon yesterday that representatives are entitled to make additions to the Part containing observations of individual representatives, provided that the Council deems such additions to be necessary to preserve accuracy and balance in the description of any situation or condition existing in the Territory under examination, and that the determination as to whether such additions are permissible rests with the Council.

/Therefore, while I do not

Therefore, while I do not suggest to preclude any comment altogether, I only ask that representatives exercise a certain amount of self-denial as far as discussion on the substance is concerned. In any case, whether the Council consents to such insertion or not, it can always be determined by a vote whether ^{or not} it is necessary to comment at length on the merits of the substance. That is an entirely different matter. As far as the insertion into the Report, the Council can always register its decision by the vote which it is going to take.

I lay this down only as a general principle, and I urge representatives to exercise a certain restraint in order to save time. That seems to meet with the general acceptance of the Council.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS: WORKING PAPER PREPARED BY THE SECRETARIAT (T/W.7)

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take this afternoon's agenda. I understand that certain documents are still being processed. I would like to invite the Council to consider first the item on the agenda concerning the draft resolutions on petitions.

The Council will recall that it decided to leave the formulation of these resolutions which are based on the discussions in the Council to the Secretariat. The Secretariat has now prepared the paper, document T/W.7, dated 24 March 1949. I believe this item can be disposed of very swiftly in view of the decisions already taken by the Council. This paper is merely a reproduction of those decisions.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I do not know whether the form under which this document is drafted is very felicitous. Mention is made here of draft resolutions on petitions. In point of fact, however, these decisions have already been taken and it seems to me, therefore, that this document is only a report.

Does this mean that we shall have to vote on each draft resolution?

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): In order to save time, I wonder whether it would be necessary to vote separately on each one of these. Such a vote would take considerable time.

As I read this paper over, I felt that it is an accurate recording of the decisions which were reached by this Council after considerable discussion. I should like to move the adoption, wholesale, of that which is labeled "Draft Resolutions" in document T/W.7.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I think that is a very wise thing to do. If there is no objection, I shall put this paper to a vote en bloc.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): As an accurate record of what has happened in the Council? I quite agree to vote immediately to approve the record of the proceedings in the Council, but if it is an approval of each resolution itself, I voted against some of those resolutions in the Council, so I could not vote for them now.

The PRESIDENT: Individual representatives may find that some of the petitions were not unanimously adopted by the Council, but the Council will agree that all the resolutions here obtained majority votes. Therefore, the adoption of this paper en bloc does not mean that the representatives voting for this paper as a whole endorse every petition in it. But it will mean that the Council gives its endorsement to this as reflecting its majority decisions.

At the same time, I should like to remind the representative of Belgium that each petition calls for a separate resolution, and those resolutions may be taken as applicable to the petition to which each resolution refers. Those are the resolutions which contain decisions by the majority of the Council.

Therefore, when I put this paper to the vote en bloc, those representatives who vote for it are not necessarily committing themselves to voting on the individual resolutions.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): As I understand it, we are not voting on the petitions; we are voting on this formulation of language in reply to the petitions. We have already voted on the petitions.

The PRESIDENT: That is right. Therefore, if there are petitions which the representative of Belgium may have voted against, he will still be free to vote for this paper as a whole, because voting for this paper means that the Council endorses this paper as containing the majority decisions.

I explained that each resolution would be applicable to each petition because the representative of Belgium suggested that this was merely a record. It is more than a record, but voting for it will not commit representatives to support all the petitions contained therein.

/Mr. SOLDATOV:

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I do not know how the other members of the Council feel about this, but it seems to me that we cannot separate the contents from the form of these documents. If we have a decision submitted to us, we are not voting for the form of the decision; we are voting for the contents. If the ^{President} /is putting all these resolutions before the Council for its approval -- and they are all called draft resolutions which I think is quite correct -- I think they should all be considered and voted upon.

How can I vote for all of these resolutions if I objected to the substance of the resolutions? It would be a very odd procedure. The substance of a decision cannot be separated from the form in which the decision appears.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind the representative of the USSR that ~~the~~ substance and contents of each individual resolution were adopted by the majority of the Council. There is no new substance contained in this paper. But each petitions calls for a resolution, and these resolutions are merely the reproductions of decisions which were already taken by by the Council. When I put this paper to the Council for a vote en bloc, representatives who vote for it will not be committing themselves or their Governments to support all the petitions. Their vote will mean that they vote for this paper as a reproduction of the decisions of the majority of the Council.

Therefore, those resolutions are binding to the extent that each resolution contains a majority decision which is applicable to an individual petition.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): In that case, in order to avoid the undoubted difficulties about a formal vote on this paper, could we not put it to the Council for adoption and, in the absence of any objections to its adoption as a text, it will be regarded as incorporating the actual decisions of the Council taken earlier.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: That is all right if the text will still constitute the resolutions of the Council.

Are there any objections to the adoption of this paper as containing the resolutions of the Council?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I can state quite frankly that I am in a very difficult position. I voted on some, I opposed others and I abstained on a number of others. What is my position; what am I going to do; how can I vote for the document as a whole?

The PRESIDENT: As I explained, all the decisions are the majority decisions of the Council individually.

If I ask for the adoption of this paper as a whole, it means that the representative of the Soviet Union agrees that this paper contains the reproduction of the majority decisions. Those decisions are binding on the Council whether any individual representative dissents from them or not, because they are majority decisions. Therefore if the representative of the Soviet Union agrees to this paper being adopted it does not mean that he changes a previous vote.

This decision would not only be applicable to the representative of the Soviet Union but also to the representative of Belgium and to every other representative.

President
Mr. UMARI (Iraq): As the/Explains quite rightly, the adoption of this paper would not revoke previous votes taken in the Council.

We are merely wasting the very limited amount of time that we have at our disposal and I feel that we should get on with the voting and with the whole work.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I accept the document as it is put before us but would ask the Council to make one small change on page 10.

The last line of the third paragraph of page 10 of document T/W.7 reads: "consultations on the question of the possible return of Bugufi to Urundi."

I suggest that that is begging the question and that instead, the last line should read: "consultations on this question."

/ I would

I would substitute the words "this question" for the words "the question of the possible return of Rugufi to Urundi."

The PRESIDENT: I think that is clear. If there are no objections I think that operation is acceptable to the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): We are voting on a paper which is headed, "The Secretariat has prepared the following draft Resolution."

After all, we have voted on every one of these petitions. Could it not be considered as a report and say that in accordance with the decision taken by the Trusteeship Council the following resolutions have been taken. In the form of a report every one of us can vote for it at once because it shows truly what has happened in the Council. But if we have to say that we are voting for all those draft resolutions we are going to recall our previous votes. I cannot be supposed to have voted for resolutions when I have voted against them. I vote for a report.

The PRESIDENT: Whether it is called a draft or a draft resolution I think it would not be quite correct to call it a report either. But with the explanation given from the Chair I think that the matter could not have been misunderstood. Because then somebody would say this is not a report.

Are there any objections to the adoption of this paper.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I explained my position and I find that I cannot vote. What are we voting on now? Are we voting on a resolution? We have already voted on them. Are we voting on a report? We have no report before us. What is it that we are voting on?

We have adopted the resolutions. They have been accepted. The report is not yet ready. I do not understand what is being put to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: The decisions we have voted on were mainly formulations from the Chair, and were mainly verbal resolutions. They have now been reproduced into one single paper containing all the / decisions of the

decisions of the Council in regard to the petitions.

It seems to me that some formal adoption by the Council is necessary in the sense that it would produce decisions of the Council in writing.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Would you ask the Council whether anyone has any objection to this^{paper} being the resolutions on which the Council has voted. If no-one has any objection then it will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask, but the representative of the Soviet Union has objected as to the different ways in which I have already put the same matter.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I move the adoption of the document given to us by the Secretariat as a correct record of the resolutions already reached by this Council.

The PRESIDENT: It has been moved that this paper be adopted as a record of the resolutions taken by the Council in connexion with the petitions.

Mr. SOLNATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): If the President puts this to the vote I shall abstain for the reasons which I have earlier explained.

The PRESIDENT: There is no objection except that the representative of the Soviet Union abstains.

The paper is adopted.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS

CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION, 1947 - REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/286)

The PRESIDENT: If the Council agrees I propose to take up the reports of the British-administered territories.

I will place before the Council now the report of the Drafting Committee on the Annual Report concerning^{the} Cameroons under British administration.

/ As in the case

As in the case of the Report on Western Samoa I will ask the Council to consider this report in three parts.

Are there any observations on Part I of document T/286.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I was adopted by 9 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Let us turn now to Part III which becomes the new Part II.

Old Part III contains the conclusions and recommendations approved by the Council.

Are there any observations

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): May I ask that these paragraphs be voted on separately.

The PRESIDENT: I will have them voted on separately.

If there are no observations I will put them to the vote separately.

/ Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico):

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I wonder what is the purpose of voting separately on each paragraph of this new Part II of the report, especially in view of the fact that this report was drawn up by a committee of the Council, a committee comprising twelve members. If the adoption of this draft is going to be subject to a subsequent vote by the Council then a situation may occur according to which the adoption of these paragraphs of old Part III will be left entirely in the hands and in the control of the Administering Authorities on the Council.

In this case it would hardly have been necessary to appoint a committee comprising all members of the Council; it would have been much more advisable and practical to set up a committee comprising solely the representatives of the Administering Authorities. This would certainly have been the most practical procedure to follow.

There was a special case as regards the drafting of this report, namely there was some difference between the situation this year and the situation last year. This was that the representatives of the Administering Authorities participated in the discussion of the report so as to give greater guarantees and safeguards to the Administering Authorities; this was a departure from the procedure followed last year when representatives of the Administering Authorities did not participate in these committees.

Today the Council is met with the following situation: this report has been prepared with the assistance and with the contribution of the views of the Administering Authority concerned; today the report comes to the Council and the draft report is left to the decisions of the Administering Authorities. I insist upon this point. Why on earth was a twelve-member committee set up if the drafts adopted in this twelve-member committee are rendered null and void because of the fact that the six Administering Authorities in the Council can vote against these reports?

I believe that this might well give rise to a discussion ad infinitum here and I suggest that instead of following the procedure outlined by the representative of the United Kingdom and since this draft was already adopted by a twelve-member committee, if some member disagrees with the text let that member propose certain alterations or certain deletions. Let us not have the work of a committee of twelve members of the Council made completely contingent today upon the desires of the Administering Authorities on this Council. This is not simply a matter of procedure or of technicalities,
/this is really

this is really a matter upon which depends our fair and continued co-operation. Frequent mention is made here of co-operation as between the Administering Authorities and the non-administering countries. If we follow the procedure outlined then a new chasm, a new cleavage is going to develop to divide the two memberships in the Council.

I therefore suggest ^{either} that a member should propose that a certain portion should be deleted -- certainly such amendments can be moved -- or amendments can be moved suggesting certain changes. Then we can vote on the amendments. Otherwise I do not believe that the procedure outlined should be followed.

The PRESIDENT: Under the rules of procedure every representative is entitled to ask that a resolution be voted in part and I would give that privilege to any representative who acts in accordance with the rules of procedure. I will therefore do so unless other members want to speak on this question.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Everything that has been said by the representative of Mexico I take for my part but just put administering powers for non-administering powers and non-administering powers for administering powers. It is exactly the same from our side. We never can, we do not even try to bring in a resolution when we know that it is going to be opposed by all the non-administering powers. We do not even try because we know it is against the will of the Charter that we could get something voted if all the non-administering countries are against it. It works both ways in exactly the same fashion.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am very surprised that the representative of Mexico should object to what is the undoubted right of any member. I am sure all of you will acquit me of any desire to hold up the work of the Council. I have done as little as possible to hold up the work of this Council. If I may suggest it, we could have already voted all of these things, one way or the other, in the time that has already been spent.

I must record my dissent from certain items; on others I am going to abstain. It is simply that I may record my own dissent from certain items in this resolution that I want a separate vote.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to vote --
page 29, Part III, document T/286.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): On section one of ^{new} Part II of the report I would like to propose the first recommendation of the Soviet Union delegation which is contained in a document which has been distributed to you. I am submitting that proposal for inclusion in the report I shall read that recommendation:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends to the Administering Authority the establishment in the Trust Territory of legislative, judicial and administrative organs which would not be subject to any organs established on the basis of a union between the Trust Territory and the colonies; and to this end recommends the adoption of legislative and other measures which would provide for the participation of the indigenous population in the legislative, administrative and judicial organs of the Trust Territory."

I shall refrain from speaking on the substance of this recommendation since I feel the Soviet Union delegation has sufficiently set forth its feelings regarding the necessity for such a recommendation. As I said previously, in the event that any representative around the Council will speak on the substance of this recommendation I shall reserve the right to speak on the substance as well.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has proposed certain additions to this Part as recommendations of the Trusteeship Council. As I look over these proposals I believe they were discussed in the Drafting Committee and the substance of these proposals has been subjected to very thorough discussion in the Council.

/As I said this morning,

As I said this morning, I would like to ask that discussion be curtailed as much as possible on the substance of these questions. The representative of the Soviet Union has not discussed at any length the substance of these proposals, but if other representatives want to enter into discussion of the substance, then he reserves the right to reply within the same scope.

It seems to me that the Council should be prepared to vote on these questions, with which the Council is already quite familiar. If there are no observations, I will put them to the vote, in the order of the paragraphs as they come in this paper circulated by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The first proposal is:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends to the Administering Authority the establishment in the Trust Territory of legislative, judicial and administrative organs which would not be subject to any organs established on the basis of a union between the Trust Territory and the Colonies; and to this end recommends the adoption of legislative and other measures which would provide for the participation of the indigenous population in the legislative, administrative and judicial organs of the Trust Territory."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. The Council is adjourned.

The Council adjourned at 3.21 p.m. and re-convened at 3.22 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is resumed.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. The motion is lost.

/The second

The second proposal reads as follows:

"In view of the fact that at the present time the tribal system, which exists in the Trust Territory with the encouragement of the Administering Authority, is inconsistent with the progressive political development of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence, the Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority take steps to bring about a transition from the tribal system to a system of self-government based on democratic principles."

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): May I suggest that the wording we discussed this morning with reference to Western Samoa on this same subject be adopted?

Mr. SOIDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to remind the representative of Iraq that this question of the tribal system in the Cameroons under British Administration is quite different from the situation which exists in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa; there is a substantial difference.

If the changes which the representative of Iraq suggested were completely acceptable to the Soviet Union, I regret to say that under these circumstances -- based on the specific conditions existing in the Cameroons under British Administration -- my delegation feels that it would be better to retain the recommendation in the form in which it is now before ^{the Council,} as proposed by the Soviet delegation, particularly since this wording was supported by a number of delegations in the Drafting Committee.

I do not object to some modification of ^{the second} recommendation but it seems to me that the modifications which the representative of Iraq suggested for the Western Samoan report would lead to a serious weakening of this particular recommendation, and I think this would not be justified by the situation which exists in the Cameroons under British Administration.

I could recall the factual situation in the Cameroons under British Administration, but I am quite sure that the representative of Iraq, as well as the other members of the

/Council

Council, will remember the facts which were brought up in the Council quite well. The main conclusion is that in its policy the Administering Authority is not taking any steps in the Cameroons to create any sort of bodies and organs which would be based on democratic principles and is basing its policy entirely on the various clan and tribal chiefs who are subject to Administering Authority officials; and these chiefs are in no way elected or selected by the indigenous inhabitants. The indigenous inhabitants have absolutely no right to replace, to change, to elect or in any way to express their dissatisfaction with the actions and policies of any particular chief, as is the case in Western Samoa where this can be done.

In view of this fact, that is, that in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons there is a policy of administration using the principle of "indirect rule", I think that the recommendation proposed by the USSR delegation should remain in its original form or might be modified in a way which would not substantially change the sense and the strength of the recommendation.

Mr. LIN (China): May I ask for a division, for the purpose of voting, between the end of the clause up to the words on the fifth line "self-government and independence" and the operative clause, to be voted separately?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): In deference to the wishes of the Chair I had made up my mind not to speak on any of these matters in order that we should get on with the work.

But the representative of the Soviet Union -- true to form -- was unable to resist the temptation -- on a purely technical matter raised by the representative of Iraq -- to bring in a little of his usual propaganda; so I am bound to say that his statements are incorrect, mischievous propaganda and nothing else.

/Mr. UMARI:

29-30

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): ~~I withdraw my amendment in favour of the Chinese amendment.~~

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I should like to remind the Council at this juncture of a similar resolution adopted by this Council during the last session in discussing the Report of the United Kingdom on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

On page 31 of our report for the last session we find a recommendation to this effect -- this was approved by a majority of this Council:

"Considers that the now existing tribal structure is an obstacle to the political and social advancement of the indigenous inhabitants."

Considering the votes that we have been taking on similar proposals, and considering further that there is a strong similarity between the tribal structure in Tanganyika and in the Cameroons under British Administration, I am wondering whether the Council is justified in reversing itself by taking a stand contrary to a resolution it has approved at the previous session.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I must thank the representative of the Philippines for reminding me of the decision which this Council took on a similar question with reference to the Tanganyika report, since in this way he made it unnecessary for me to reply to the representative of the United Kingdom; since the latter is therefore not actually accusing me but the Council itself of mischievous propaganda on this matter.

~~The PRESIDENT~~

2/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I will put it to vote. As requested by the representative of China, I will put it into two sections.

I ask the Council to vote first on the introductory part of this paragraph, which says: "in view of the fact that at the present time the tribal system which exists in the Trust Territory with the encouragement of the Administering Authority is inconsistent with the progressive political development of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The part in question was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the operative part:

"...the Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority take steps to bring about a transition from the tribal system to a system of self-government based on democratic principles."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. The Council is adjourned.

The Council adjourned at 3.30 p.m. and re-convened at 3.31 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The meeting is resumed.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I request a roll-call vote.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has resumed its session, and will vote again on the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

In Favour: China, Costa Rica, Iraq, Mexico, Philippines, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States of America.

/The proposal

The proposal was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no necessary majority. Therefore, the entire proposal is lost.

We will now vote on the third proposal of the representative of the USSR;

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority take measures to replace the personal and hut tax by a progressive income tax or at least an income tax system which would take into account property qualifications and the ability to pay of the population."

Mr. LIN (China): I do not want to discuss the substance of this issue; I should like to amend the resolution to read as follows:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority review the personal and hut taxes, with a view to bringing about a system of progressive taxation."

The PRESIDENT: Has the representative of the USSR heard this amendment?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I regret that I cannot accept this amendment, since it does not include certain basic elements which are contained in the original USSR proposal.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I must say that I fully sympathize with the proposal advanced by the representative of China, and the proof of this is that one of my first steps, when I became Governor-General in the Congo, was to determine that the head tax should be revised.

The same experiment was renewed frequently, and each time the result of these studies was decisive. Despite our will to replace the per capita tax by a sort of progressive income tax, we were always compelled to recognize the fact that this was patently impossible.

I am convinced that the studies which the Government of Tanganyika would be asked to undertake would ^{lead} to the self-same conclusions, and

/that is why

that is why I cannot vote for such a resolution --- and this although, as I have said, I fully sympathize with the intent of that same resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I will put the Chinese amendment to vote. The amendment is to alter the USSR proposal to read as follows: "The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority review the personal and hut taxes, with a view to bringing about a system of progressive taxation."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Chinese amendment to the USSR draft resolution was adopted by 6 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is carried.

In that case, it seems to me that it is not necessary to put the original to vote. The proposal as amended is exactly as the one I have read.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I understand that we vote first on whether we approve the amendment or not. If the amendment carries, then we vote on the amended proposal.

The PRESIDENT: It would be the same thing. All right, the proposal as amended, which is the same as the amendment.

There is nothing more to put to vote.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Under our rules, when an amendment is proposed, we first vote on the amendment. If the amendment carries, then we vote on the whole amended resolution.

The PRESIDENT: That is so if it is different.-- if there is a whole, if the whole is not the same as the amendment.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Take, in my own position, I voted for the amendment, because I think the amendment improves the original resolution. But I am not for the amended resolution.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I will put the amended resolution again. The resolution, as amended, now will read the same as the amendment, but I will read that again.

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority review the personal and hut taxes, with a view to bringing about a system of progressive taxation."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I may be somewhat confused, but I must say that I do not see that the text suggested by the representative of China has anything whatsoever to do with the text submitted by the USSR.

I do not see why, then, we have to take a second vote. There is really no reason for this at all, since the Chinese proposal has nothing to do with the USSR proposal. The Chinese proposal is a new proposal and has been voted upon.

I do not believe that this is a question of amendment; this is an entirely new proposal.

The PRESIDENT: There was an amendment.

In this case, if the amendment is carried, actually the original falls. Ordinarily, if the amendment is the same as the text as amended, I would have thought that there is nothing to put to vote, but since the representative of the United States voted for the amendment under a false impression, I put it to vote again, with very astounding results.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that the only points of similarity as between the Chinese and the USSR proposals are the words "the Trusteeship Council." It seems to me that really these are the only points of similarity; otherwise, the two resolutions are entirely different in substance.

I therefore do not see why if we voted on this proposal by a majority vote, at the present time this proposal is not supported.

The PRESIDENT: The USSR proposal asks the Administering Authorities to replace the personal ^{tax} by such and such taxes; the Chinese amendment is to ask the Administering Authorities to review it, with

/a view

a view to bringing about a progressive system of taxation.

In other words, the request is not as absolute and peremptory as the original. It is, in every way, an amendment.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I understand the doubt which the representative of Mexico has expressed, and I also understand the reasons why certain representatives asked for a second vote on this resolution.

What I would like to know is the following: might I ask the President to put to the vote the third USSR resolution as it is? If the President wishes to conform exactly with procedure, I will say that I am reintroducing it as a new resolution for a vote in the Council.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): On a point of order, we have already taken one vote on this thing. Having taken that vote can we now say we were wrong to take that vote, and must begin all over again?

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I would first say a word in explanation of what was done.

The Chinese proposal was put forward as an amendment. The President -- quite properly, it seemed to me -- ruled that it was an amendment.

Under rule 61 it is provided that:

"An amendment shall be voted on first and if it is adopted, the amended resolution or motion shall then be voted on."

Personally I felt that the amendment was an improvement on the original resolution, and should therefore be voted on affirmatively. On the other hand, even though it was an improvement on the original resolution, it was not, as amended, a resolution which I think is wise; partly in view of what the representative of Belgium has said and partly for other reasons.

It therefore seems to me that the President's ruling was correct and our procedure has been correct, and the matter is finished business.

I would like to ask the representative of the USSR what he means when he says: "I understand the motives with which some people acted."

I would like him to specify.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I had in mind the fact that certain members of the Council were interested in maintaining the rules of procedure as set down in our document, containing the rules of procedure.

/My second question

My second question is my request to reintroduce my recommendation, but I see that that is going to hold our work, so I will not insist on a reintroduction of my recommendation as a new one.

The PRESIDENT: According to our rules of procedure, then, we have to vote a second time on the text as amended by the representative of China.

Strictly speaking I would say that rule 60 applies to a resolution which contains several Parts: when a Part is amended, then the whole can be put to a vote.

This is a very exceptional case where the amendment is really a substitute for the original, inasmuch as that after the amendment is carried, there is nothing left and no different Part that has to be voted again in order to make up a whole. But as I said, I will put it to vote again. I am doubtful about this procedure, but I am doing this because I do not wish any representative to labour under any misapprehension and I do not want any vote to be considered doubtful, particularly in view of the fact that the subject was one that emanated from my delegation.

I have to confess, however, that that is a flaw in the President's ruling, and I hope that it will not be taken as a precedent.

I will now ask the Council to vote again on the text as amended. To make it 100% correct, I will first adjourn the Council.

The Council adjourned at 3.44 p.m. and reconvened at 3.45 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The meeting is resumed, and I ask that the Council vote again on the text as amended.

Since there has been so much discussion, and order to make everything clear, I will read it again. The text as amended reads as follows:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority review the personal and hut taxes, with a view to bringing about a system of progressive taxation."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: Now I come to the fourth proposal by the representative of the USSR, which is as follows:

/The Trusteeship

"The Trusteeship Council recommends that the Administering Authority return to the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory, lands which have been alienated from them whatever the manner of alienation and to prohibit alienation of lands belonging to the indigenous population, in the future."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: I come back to Part III of document T/286, on page 29, "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council" "1. POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT".

I will put this Part to the vote, paragraph by paragraph. The first paragraph, under the heading of "General".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 6 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: The second paragraph, "Differences between Northern and Southern Provinces".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The third paragraphs, "Executive and Legislative Councils":

"The Council urges the Administering Authority, as part of the constitutional reforms being studied in Nigeria....."

Mr. NCRIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I venture to call the attention of the Council to the importance of this particular text, particularly in view of the fact that the Council is here venturing to make recommendations as regards political circumstances and conditions which prevail in a territory which is not a Trust Territory.

/I do not know

I do not know whether the Council will adopt this text in the final analysis, or whether such an adoption will enable the Council to make, in the future, recommendations to the Administering Authorities, as regards administrative policies followed in territories which are not Trust Territories, but which, as colonies or protectorates, come under the jurisdiction of the afore-mentioned Administering Authorities.

I believe that the substance of this recommendation must be weighed extremely carefully, because this text means that a new policy is being inaugurated by the Council. The field of activity of the Council is clearly being extended.

It might be added, also, that this recommendation is simply being made so as to favour the political advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. But on the other hand we might just as well contend that with such a recommendation, we are really approving a type of political union.

/I do not wish to

I do not wish to dwell upon this subject because it seems to me that this matter is before the members of the Council and that all of them are perfectly aware of the situation. It is, therefore, hardly necessary to argue any further.

The point that I wish to stress is this: that to approve this step is really implicitly tantamount to grant to this Council the right to refer to political institutions in Territories which are not Trust Territories.

The PRESIDENT: We are now voting on paragraph 3 under the heading of Executive and Legislative Councils.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): When this recommendation was under consideration in the Drafting Committee, the delegation of the USSR spoke against the adoption of this recommendation because it would mean the approval of the policy of fusing the Trust Territory with the colonies of the Administering Authority -- a policy which is being carried out by the Administering Authorities in violation of Article 76 of the Charter which quite clearly states:

"The basic objectives of the trusteeship system...shall be:

"to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence..."

I wish to underline these two words "self-government or independence,"

"...as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;"

I wish to emphasize the words: "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the serious nature of this recommendation which, at the present time, is before the Council for its consideration. The delegation of the USSR objected to the adoption of such a recommendation and, for this reason, it wished to make its views on this matter quite clear to the Council and we wish to state that the adoption of such a recommendation would mean that the Council is approving the actions and the policies of the Administering Authority, which are in violation of Article 76 of the Charter and of the basic objectives and principles of the International Trusteeship System.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): My delegation is opposed to this particular resolution because it considers that approval thereof will prejudge the issue of administrative unions which is still pending study by this Council and that approval thereof might sanction the existing arrangement before a final decision on the question of administrative unions is made.

Secondly, the question of giving increased representation to the indigenous population in the legislative, judicial and executive organs, within the Trust Territory itself, is provided for in the resolution.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I think that this recommendation, in its present form, is the result of the voting in the Drafting Committee which eliminated some parts which, if adopted, would make this recommendation quite a logical and coherent one.

However, since the result of the voting in the Drafting Committee did not contain the other parts, my delegation shall vote against this recommendation since there is ⁿpossibility of a study of administrative unions which does not take care of this.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on paragraph 3: Executive and Legislative Councils.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on paragraph 4: Suffrage and Participation in Organs of Government.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to page 30, on Economic Advancement. Paragraph 1 concerns the Cameroons Development Corporation.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico): I should like to suggest that we vote section by section: first, Economic Advancement, second, Social Advancement, etc. In this way we could only vote on those paragraphs upon which specific objections are levelled and could expedite our work.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has already decided to vote paragraph by paragraph.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): After this vote, the next four could be taken together. I shall ~~vote against~~ the one which is now before us and after that I will ^{indicate} the ones I shall vote against. I merely want to record my own vote.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: We shall vote first on paragraph 1: Cameroons Development Corporation.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In the Drafting Committee, the delegation of the USSR voted against the adoption of this recommendation because a substantial part of the lands on which the Cameroons Development Corporation operates belong to the Bakweri people.

In its petition, the Bakweri Land Committee raised the question of the return of lands which have been alienated from them in the past and which, at the present time, are at the disposal of the Cameroons Development Corporation.

The adoption of this recommendation, even in the form in which it is now before the Council, would mean that the Trusteeship Council, without considering the substance of this petition from the Bakweri Land Committee and not having taken a decision on this petition, is, on the other hand, to a certain extent, giving its approval to the fact that this land is legally at the disposal of the Cameroons Development Corporation.

The delegation of the USSR drew the attention of the members of the Drafting Committee to this fact and we wish to do that now, in the Council. On this basis, we request a postponement of the final decision on the Cameroons Development Corporation until such time as the Bakweri Land Committee's petition is completely discussed and a decision reached in the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will vote on paragraph 1.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 6 votes to 4.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): In accordance with the wish expressed the representative of Mexico, I suggest that the Council take the next four paragraphs together.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I think we agreed on a particular procedure; that is, to vote on each paragraph separately. I ask that we adhere to procedure because, since a procedure has been adopted, I should like to vote for those recommendations which I feel are acceptable and I should like to vote against those which I feel are not acceptable.

In the section on Social Advancement, for instance, there are some recommendations with which I agree and some with which I do not agree.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I too, because I really would not like to be obliged to vote for a recommendation that communications be improved and also that trade and commerce^{be}/facilitated. I find it so useless to say it that I would not like to vote for it, but would like to vote for the next one.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair does not incline to the reason for this. Any representative who wants to vote separately shall do so.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): My colleague from Mexico and I surrender.

The PRESIDENT: If we refrained from changing our procedure every now and then I think it would be in the interests of expedition.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): If we are to vote on the paragraph dealing with communications and trade, I shall vote negatively. This is not because I am hostile or opposed to this recommendation, but because I consider it absolutely useless. It is quite self-evident that it is to the interests of the Administering Authority to develop transport, communications and trade - whether internal or foreign. This is so evident -- so pellucid -- that I would it consider it rather ridiculous to vote for, and I shall therefore vote against.

The PRESIDENT: "Communications and Trade"

A vote was taken by show of hands

The paragraph was adopted by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to Section 3. "Social Advancement", the first paragraph: "General Conditions".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: The second paragraph: "Wages".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: "Standard of Living".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: "Corporal Punishment".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: "Deportation", on page 31

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: "Health".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: "Health and Education".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: Section 4. "Educational Advancement", the first paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: The second paragraph, beginning: "The Council, desiring to emphasize..." down to "...government scholarships abroad".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The last paragraph: "The Council urges that the Administering Authority make an earnest effort to further develop through educational channels the various indigenous cultures of the population".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: I will now ask the Council to vote on this Part, "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council", as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Part in question was adopted by 9 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: Now we come to Part II of document T/286 -- which will, when we adopt it, become Part III of our report -- "Observations of Individual Members of the Council".

If there are no objections or observations, I will put this Part to the vote as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Part in question was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Now I ask the Council to vote on Part I, Part II and Part III together, to take this draft report as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The report was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Might I ask the President ^{allow me to} to clarify something regarding the texts of the Soviet recommendations which have been suggested for the Cameroons Report?

The PRESIDENT: What is the clarification the Soviet representative desires to make?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): When the final text of Part III of the Report is prepared by the Secretariat, I would like -- when they come to the recommendations of the Soviet representative -- to have the translation of the Russian statement simply corrected. The correct translation is in the documents which are before the Council and not the originals which are in the "Observations" in the present report.

The PRESIDENT: Which recommendations are not properly translated? It is the "Observations" -- yes, as far as the translation is concerned this shall be borne in mind.

TOGOLAND UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION - REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/287)

The PRESIDENT: We now take the Report on Togoland under British Administration. We will follow the same procedure and take Part I first.

/A vote was taken

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I was adopted by 10 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Now we come to Part III "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council", page 23 of document T/287.

I notice that there are certain additions proposed by the representative of the USSR and also by the representative of the Philippines.

/The Soviet proposal

The USSR proposal concerns this part. I notice that the language is identical to those relating to the Cameroons under British Administration. Is it the desire of the Council that representatives can change their minds when this proposal is applied to Togoland under British Administration? If not, I should like to ask the representative of the USSR whether he insists upon putting them as individual proposals, or may I put them to the Council as a whole?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Although the recommendations are the same as those made for the Cameroons under British Administration, nevertheless every representative knows that conditions in Togoland differ from those in the Cameroons and it might be, in the opinion of some of the representatives, that certain recommendations are not acceptable for the Cameroons but that such recommendations might be applicable to Togoland under British Administration. So I would request the President to take each recommendation, one after the other, for the purpose of the vote. I do not think it would take much time and I feel that it would be procedurally correct to handle the matter in this way.

The PRESIDENT: I agree with the USSR representative that it is procedurally correct that I should put the recommendations individually to the Council.

The Council will please note that the representative of the USSR has put forward four proposals in connexion with the Report on Togoland under British Administration. I put them, paragraph by paragraph, to the vote of the Council. The Council will now vote on the first paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The first paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the second paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: Since the necessary majority was not obtained, I will have it voted again at the next meeting.

The Council will now vote on the third paragraph.

/A vote was

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: Again there is no majority. I shall have this paragraph also voted at the next meeting.

The Council will now vote on the fourth paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The fourth paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The Council adjourned at 4.13 p.m. and reconvened at 4.14 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is reconvened. We shall vote again on the second paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The second paragraph was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority; the second paragraph is not carried. The Council will vote again on the third paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The third paragraph was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I believe that the vote we have just taken as a sort of calisthenic exercise is certainly very interesting, but I wonder what its direct effects will be.

As regards the new proposals which will appear in connexion with the Cameroons under French Administration and Togoland under French Administration, I wonder whether we could not vote on them in toto except for the first part which seems to differ from the others. I hardly think that we should waste time as we seem to be doing at present.

We know that things will not be changed in this way. A good friend of mine once passed on to me an axiom on Disraeli -- "I have heard many good speeches; they have convinced me but they have never made me change my vote." I think the same often occurs in the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I think I have at last arrived at the most expeditious procedure, and will proceed with it until there is cause for change.

/I now place

I now place before the Council the addition to this part of the report proposed by the representative of the Philippines on economic advancement.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Do you want me to explain it?

The PRESIDENT: Not unless you want to do so. Do you want to add anything at this time?

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I could make an explanation.

The PRESIDENT: It is not necessary. The Council will now vote on the Philippine addition to this part of the report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): May I ask for a vote on the preamble separately from the operative of the resolution?

The PRESIDENT: I will do so on the understanding that if the operative part is rejected, there is no resolution. The Council will vote first on the paragraph beginning "THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL, noting..." and ending with the words in parenthesis, "...market price."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. I shall have it voted again if necessary. The vote will now be on the second part, "RECOMMENDS that the Administering Authority review from time to time its policy with respect to the cocoa industry to the end that the cocoa producer may get the most direct benefits out of his cocoa produce."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The operative part was adopted by 8 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: We must vote again on the introductory part of this proposal.

The Council adjourned at 4.17 p.m. and reconvened at 4.18 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is reconvened. I shall ask the Council to vote again on the introductory part of this resolution.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The introductory part was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. Therefore, the proposal is carried in so far as the operative part is concerned, and it will be inserted into this part of the report as follows:

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

"RECOMMENDS that the Administering Authority review from time to time its policy with respect to the cocoa industry to the end that the cocoa producer may get the most direct benefits out of his cocoa produce."

We come now to page 23 of document T/287. If there is no request for separate voting, the Council will vote on the first paragraph under "Political Advancement" headed "General".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the second paragraph, "Differences between Northern and Southern Sections".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The second paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I must refer to the same argument I gave previously, that is, as regards the text referring to the Cameroons. I believe it is hardly necessary for me to repeat that statement now.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): My arguments against this recommendation are the same as those which I advanced against a similar recommendation for the Cameroons under British administration.

The Soviet delegation considers that the adoption of such a recommendation would mean that the Trusteeship Council is to some extent approving the violations of the Charter, and Article 76 specifically, those violations which are being carried out by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory.

The Soviet delegation will vote against this recommendation as it did in the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT:
Executive and Legislative Councils.

A vote was taken by show of hands
The motion was rejected by 6 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: Fourth Paragraph - Suffrage and participation in organs of government.

A vote was taken by show of hands.
The motion was adopted by 6 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Page 24 - Social Advancement. First paragraph - General Conditions.

A vote was taken by show of hands.
The motion was adopted by 10 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Second paragraph - Wages.

A vote was taken by show of hands.
The motion was adopted by 8 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Third paragraph - Standard of Living.

A vote was taken by show of hands.
The motion was adopted by 8 votes to 0.

/ The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: Next paragraph - Corporal Punishment.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 8 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: Next paragraph - Health.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 8 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Next paragraph - Health and Education.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 7 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: Next section/^{first paragraph} Educational Advancement.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was carried by 8 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Second paragraph, page 25.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was carried by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: Last paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 7 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Council to vote on Part III as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 9 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: The whole part is adopted.

Now I come to Part II of document T/287 - Observations of Individual Members. Are there any observations.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In view of the understanding I arrive at, that Part II of the report will contain such observations as may have been approved, among others which have been disapproved by the Council, I should like to insert on page 19, at the bottom of the "Cocoa Marketing Board," the preamble of the Philippine proposal which was defeated, by
/ merely substituting

merely substituting for the words "The Trusteeship Council, Noting", the words "six representatives of the Council noted."

The PRESIDENT: I would say this: that ^{if} the representative of the Philippines desires to insert that as his own observation, I believe that is permissible provided that there is no objection on the part of the Council as a whole. But I am not certain whether it can be attributed to six members in the sense that the first part of the resolution is put to the vote as part of a resolution, part of which has been adopted.

I feel that while perhaps in this case the result may be the same, as a matter of principle I think it is a little different.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): How can we really check if six members made that observation during discussion.

The PRESIDENT: When the representative of the Philippines referred to six members I think he had in mind the six members who voted for this part of the resolution.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): They did not ^{themselves} make that observation.

The PRESIDENT: That is why I said that it would be preferable if it could be inserted as the observation of the representative of the Philippines. As I said, the observations of the individual members may be endorsed by more than six or they might not be endorsed by more than one or two. But to consider the result of a vote as confirming the observations as coming from six delegations is, I think, a stretching of the understanding there.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I have no objection to this being limited to observations of the Philippine delegation without prejudice to other delegations noting their agreement thereto.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): ^{If that goes in} / I should like to add something to the observations of the United Kingdom.

Six other delegations voted against it, and I personally voted against it because I thought it was entirely misleading.

/ The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the Philippines agree to put it in as his own observation, and there is no objection on the part of the Council that such observations be included?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): Provided that mine goes in.

The PRESIDENT: There is no attribution to six members.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): But I want to put in my own remark. What is the representative of the Philippines going to say? All I would like to say is that I consider that statement misleading.

The PRESIDENT: You want that to be included? If there are no objections then the observation of the representative of the Philippines and the counter-observation of the representative of the United Kingdom will be inserted into the part containing individual observations.

/ Sir Carl BERENDSEN

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): Might I suggest that it be put in that the representative of the United Kingdom and other representatives consider it misleading? I had previously and privately said that I would be glad to support the second part but I could not support the third part because I believed it to be misleading.

The PRESIDENT: In that case the representative of the Philippines may want to say that the representative of the Philippines and other representatives state this. I have just told the representative of the Philippines that if he wanted to make that observation he could not attribute it to other representatives. But if the representative of New Zealand wants to put in "other representatives" I cannot ask the representative of the Philippines to refrain from doing so.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I would be glad to say "other" in both places but really I do not mind.

Mr. SAYRE (United States): Might I ask exactly what will go in?

The PRESIDENT: ^{of the resolution about cocoa} The first part/was not carried by the Council. We will now go on to the observations of individual members as observations of the representative of the Philippines, with no mention of other representatives. Added to that there will be the counter-observation of the representative of the United Kingdom that this statement was misleading.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Without prejudice to the rights of members would it not be better if neither observation would go in?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I would be glad to withdraw my own if the Philippine representative can withdraw his.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Inasmuch as a further consequence of the observation of the United Kingdom would be a rebuttal of his statement that the statement made by the Philippine delegation is misleading, I agree with the proposal of the United Kingdom that
/we both withdraw

we both withdraw our remarks; anyway they will appear in the records of the Council.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I vote for that.

The PRESIDENT: With the decks thus cleared are there any further observations on Part II of document T/287 which, if adopted, will become Part III of the report?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have the same request ^{as before, since} and the translation of the observations which were included earlier was not quite exact, I would like to have the translations of the Soviet Union observations corrected. The most recent text which I have received has the correct translation.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the Council is agreeable to leaving the matter between the representative of the Soviet Union and the section of the Secretariat in charge of translations.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I do not insist upon participating in this at all; do not drag me into this. I am just asking the Secretariat. I mean, there can be all sorts of suspicions brought up. Let the Secretariat please check back on this and correct the translations; that is all.

The PRESIDENT: I thought I would reserve your right to look over them.

In that case Part II is now before the Council.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part II of T/287 (now Part III) was adopted by 8 votes to 0.

The PRESIDENT: Now I ask the Council to vote on Part I, Part II and Part III together, taking the report as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The report was adopted by 9 votes to 0.

The meeting recessed at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5.00 p.m.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: The Council is called to order.

REVISION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The PRESIDENT: According to our agenda we should next proceed to consider the reports on the French-administered Trust Territories. But inasmuch as an important conference is going on which necessitates the absence of the representative of France, I think the Council may profitably during this time discuss some household matters. If no decisions can be reached until the other absent members return, at least I think the Council will have the opportunity to exchange some views.

First of all, I would say that the Council will recall that at a previous meeting some time ago I told the Council that a committee would have to be appointed to look into the question of the questionnaire; inasmuch as the Council has been preoccupied with other matters which have prevented this question being further discussed, and inasmuch^{as}/the observations on the questionnaire have not all been received by the Secretary-General, I would suggest that this matter -- the revision of the questionnaire -- be deferred until the next session, because if the Council is to appoint a committee now I do not believe that committee could begin its work during the recess of the Council. The matter will have to be deferred until the next session.

In the meantime I have already -- in accordance with the resolution of this Council--transmitted the questionnaire to the Security Council in connexion with the recent resolution taken by the Security Council and by the Trusteeship Council.

~~As there is no objection, the question of revision of the questionnaire will be deferred until the next session.~~

COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN TRUST TERRITORIES (T/267)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will also remember that, in accordance with a resolution by the General Assembly, this Council was asked to study various aspects of education in Trust Territories and after considerable discussion the Council agreed that a committee should be appointed to study,
/on behalf

on behalf of the Council, educational facilities in Trust Territories; and we were also told by the Administering Authorities concerned, that there was going to be held in Paris a conference on this subject -- I am informed that it has been held in Paris -- and a report of that conference communicated to the Secretariat, or information regarding that conference will be communicated to the Secretariat; and I believe a committee appointed by this Council could do some useful work in the period between the sessions of this Council.

For this purpose I would like to nominate as members of this committee the representatives of the United States, Australia, Mexico and the Philippines, if that meets with the agreement of the Council.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I feel that in view of the fact that this committee is dealing in a field where nothing can be done except with the full approbation and with the help and assistance of the Administering Authorities, representatives of the United Kingdom and of France should be on this committee, and I should be glad to withdraw the United States -- if this committee has to be limited to four members -- in favour of either France or the United Kingdom.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know whether the Council wishes to limit the membership to four members for this committee; I believe the resolution did indicate that it should be a committee of four, but at the same time it is the practice of this Council to appoint a committee with an equal number of representatives representing, on the one side, the Administering Authorities and on the other side the non-administering powers. Therefore, if the representative of the United States wishes to withdraw in favour of one of the countries concerned he will upset the balance in the composition of the committee.

There is also another consideration about which I thought when considering the composition of this committee. Both the United Kingdom and France -- as the representative of the

/United States

United States has already pointed out -- are the countries immediately concerned. While it is desirable, on the one hand, that those countries that are directly concerned should be represented on the committee, on the other hand the Council may feel that -- inasmuch as this committee is going to undertake a neutral investigation into the matter -- perhaps some members who are not the Administering Authorities concerned would be in a better position to report the findings of the committee to this Council.

Also, we must not lose sight of the fact that the representatives of the United Kingdom and France and the authorities of these two Administering powers will be able to make accessible to this committee any information the committee may desire. I am sure that even if they are not represented on the committee, their co-operation will not be lost to the committee.

When I say this, I have not the slightest objection to the inclusion of these two countries as proposed by the representative of the United States. I am only putting these considerations before the Council in order to help the Council to make its own decision.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Might it be the best way to allow the sub-committee to co-opt any two other members if it may wish to do so?

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that it is within the power of that committee to invite the Administering Authorities concerned to send representatives to help in the study it is going to undertake.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I am sure there is no question of the willingness and desire of the Administering Authorities to furnish full co-operation and help.

On the other hand, this committee -- according to its terms of reference -- is to determine the practicability and the desirability of establishing this proposed university. Now I do not know who could give a better judgment as to the
/practicability

practicability than the Administering Authorities on the spot who know the conditions, who know their own plans and on whom everything must depend in the way of practical steps taken in this direction.

And these are the reasons which prompt me to withdraw my name in favour of that of either the United Kingdom or France or -- in the alternative -- I would be entirely agreeable to an amendment to this resolution so as to constitute a committee of six, naming the four which you have suggested plus France and the United Kingdom.

/I do feel

I do feel it important, in view of the duties to determine practicability and desirability, that we have on that committee two representatives who can speak with authority.

The PRESIDENT: I agree with the representative of the United States that it is desirable to have the representatives of the United Kingdom and France in the committee. As I said, their co-operation is entirely essential to the study facing that committee.

I also felt that that co-operation could be forthcoming with or without their being members of the committee. The resolution of the Council states in the second paragraph:

"The committee in carrying on its study shall consult with the respective Administering Authorities concerned and shall be free to call upon such technical experts as it may find desirable. It may request the Secretary-General to make available experts from the Secretariat of the United Nations, and may seek the assistance of any of the specialized agencies.

"The Committee shall report its findings and any recommendations to the Trusteeship Council before the end of its fifth session." The resolution is contained in document T/267, under date of 4 March:

"The TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL...

"DECIDES to set up a committee of the Council consisting of four members of the Council to be appointed by the President, with the following terms of reference:"

I am quite prepared to submit the proposal of the representative of the United States to the Council to increase the membership to six, but I have to remind the Council that it is the practice to appoint a committee with an equal number of representatives, representing, as I said, on the one hand, the Administering Authorities, and, on the other, the non-administering countries.

Therefore, if the representative of the United States would like to propose that the number should be increased to six, namely, to add the United Kingdom and France to the committee, that would upset the balance of the committee.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): The United States would be very happy to withdraw its own ^{name} in favour of the United Kingdom or France, electing an additional non-administering power.

/Mr. HOOD

Mr. HOOD (Australia): In that case, we also would be happy to withdraw in favour of either France or the United Kingdom.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): If I understood the President's proposal correctly -- and I must here apologize because I did not hear the beginning of the President's statement to the Council -- the President suggests, I take it, that there should be four members, ^{the} Philippines, Australia, Mexico and the United States, it being understood that the United Kingdom and France might participate in the debates, if not with vote, at least with a right to take a stand as regards the decisions of the Council.

Is that the way the President sees the situation?

The PRESIDENT: The committee will have to call in the Administering Authorities concerned for consultation and for the supply of the necessary data, and naturally also, to take into consideration the views put forward by the Administering Authorities.

The situation is now that both the United States and Australia have indicated that they are willing to withdraw in favour of the United Kingdom and France.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not know why, in this case, it has been considered that Ruanda-Urundi is outside of Africa, and why it was not decided that there should also be in this committee a representative of Belgium.

It seems to me that if we have the United Kingdom and France, then there should certainly be also Belgium.

Of course -- and this before launching out on any further statements -- I must say that Mexico, for its part, recognizing that it was the Costa Rican delegation which brought up this whole matter, is prepared to relinquish its nomination -- although we thank you very warmly for it -- and we should like to nominate Costa Rica as a candidate instead.

As regards the other point, namely, the presence of the Administering Authorities which are directly concerned in this question, on the committee, I might say this: I might foresee, without being a prophet, what would be the result of the work of the committee. There would be two series of recommendations -- and I have strong doubts that there would be a third series of compromise recommendations/which would say that /such and such

such and such a type of university can be set up. Then there would be a Class B type of recommendation of the Administering Authorities which would say: "It would be absolutely foolish to set up a university in Africa. We send our students to the metropolitan territories to carry out higher studies. Others are not sent because it is not felt that higher education would really make them any happier."

As you would see, if the committee were comprised as suggested, we can immediately prejudge what would be the result of the work of such a committee. The net result would be that the Council would be faced with a series of documents, on which one page would say "yes"; the other page would say "no". We would have two series of recommendations, and we would not have, then, a constructive recommendation supported by the moral authority and prestige of the Council.

If representatives of the Administering Authorities participate in the work of this committee -- and I know that many of them may have the same criterion on certain matters -- it is consistent to presume that if they are not directly concerned, there might be some sort of divergency as to their views, and therefore better possibilities for our study.

I do not wish to contend or to anticipate that the Administering Authorities which refuse to set up a university in Africa are mistaken. They may be quite correct in taking such a stand.

But we know perfectly well that when a person has a given stand on a matter, it is extraordinarily difficult to have that person change his views.

If Australia and the United States -- both of which countries have carried out a very important role in respect of educational progress -- have different views as regards the problems, then it might be possible to find a compromise measure, which, if not to set up a university, might be at least to set up a centre of higher education in Africa.

There might be some sort of different formula, but in any event this would obviate the risk which would certainly be incurred if the other procedure were followed and the committee were comprised as is suggested. We would know immediately, beforehand, that there is no human possibility of agreement being reached in that committee as suggested.

That is why I suggested that the President's suggestion as to the composition of the committee is quite correct as regards the participation /of the Administering

of the Administering Authorities.

As regards the request for the co-operation of the Administering Authorities, I would say that for advisory purposes or for purposes of obtaining their information, the Administering Authorities do have a right to sit on the committee. They should simply have a right to sit at the table and give certain information. This is the only equitable solution, but I believe that the Administering Authorities directly concerned must not have any more important role in the committee, since they have already expressed their opposition to this in Paris, as well as in the Council.

/If the committee

If the committee is comprised as suggested it could certainly have no practical results, and there would be the further difficulty that Belgium, which should have the right to participate in the committee, has not been referred to as a possible member.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Very briefly, I did not suggest the representative of Belgium because he previously indicated his desire not to be on the committee, although the representative of Mexico is quite right in saying that Belgium is concerned.

Secondly, the representative of Mexico seems to feel that this committee is going to result in a tug-of-war between Administering Authorities and non-administering powers.

In order to allay his fears I strongly suggest that the committee be made up of four non-administering members, with no administering member on the committee. I think that would be a very healthy kind of committee, and I strongly suggest it.

Thirdly, I think that we have not time to launch into a debate on this matter. I suggest we leave to the President the appointment of the committee. I for one would be entirely agreeable to whatever committee he appoints. I suggest we do not debate this matter further. I do urge him to appoint a committee of four non-administering members.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): If I understood the representative of Mexico correctly, he said that he knew beforehand that ⁱⁿ a committee of this type -- and I do not wish to be a party to this committee -- some would say that it was mere folly to set up a university in Africa, and others would contend that in any event they send their students to the metropolitan territory and that is sufficient. Others would say that the less the native learns, the happier he is.

I am sorry that even at the end of our discussions the representative of Mexico started to indulge in such dubious pleasantries.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): There seems to be a general reluctance on the part of those who have been nominated to serve on the committee, and I can assure you that I am not anxious to serve.

But I do not agree with the representative of the United States that there ought to be a committee of four non-administering members.

/We have a very

We have a very good rule in this Council that all these committees should be divided equally.

I should like to refer to the remarks of the representative of Mexico, when he says that the representatives of the Administering Authorities have already made it clear that they were opposed to this suggestion.

It is a very wicked thing for an Administering Authority to express an opinion, but do let me remind the Council that the members representing non-administering powers have expressed the opinion, without knowing anything of Africa, which at least the Administering Authorities do, that such a university is desirable and possible.

~~Surely it is no more wrong for the Administering Authority to oppose a thing than it is for the others to say they are in favour of it.~~ I cannot follow this reasoning at all.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): As far as I am concerned I would be prepared to follow the President's suggestion, subject to this reservation: namely, that the three powers concerned, the United Kingdom, Belgium and France, would naturally be consulted.

We would therefore not have a deliberative vote, but it would be clearly understood that the three parties best qualified to give authoritative views on the subject would be kept up to date on what was taking place, and could at least be present at the debates of this four-member committee.

Subject to this reservation, I would be prepared to support the suggestion as to membership which the President has advanced, unless the representative of Mexico asks the representative of Costa Rica to replace him.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): If the President is considering a change in the number of members in the committee, I would like to reiterate the suggestion I put out before that it be a committee of the whole.

We have had such a happy experience with respect to the Drafting Committee that I am sure that, if a committee of the whole were appointed, its views would reflect the views of the Council.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I am not certain that the Drafting Committee has really given such a happy precedent, but in any case, for this particular study, I think a committee consisting of all members would be too unwieldy.

It seems to me that when the representative of the United States first suggested that the United Kingdom and France should be included in this committee, it was because their presence was necessary.

Now that the representative of the United States has made an alternative suggestion which would not include the Administering Authorities concerned, I feel that the fundamental reason for his first suggestion would have been eliminated. Therefore, I would like to come back to the original proposal.

The original proposal would observe the usual practice of this Council in having a committee composed of an equal number of representatives of administering and non-administering members. I feel that the committee as I first suggested would serve the purpose, and it has been adopted by the representative of France. I need not reiterate that according to our resolution that committee will have to consult the Administering Authorities concerned, and it will, I am sure, avail itself of any assistance and information that may be forthcoming from the Administering Authorities.

Unless, therefore, any of the members I have nominated have particular reason to decline to serve on this committee, I would like to ask their consent to serve on the committee, as I first proposed.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I suggest that someone be placed on the committee other than the United States.

I make this suggestion partly due to the fact that I myself will probably be out of the country, and I am not sure that we shall have anyone available who can serve during these intervening weeks, until our next meeting. I hope, therefore, that the President will appoint someone other than the United States.

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of the United States feels that he himself will not be able to be present, could he not appoint an alternate, or some member from the United States delegation to serve on this committee?

/Mr. SAYRE

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I would prefer to have some other representative appointed. I would myself prefer to have a non-administering member appointed.

The PRESIDENT: But that would upset the balance, and, as the representative of the United Kingdom has pointed out, it would not constitute a very desirable precedent.

Since neither the United Kingdom nor France will be in the committee, and the representative of Belgium has signified that he is not willing to serve on this committee, very few countries remain who would be available. If I remember correctly, the representative of New Zealand also indicated formerly..... May I ask if the representative of New Zealand is ready to serve on this committee?

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): We are always ready to do what we usefully can, but I would not suggest that it would be a convenient thing to do at all.

I am astonished to learn that the United States, with all its resources, cannot find a member for this committee.

The PRESIDENT: It seems that the Council would like the representative of the United States to reconsider his refusal to serve on this committee.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I, too, wanted to ask the representative of the United States to reconsider this matter.

It seems to me that it would be extremely useful to have him as a member of this four-member committee. If Mr. Sayre himself cannot attend, I do hope that it will be possible for the United States delegation to name some other member to replace him.

I certainly hope that the United States will see fit to become a member of this committee.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I throw up my hand.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States consents to serve.

I am aware that the representative of Mexico suggested that the representative of Costa Rica should be on this Committee. Of course that would be a welcome nomination also but inasmuch^{as} I have come back to the original committee, it would^{be} a waste of time if the representative of Mexico had to be urged to serve.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I very much regret that, after having consulted Mr. Norve again on this matter and in view of the situation prevailing in our staff -- that we are already a member of many committees here--we find that we do not have sufficient staff to discharge this new function.

Therefore, Mexico is very grateful for this nomination but my delegation finds that it cannot accept.

The PRESIDENT: It is regrettable because the Mexican delegation was most interested in this question of education and it was this delegation which introduced the resolution on the educational seminar.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I have no objections whatsoever to having this committee meet and the only reason I have for not wishing the Belgian delegation to be a member of that committee is because this question^{is} on the agenda of a conference in which my country intends to take part. It is a conference which, ex proviso, is at present studying this question with the help of numerous experts and specialists.

In view of the fact that everyone is trying to get away with murder and trying not to be a member of this committee, I really wonder whether it is so urgent to set up this committee. We are told that a conference in Paris convened on 15 March to study the matter. At the next session we shall have the conclusions of this conference. I do not know what these conclusions will be but, if at that time the Council considers that these conclusions are reasonable, then the Council can support them. If the Council should have some doubts as to the reasonableness of these conclusions, then the Council can always set up a committee which will, once again, reconsider and reinvestigate the matter and will, purportedly, demonstrate to the powers concerned that the conclusions reached by their conference are erroneous and must therefore be changed.

But, I do not think the matter is so urgent since no one seems to be willing to serve on this committee. Naturally I have no objections at all to having this committee meet.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say that the Council has debated this question for some time and we have a resolution on it. I think it would be very unwise to go back on a resolution without having a good reason or a thorough debate on it.

I should therefore like to act in accordance with this resolution and invite the representatives of the United States, Australia, the Philippines and Costa Rica to serve on this committee, acting on the suggestion of the representative of Mexico that the representative of Costa Rica should serve in his place.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I have already observed, some time ago, that the representative of Costa Rica might or might not be prepared to serve on that committee. I should like to hear the views of the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. CORTEZ (Costa Rica) (Interpretation from Spanish): We are in somewhat the same position as the delegation of Mexico as regards our staff and, in view of the fact that the General Assembly is imminent, we find it impossible to take part in this committee.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): In view of the statements of the representative of Costa Rica, may I suggest that the delegation of China replace the delegation of Costa Rica on the committee and the balance will not be upset.

The PRESIDENT: I have never refused to do anything the Council wished me to do but I must say that I shall not be with the Council after this session and I am not sure of the plans of my alternate representative. I should therefore hesitate to accept the nomination.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I understand that the President is speaking now as President. Could he not nominate the representative of China, no matter what his opinion?

Mr. LIN (China): I wish to say that China is already on the Committee on Administrative Unions which will meet much more frequently, I imagine, than the committee on education.

The PRESIDENT: I may say that when I considered the composition of the committee, I did consider a more even distribution of membership in the different committees.

/Sir Carl BERENDSEN

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I should like to express the opinion that this is the most appalling waste of time. We apparently have a number of people here who are quite willing to dandle this baby for a minute or two but are not prepared to nourish it. This, then is the period when we are going to find out whether the baby is going to live or whether it is going to die.

I suggest that we put an end to this debate now, and that we agree to the President's proposal that this committee consist of four members and leave it to the President to appoint those people and draft them.

The PRESIDENT: I shall say that the original proposal stands. The committee will be composed of the United States and Australia for the Administering Authorities -- that is a very bad thing to say because I do not like to have a committee with a line of division between them -- and the Philippines and Mexico.

acting in accordance with the resolution passed by the Council.

OF ANNUAL REPORTS - CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION 1947 --
E DRAFTING COMMITTEE (documents T/277, T/277/Add.1, T/288)

The PRESIDENT: We now have to come back to the other item under discussion; that is the Examination of the Annual Reports. I ask the Council to note the draft report on the Cameroons under French Administration.

I should like to follow the same procedure which we followed in the case of the British Trust Territories.

Since there are no observations on Part I, I shall put it to the vote immediately.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I was adopted by 9 votes in favour and none against.

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the members of the Council to turn to Part III of document T/277, the recommendations and conclusions approved by the Council. This will be found on page 32 of document T/277, Political Advancement.

Are there any requests for separate voting?

As I hear no such requests, the Council will proceed to vote on this Part in its entirety, with the exception of such proposed insertions as are submitted by the representative of the USSR.

/The representative of the USSR

The representative of the USSR has submitted five proposals which I will submit to the Council for voting separately.

Proposal 1.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 2.

A vote was taken by show of hands

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority; I will have it voted again at the next meeting.

Proposal 3.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I simply wish to point out that there is a patent inaccuracy in this resolution -- namely, that hut tax does not exist. There is no such thing as a hut tax.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): This question came up in the Drafting Committee and I think it was quite clear that there was no information which would clearly show that there was no such hut tax. I cannot, therefore, agree with the deletion of this.

The PRESIDENT: Then it will be voted on without the hut tax.

A vote was taken by show of hands

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 4.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 5.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: I will adjourn the meeting for one minute.

The Council adjourned at 5.42 p.m. and reconvened at 5.43 p.m.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: The Council is resumed.

I will ask the Council to vote again on proposal 2, which is the proposal in regard to the tribal system.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: I now come back to Part III of document T/277, beginning on page 32. There is no request for separate voting; I will submit this Part to the vote as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Part in question was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: I will now invite the Council to turn to Part II of document T/277: "Observations of Individual Members of the Council" on page 15.

I notice that the French delegation has submitted a number of additional observations, and I believe that the representative of the USSR has some counter-observations.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is not proposing any additional comments which have not been made earlier in the Council, and considers that the process of submitting such observations or comments is not a proper procedure -- that is, comments which have not been made during the debates and are requested for inclusion in the report. However, as it seems that the representative of France is proposing certain observations which were not made in the Council and is insisting upon their inclusion in the report, I would like to ask, through the President, whether the representative of France insists upon the inclusion of the comments in document T/288 in ^{the new} Part III of the report, or does the representative of France, in the interests of the most effective completion of our work here, not insist upon the inclusion of these comments?

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I should like to have these additions added to the old Part II -- that is, the additions I submitted to the Drafting Committee. I shall not dwell again on the general arguments which we have used in this respect.

/The comments

The comments which we should like to have inserted in the old Part II were either referred to by the special representative or by the representative of France during our discussions, or they result from facts which can be taken from the Reports and documents before the Council.

These being the circumstances, I should like to have these proposed additions to Part II adopted by the Council.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation does not consider this practice a correct one -- that is, the practice of including in the Report of the Trusteeship Council comments which have not been made in the course of the debates in the Council on any specific matter..

There is no question as to the fact that the new comments proposed by the representative of France are new comments and were not made earlier. In answer to a question which I asked several times in the Drafting Committee, the reply was given that these comments or observations are not contained in any document of the Council in any connexion -- neither in connexion with the Annual Report nor with the special representatives. -- There are individual remarks and observations made by the special representative, but the comments which are now before us are new. They were never put forward in this form and they are completely new.

/The Secretariat

The Secretariat at the request of the USSR delegation carried out a study to find out whether these comments had ever appeared in any form in the documentation of the Council. The Secretariat said they had not appeared and seemed to be completely new comments.

If the Council decides to include these observations proposed by the representative of France, the USSR delegation will be forced to request the Council to include those observations which the USSR delegation has submitted in document form and which are now before the Council in the form of a white paper.

The differences between the papers presented by the representative of France and the representative of the USSR are the following: The paper of the representative of the USSR simply refers, in most cases, the reader to the appropriate parts of the Annual Report or to other documents. The USSR comments contain no insulting commentaries on the French delegation which, unfortunately, is not the case in the French document.

The French delegation found it necessary to make such comments anent the USSR which our delegation finds impractical and not necessary for the proper and effective working of the Council.

If the comments contained in the two French documents are to be included, documents T/288 and T/289, the USSR delegation will request that the factual references contained in the white paper, which is now before the Council and which are replies to the observations made by the representative of France, be also included in the report.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): The French delegation has turned over to the Secretariat a list of additions and, as regards each addition, there is a specific page reference. There is a specific reference either to the summary records of our meetings or to this or that section of the Report of the Administering Authority which relate to the comments made by the representative of the USSR. I take it that this list has been distributed to all members of the Council.

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary): All references which we have received from the French delegation are included in document T/288.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): It does not seem to me to be too material as to whether or not this is new matter. I have before me the record of our meeting yesterday, and I shall read a

/sentence

IFT/DG

T/P.V. 164

... sentence from page 76 of document T/P.V. 162, where the agreement as announced by the President was: "Therefore, Part III may include such counter-observations or corrections as members of the Council may deem necessary for accuracy, even if the data was not immediately available at the time of discussion, provided the Council decides to accept that inclusion."

It would seem to me that it is therefore not material whether it is new matter or not. What we are seeking to obtain in these reports is the truth of the situation. If the Administering Authority finds that observations are placed in the new Part III of the report, the Administering Authority has the right under this agreement which we reached yesterday to insert such material as it feels necessary to correct what it deems to be inaccurate statements or statements which give a false impression, if the Council decides on the admissibility of those new observations.

In other words, the right of the Administering Authority to insert those observations depends upon the decision of the full Council, and that decision, according to our agreement of yesterday, does not depend on whether it is new material or not. What we are trying to get at is the truth.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that, under the arrangement arrived at yesterday, the representative of France is entitled to bring forward such counter-observations as he desires for insertion into the part of the report containing observations of individual members, if the Council deems such insertion necessary to preserve accuracy.

The representative of the USSR has contended that, in order to observe the balance as he sees it, it would be necessary for him to have further counter-observations inserted at the same time. Under our arrangement, I believe that also is in order, but again subject to the consent of the Council. Therefore I put these two proposals for insertions to the Council.

I understand that the representative of France has referred to some other paper which I did not see. May I ask the representative whether he has introduced some new matter in this white paper?

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): In this document you will find simply the relevant references which support each of the additions which we are proposing to Part II, references /which are made

which are made either to the Report of the Administering Authority or to the summary records of our meetings. This was to make clear that the proposed additions to Part II which we are suggesting are not anything new. We are not bringing any new elements into play at all. All these proposals rest either on statements made during our meetings or in statements which can be garnered from the Report of the Administering Authority.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I would like the Council to know that the comments contained in document T/289, comments 1, 2, 5, 6,7, 12, 13, 14 and 17, are not contained in any of the Council's documents.

As far as the other observations are concerned, we could find some distant kinship between these observations and what was said by the French representative in the Council.

I would like the members of the Council to have an accurate picture of the situation as it is, because evenⁱⁿ the additional comments which the USSR delegation is making to the insulting observations made in the documents presented by the French delegation, there is not a single remark which was not covered by statements made by the USSR representative in the Council debates.

It was only because of the insulting comments and observations of the French delegation that the USSR delegation felt it necessary to give factual references as contained in this white document which the Council has just received this afternoon and which was presented by the USSR delegation.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: Under the arrangements arrived at yesterday I will now submit to a vote of the Council document T/288 containing proposed additions submitted by the representative of France.

The proposed additions are to be inserted into ^{the new} Part III of the report, that is at present Part II of the draft report, containing the observations of individual members.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I do not consider it proper to separate the comments made by the representative of France and the representative of the Soviet Union.

If you want to put this to the vote then it should be phrased in the following way: "to include in this part of the report the comments submitted by the representatives of the Soviet Union and of France." Not to vote on them separately, because both the French and the Soviet delegations here have equal rights and equal privileges in this respect, and there should be no discrimination practised in the vote.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the Soviet paper states that if the additions proposed by France are included, then we insert after them the following observations.

Before I submit it to a vote, I do not know whether the observations of the representative of France would be included.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that for the members of the Council it would be very simple to decide whether they would drop these two documents or will include them in Part III. They can both be dropped or they can both be included, but I think they should both be put to the vote at the same time in order to avoid any question of discrimination in the treatment of these two documents.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask if the Council has any objection to the two documents being voted upon together.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I have two points in mind. First I would like to ask the representative of France whether he would be willing to change the words in the bottom line of document T/288, the words "an absolute untruth" to the words "not in accordance with the facts".

/ It seems to me that

It seems to me that this would not change the substance of the paper in any way, and would perhaps be a little improvement in language. I would like to ask the representative of France whether he would agree to that.

The same thing is true in point 7 on page 2 of document T/288. I simply offer that as a suggestion.

As to the question which the President asked, it seems to me that the questions as to the admission of the French paper T/288 and the admission of the Soviet counter-observations on white paper, present two very different issues. One is the issue whether the Administering Authority shall have a right to put in a correction to what he believes to be a mis-statement or a misrepresentation.

The other raises the issue of how long will the Council have to argue and debate on counter-observations and counter-counter-observations and so on. I think we will have to draw the line somewhere. Whether that line should be drawn after the second paper has been put in, or whether we allow half a dozen exchanges does raise an issue; an issue on which I think this Council will have to make some decision.

My conclusion therefore is that we should not vote on both papers together. We should vote on each separately. Because I think the two raise very different issues.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): In any event I would suggest permitting the representative of France to insert into the report statements which it is certainly his right to make at any time.

As to the insertion of the following comments I would like to know if, after that, we shall have to include counter-counter-counter proposals on the part of the representative of France again.

It seems to me that this is an absolute right. If we have the counter-observations of the Soviet Union and the French counter-observations, then we must necessarily have the counter-counter observations of the representative of the Soviet Union and the counter-counter-counter etc. comments of the representative of France.

I should like to know, therefore, whether we are prepared to have yet a new paper submitted by the French delegation in answer to the Soviet white paper, because in that event I would have to return to the procedure which it seems to me is the most reasonable one; namely, to say that no comments whatsoever shall be included in this Part, and that I will vote against this Part.

/ Mr. GARREAU

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): As regards the proposal advanced by the representative of the United States, namely that some of the texts advanced by the French delegation should be altered, I had myself intended to make changes of that nature.

On those points I would be quite in agreement with the representative of the United States and would be prepared to change certain terms in the proposed additions of the French delegation. For instance, in item 3, we could delete the last sentence, that is, the sentence which reads: "the statement that has been made was an absolute untruth, and must be treated as such." On the last line of paragraph 7 I would be prepared to change the last two words "absolute untruth" to read "inaccuracy".

I should also like to point out that these terms are not meant to be offensive in any way. They are simply facts. When we tell someone that he has stated an untruth, this is really not meant to be an offence in any way. After all, truth is truth, and untruth is untruth.

And I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union, just as I am, when he is faced with an untruth tells the person perpetrating this untruth, "Sir, you have just voiced an untruth," and that is all.

Naturally, I would quite agree that we vote simultaneously on this subject and French proposals, because the French proposals really constitute a resolution.

I do not believe that there is a joint Soviet and French observation, or rather, I cannot agree to having the two observations - the Soviet and the French - mixed up and voted upon together, since they are quite clearly separate observations.

As regards the last point, it seems to me that the representative of Belgium hit the nail on the head when he said that after all, we could not contemplate an answer to an answer without necessarily implying thereby a counter-answer to a counter-answer, etc. And this would go on, presumably, ad infinitum.

And since, as the representative of Belgium recalled a few days ago, it is always the defence which has the last word when there is an accusation whether it is well taken or not, the counsel for the defence, so to speak, has a right to express his view, and then the reader of the report can always issue a judgment.

As a matter of fact, any part of these reports can always be referred to the Fourth Committee or to the General Assembly, so we are not the last legal instance or the last court of appeal.

/ Sir Carl BERENDSEN

Sir Carl Berendsen (new Zealand): I am glad the representative of France has agreed to that alteration in the wording of this resolution. It makes it much more acceptable to the representative of New Zealand.

There is of course a matter of real importance now to be decided. I am bound to say, that in my opinion, what we did decide and what we should decide was this, and nothing more than this: that where the representative of an administering power felt that the facts had been misrepresented - they may have been ^{un}intentionally misrepresented; intentionally^{or} otherwise misrepresented -

then the representative of the administering power would have the right to insert, with permission of the Council, a form of words that would put the matter right.

I have never understood, and I will not vouch for any proposal to the effect, that this should lead to another report and a subsequent report, ^{ad infinitum} so on, as has been said.

/ I will readily concede

I will readily concede that that might lead, possibly, to some degree of injustice to the representative of the Soviet Union. He might properly feel that the matter is not yet accurately presented and that he should have the opportunity of a reply. I will concede that that could arise and if it has arisen then I will say that the Soviet Union representative brought it on himself because of the obvious irresponsibility of his comments in the course of the debate.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to dwell for a moment on two matters. First even in that ruling which the ^{Chair} laid down yesterday there is nothing which would prevent the Soviet Union delegation from including its proposals, without even speaking of the fact that the Soviet Union delegation has every legal right to do this. The President said:

"Therefore, Part III may include such counter-observations or corrections as members of the Council may deem necessary for accuracy, even if the data was not immediately available at the time of discussion, provided the Council decides to accept that inclusion."

There is no division between administering and non-administering parties. In that ruling the President spoke of "members of the Council". What have we now? We have the following: that the representative of France is proposing certain comments -- most of them insulting in nature -- as regards the Soviet Union delegation and he is asking to have these comments and observations included in a document which will be forwarded to the General Assembly. I will show you what sort of comments these French comments are.

On the other hand, we see that the French representative is being granted this right and the Soviet Union representative, who spoke in the Council and gave concrete statements in the Council, is not being given the opportunity to rectify the situation, to correct if not to refute and to answer the insulting comments.

I must draw your attention to the situation which has arisen. I would ask you to take in hand the documents which the French delegation has submitted and the Soviet Union document which you have before you and let us see what we are talking about. Let us see addition No. 1 in documents T/288 and T/289. You will see quite clearly what the representative of France is saying and all we are saying is this:

"The facts stated in the speech of the Soviet representative show that the population of the Cameroons and Togoland not only

/does not enjoy

does not enjoy the liberties proclaimed by the French Constitution, but does not in fact possess political rights of any kind."

We are not insulting anyone; we are not using any injurious or insulting language towards any delegation.

On additional observations No. 2 in documents T/288 and T/289 what does the Soviet Union delegation say? In reply to the French observations we say:

"In the trusteeship agreements for the Cameroons and Togoland nothing is said of France's right to assimilate the Cameroons and Togoland to her colonies by including them in a political unit like the French Union. The United Nations Charter, not the French Constitution, is the basic guide for the development of the trust territories of the Cameroons and Togoland."

Is this or is this not a fact? Shall we or shall we not advance such facts in reply to the comments which have been submitted by the French representative?

Further, look at additional observation No. 3. In reply to this the Soviet Union representative has attempted, to give exact facts additional to what the Soviet Union representative had already said; that is:

"The Decree of 25 October 1946 confirms that the Representative Assembly has no real powers. In Article 33 of that Decree it is stated that: 'The Assembly shall conduct debates and express opinions' (Cameroons Report, page 224). Consequently its principal function, according to that Decree, is to debate and express opinions. Such powers cannot be described as real powers. In reality the Assembly has advisory or consultative functions only. The 'debates' of the Assembly have no final force. In accordance with Article 35 of the Decree (Report, page 224) the Commissioner can simply annul them."

Open the report and look on this page and you will see that that is written there.

"Article 36 makes it obligatory for the Conseil d'Etat of France to approve debates in the Assembly on the system of taxes and dues and the right to levy them. The Conseil d'Etat may quite arbitrarily amend the proposals of the Assembly and the Assembly cannot insist upon its own proposals (page 225 of /the report).

the report). The budget is brought into effect by the Head of the territory. The initiative in introducing expenditure items for the establishment of new posts or the increase of credits affecting personnel lies exclusively with the Head of the territory (page 225). According to Article 42 of the Decree the Assembly may not grant any privileges to any official or class of officials: this right belongs exclusively to the Head of the territory. All these provisions prove that the Representative Assembly cannot be said to have any real powers. Even in questions which affect the population most vitally and immediately, such as finance, the Assembly has no real powers."

What is there in this comment which is unacceptable or insulting to the French delegation? Further, after addition No. 5 as proposed by the representative of France in documents T/288 and T/289, we are simply asking that our own comments be added here, namely:

"The tribal system cannot be considered as 'democratic progress', and the replies of the special representative of the Administering Authority (T/PV 130, pages 81-82) show that the Administering Authority is artificially maintaining the tribal system."

Furthermore, what are we suggesting after addition No. 6? Two lines in all:

"The observation of the Soviet representative is based on data contained in the Report (pages 147-149) and is therefore completely warranted."

After additions Nos. 6 on Togoland and 8 on the Cameroons we are simply requesting the inclusion of the following:

"The observation of the Soviet representative is based on the reports (e.g. page 26 of the Report on the Cameroons), where reference is made to so-called native conciliation tribunals consisting of three chiefs with power to settle disputes between indigenous inhabitants and also based on the replies of the special representative (e.g. T/PV 130, pages 81-82)."

/Furthermore,

Furthermore, after addition No. 7 of the French delegation on the Cameroons, we are simply asking that it be said:

"The observation of the Soviet representative is based on the statement in the Report (page 27) that the staff of each jurisdiction is in principle appointed and dismissed by the High Commissioner."

After additions Nos. 7 on Togoland and 9 on the Cameroons (again we refer to documents T/289 and T/288) we say:

"The observation of the Soviet representative is confirmed by facts taken from the Reports (e.g. pages 39, 56 of the Report on the Cameroons; page 69 of the Report on Togoland) and from the replies of the special representative (e.g. T/249, page 19 on the Cameroons; T/PV 131, page 7 on the Cameroons; T/PV 137, page 7 on Togoland)."

/After addition

After addition 8 on Togoland, ^(T/289) we are asking that the following be included:

"The French representative cannot deny that the indigenous inhabitants and the majority of the representative assembly always oppose classification. This constitutes undeniable proof that classification is detrimental to the interests of the indigenous population. The requirement that the classification should be carried out in agreement with the village notables does not constitute a guarantee, because the interests of such notables and those of the indigenous population might often not coincide."

Is this not a fact? It is a fact, and this is something that we want to have clarified.

After addition No. 9 on Togoland (T/289) and No. 11 on the Cameroons (T/288) we explain that:

"The Administering Authority does not know the profits earned by these companies in the Trust Territory nor the extent of these companies' capital investments (see document T/PV 131, page 22). It is clear that under these circumstances the companies do not pay taxes on the whole of their revenues and the Administering Authority cannot levy taxes on their total revenues since it does not know what amount it should tax; for this reason it cannot make use of taxes for development of the Trust Territory."

After addition No. 10 on Cameroons (T/288), what is the Soviet delegation asking to have included?

"The explanation of the French representative cannot change the basic picture of the distribution of land as between the indigenous population and Europeans since the average European holds 1,428 times more land, which he owns legally, than the average indigenous inhabitant."

"The importance of this question is so obvious that the Trusteeship Council is bound to examine the problem in order to put a stop to the alienation of lands belonging to the indigenous population and to restore to the indigenous population the lands already alienated."

What is special here? This is contained in principle in a recommendation which the Soviet Union delegation advanced and which was supported by a number of representatives in the

/Council

Council -- in other words, it was not purely a Soviet Union view. I can give you the fact that it was not only the delegation of the Soviet Union who voted for this recommendation.

Further, after addition No. 10 on Togoland (T/289) and No. 12 on the Cameroons (T/288), we simply say:

"The French representative cannot disprove the figures cited by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which constitute evidence of racial discrimination. The fact that the French representative describes as an expatriation grant the difference between the salaries paid to Europeans and those paid to the indigenous inhabitants does not do away with the discrimination, particularly since this grant is permanent."

After additions No.11 on Togoland (T/289) and No.13 on the Cameroons (T/288), we simply ask that:

"In support of his observation the USSR representative refers to Article 36 of the Decree of 25 October 1946."

Further, after addition No.12 on Togoland (T/289) and No.14 on the Cameroons (T/288) we are simply asking the following:

"A great number of written, as well as oral questions on these sections of the reports confirm the correctness of the observation made by the USSR representative," -- and that is to the effect that there was insufficient information.

After addition No.13 on Togoland (T/289) and No.15 on the Cameroons (T/288) we simply state:

"The statement of the representative of France that France is proud of the conditions in the Cameroons and Togoland is alarming as it may indicate a definite tendency to retain in the Trust Territories a low level of political, economic, social and educational development in violation of the requirements of Article 76 of the United Nations Charter."

After addition No.14 on Togoland (T/289) and No.16 on the Cameroons (T/288), we want to say the following:

"The statement of the representative of France fails to refute the concrete facts of discrimination cited by the

USSR representative."

Further, after the additional comment No.15 on Togoland (T/289) we say!

"The amounts of increased budget credits for public health as given by the representative of France do not indicate that the public health situation is favourable as it is in such a bad state that much larger credits are required in order to raise it to a fairly satisfactory level."

After the addition No.16 on Togoland (T/289) we say:

"The figures given by the representative of France do not indicate any noticeable increase. The figure of 84% of illiteracy and the figure of 24,600 which is the number of pupils in primary schools, are much more eloquent regarding the state of education than the figures given by the representative of France."

And finally, after the additions No.17 on the Camerouns and Togoland (T/288 and T/289), in view of the comments which the French delegation found it necessary to make and directed towards the Soviet Union delegation, we simply want to say the following:

"The USSR representative recommended that education in government schools should be made a basic requirement. The desirability of this is obvious.

"Thus, as appears from the foregoing, the objections made by the representative of France to the observations of the USSR representative are gratuitous and completely unfounded."

If the representative of France will delete from his many observations and comments the various injurious remarks directed towards the USSR we, on our part, will gladly delete the last three lines which I have just read in our document.

I really wish to beg the President's pardon for delaying the work of the Council, but I did want to make it quite clear and to show why the Soviet Union delegation insisted upon the inclusion of these comments in the report.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: There are many representatives who have signified their desire to speak. It seems to me that if we go on debating this question any longer we would be going either into the substance of the points raised in these two papers or going back on the arrangement which was arrived at yesterday.

It seems to me that once we have departed from the principle that Part III (old Part II) containing the observations by individual members should not preclude -- that that part should also include -- statements made or observations made after the general debate, then this situation necessarily is inevitable.

Under the arrangement arrived at yesterday, I think each representative is entitled to bring such proposals forward as he deems fit for insertion, provided that the Council feels that such insertion is necessary to preserve accuracy. Therefore, every such proposal must be subject to the consent of the Council. There is no question about that, and it seems to me that no further debate is necessary.

In regard to the voting on these two proposals, I have suggested putting the French additions first because it seems to me that is the prior question to determine. If that is adopted, then the counter-observations of the representative of the Soviet Union will be subject to a vote.

The representative of the Soviet Union has contended that the two should be considered together and should be voted upon together, and the representative of France has contended that his paper in fact constitutes a resolution. Whether we consider it as a resolution or as any other document to be voted upon, the rules of procedure provide that a representative is entitled to ask for a separate vote, even if it is in the same document, even if it is submitted by one representative.

It seems to me, therefore, that I can only accede to the request that the two papers be voted upon separately, and unless I hear further/^{valid}objections I will proceed to put these two papers to the vote as I suggested.

Mr. CARREAU:

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French):

I should have liked it to be possible to proceed immediately to a vote. Nonetheless I am impelled to give some answer to the lengthy/^{statement}just served us by the representative of the Soviet Union.

As regards the words which he considers offensive in the French declaration, I have already stated that to assert that a statement is an untruth is not to be construed as offensive. I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union is being unduly susceptible in this respect.

/Before the

Before the beginning of the meeting, as a matter of fact, I had got in touch with the representative of the USSR to find out how we could hasten this debate. At that time he did not indicate in any way that he found the terms in which the French statements were couched to be offensive. At that time I had told him that if he wanted any specific deletions in my statement, I was quite ready to acquiesce in any such proposal, and I said this a moment ago in answer to a suggestion made by the representative of the United States.

But in the statement just made by the representative of the USSR, I find once again that I must say that this is simply a network of absolute and patent untruths.

To take one instance: ^{when} the representative of the USSR contends that in point of fact the citizens of the Cameroons enjoy no political rights, here I must contend that they do in fact possess political rights. They have complete freedom of conscience; they have complete freedom of speech; they have elected representatives, and these elected representatives can, in the French assemblies, embark upon very strong and stringent criticisms of the Administering Authority's policies. I know that in other countries such situations do not prevail, and that in other countries, the representatives of the Cameroons, if they were to indulge in such criticisms, would probably be immediately incarcerated in prisons, if not done away with altogether.

We have a concept of democracy which is certainly not shared by the representative of the USSR, and when I advise the Trusteeship Council to wonder first of all, before dealing with the establishment of democratic institutions in Western Samoa, that we should know what we are talking about. For instance, the representative of Mexico, when he advocates democratic institutions for the Samoan islands, might not have exactly the same democratic concepts in view as the representative of the USSR.

I believe that there is some difference in the concepts which we hold here as regards what is a democratic institution. One thing I can say is that the citizens of France, Togoland or the Cameroons are infinitely freer -- and I can assert this because I am quite sure -- than are any citizens of the USSR in the USSR itself.

The PRESIDENT: These observations and counter-observations are already presented on paper, and if the Council is going to go into /observations

observations and counter-observations of substance, we will have more and more observations, and the Council will never be able to finish.

I hope the representative of the USSR is not going into the substance of the conditions in the Cameroons.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Of course, I shall not act in such an unseemingly manner as that in which the representative of France has acted, because I do have a feeling of respect for the Council and for my colleagues in the Council.

I simply wanted to say that the statement of the representative of France is based on slanderous fantasies which have appeared in the press of certain countries. Of course, it is extremely strange, exceedingly strange that such statements are made in the Trusteeship Council; that is, statements which are based on completely irresponsible canards which appear in certain irresponsible organs of the press. That is the first thing.

Now as regards concepts of democracy and other such questions, I can remind the representative of France of a number of incidents and events which took place during the last few years in territories with which the representative of France is quite familiar -- events which lead to the mass extermination of many peoples who are carrying on a struggle for independence and freedom.

I do not think that it is necessary to advance examples of this here and now, and I do not think it is befitting for the representative of France, who so often speaks of the fact that we should not engage in propaganda here, to speak ^{here so often} in the role of an agitator who tries to convince the members of the Council of absolutely unbased facts, and his attempt to teach the Council along his lines and his voicing of slanderous statements here tend to turn this Council away from its true task of considering matters in Trust Territories.

It is only out of respect to the President, to the Council and to procedure that I will not give here many instances of how rights are limited in France and so forth, because I have a full right to do this, because France is an Administering Authority. I could speak of that in the Council, and I protest. I protest.

The PRESIDENT: We have got away from the substance and we have actually gone beyond the Trust Territories under discussion.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have the right to express my protests here. I am not discussing the substance of the matter. I simply wish to protest against the undignified statement made by the representative of France in the Council -- a statement which has no justification, and which is based entirely on false, slanderous, dirty fantasies which have appeared in certain irresponsible organs of the press in certain countries.

I would ask that my protest be appropriately recorded in the documents of this Council.

As far as the question raised by the representative of France regarding democracy and rights and where they exist and how they exist, I am not going to answer this, because this statement was based on the slander of certain bourgeois yellow press organs in certain countries.

The PRESIDENT: I have already ruled many times that any discussion of substance would be out of order now, and certainly the mutual accusations pointing towards any ideological differences in different countries would be utterly out of order and cut of the competence of this Council.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I hope that you will note that the representative of ^{the} USSR did exactly what the President has asked wh members of the Council to do. He did not follow the course of the representative of France, who discusses in the Council questions which have nothing to do with the work of the Council and who furthermore repeats slanderous statements made in various irresponsible organs of the press.

The PRESIDENT: I shall stop the proceedings, pointing out to the representative of France that we should confine our task to these present papers. I make my point of order without any intention of making it applicable to only one representative, but to all representatives in general.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): We will never get through if we continue along these lines.

/I am very

I am very happy that the President has decided to rule out as non-pertinent matter all discussions as to the substantive issues in this report and all such observations as we have recently been listening to. We are surely not called upon this afternoon to make a decision whether the French view or the USSR view is correct. That is not what we are doing. We are discussing a point of procedure, and I think we must confine our remarks to procedure if we expect to complete this job.

On the question of procedure, the representative of the USSR has a right -- and seeks -- to couple together the French and the USSR statements. He suggested a single vote covering both.

I can well understand this view. I can well understand the feeling that if a statement is made, a counter-statement should be allowed.

But what I would like to point out is that there are three documents with which we are now dealing.

The first statement is contained in Part II of document T/277 -- the observations -- which contains numerous observations by the USSR representative.

The French counter-observations, contained in document T/288, constitute a reply to those original statements. In other words, document T/288 should be coupled with the statements in document T/277, Part II, if any coupling is to be done.

I can understand the desire to couple them, and it seems to me that if the USSR statements in document T/277 -- the draft report -- are allowed, then the French observations should be allowed.

If, on the other hand, the Council desires that they be excluded, I should be perfectly willing to exclude them both. I think that follows.

We were discussing those counter-observations in the general arrangement reached yesterday afternoon. The President said that the new Part III may include such counter-observations or corrections as members of the Council may deem necessary for accuracy, even if the representative of France is not immediately available at the time of discussion, provided the Council decides to accept their inclusion.

In other words, document T/288 may come up for vote of the Council, not for the Council to decide as to the correctness of the material therein, but simply to decide whether the Council feels, in the interests of accuracy, those French observations should be included if the USSR observations are included.

When we pass to the USSR counter-counter-observations, in the white paper, we are treading on entirely new ground. That is not the one to couple with the French observations, but should be coupled, perhaps, with the French counter-counter-counter-observations.

In other words, if any coupling is done, I think it is clear that the first and the second should be coupled, and not the second and the third. Therefore I agree ^{with} and would like to support the President's ruling that the document T/288 should now be voted on without further discussion as to the substance, and voted on separately, as he has ruled, from the white paper, which raised entirely different issues.

/Mr. GARREAU

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I want it to be formally noted in the summary records that I vehemently protest against the slanders and untruths which have been advanced here by the representative of the USSR.

As to the insinuations which he added when he spoke of the massacre of the masses in some Godforsaken place, I am quite ready to have some clarification as to those massacres, and where they take place in French territories. In point of fact, I could bring up the same question as regards massacres, if the USSR representative wants to turn the Trusteeship Council into an organ for propaganda and agitation then I shall always follow him on that path, and he will hear my answers, which will certainly be well worth his attacks.

I, too, am ready to bring any number of truths here to the Council, and a whole pile of documents which I do not think would please the representative of the USSR.

I am ready to agree to no calumny, to no libel, to no menace and to no threats. I have never started any attacks here, and I do not want to make this a breeding ground for discord, but the entire responsibility for this situation falls on the shoulders of the representative of the USSR.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that we can proceed to vote now.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): If the representative of France insists upon my giving him facts, and if the President will, as an exception, give me that right, in order to satisfy his request, I can give him those facts.

I personally cannot take on my conscience such an action, because I feel that it is not up to the Trusteeship Council to take up matters which have nothing in common with Trust Territories. If the representative of France, however, insists, and if the President will allow me to do so, I can give him those facts. I have them here at hand.

The PRESIDENT: Even if they are given, it would not be within the competence of this Council to listen to those facts, and it would be out of order.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I would like to ask one question of the representative of the USSR.

Does he agree that the last word in this exchange of observations should be by the representative of France, or does he claim that the last word should be by him? I want to know that for my vote.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): If, after the inclusion of the explanation and clarifications which the representative of the USSR wishes to make, the representative of France adds some other statement which will not be offensive or insulting to the USSR delegation, we would have seen no need for including those statements.

In general we do not see the necessity for including any additional comments, and we will vote against their inclusion. But if the French comments are included, then we shall have to insist on the inclusion of our comments.

I again repeat that if the representative of France is willing to delete certain offensive parts of his document, which he himself has agreed to do, I am willing to drop my last three lines, which were characterizations of the French observations.

The PRESIDENT: I will now proceed to the vote.

Those who are in favour of the French proposals for addition to this Part containing observations of individual members, please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal for such additions, as contained in document T/288, is therefore adopted, with such corrections as proposed by the representative of the United States and accepted by the representative of France: that is, to change the words "an absolute untruth" to read "not in accordance with the facts"; or, rather, the deletion of the last sentence on page 1 of document T/288, and on page 2 the word "inaccuracy" will be substituted for "absolute untruth".

/Mr. UMARI

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I should like to make it quite clear that when my delegation voted on these additions, it voted on the principle of additions and did not endorse the offensive or inoffensive references made in these additions.

The PRESIDENT: I will now put to vote the USSR proposals for further additions to Part III of the report, containing observations of individual members.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast for, and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. I shall therefore have to adjourn the Council for a very brief period, in order to vote again.

The Council was adjourned at 6.49 p.m. and reconvened at 6.50 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The meeting is resumed.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Before the President takes a final vote, I would like to say that the USSR delegation has already pointed out the serious consequences which can result from discriminatory practices towards a single member of this Council.

/I have already pointed

I have already pointed out that the delegation of the USSR has done everything possible to co-operate, in a businesslike way, with all the members of the Council. I have already said that, for this reason the delegation of the USSR did not submit any observations or comments that it wanted included as a minority report.

Now, when it comes to a vote on these completely innocent clarifications which the delegation of the USSR is proposing in extension of the new French observations, the vote seems to show a tendency, on the part of certain members of the Council, to force the representative of the USSR to present a special document for the consideration of the General Assembly.

Perhaps this document will not even be a minority report because, since the situation has arisen in this particular matter, it will be necessary for me to think over very carefully what to do next in this particular circumstance. I do not see how a member of the Council can be deprived of the right to include in the report, statements which were made in the Council; particularly those remarks which were made by the delegation of the USSR in the Council. That is why I stated them. The remarks of the representative of France which were never made in the Council were included. Those remarks were never voiced in the Council but were submitted as a document.

I especially read out, in extenso, the USSR explanations because I wanted it quite clear that they were stated in the Council. Now I see that my innocent right to refer to Council documents -- which is all I have done in my document -- is being denied me.

I cannot see, therefore, how we can speak of co-operation between administering and non-administering countries and so forth when, on the part of certain members of the Council, there is a very definite tendency to limit and restrict the rights of certain other members of the Council even on such completely minor and insignificant matters.

That is the reason why I have spoken now; to bring the attention of the Council to very serious possible consequences and precedents which might arise as a result of such action. The representative of the USSR will have to consider the entire question. Not only the matter of the submission of a minority report, but on the submission of a document which would deal with the entire situation which has arisen in the Council. It is an absolutely abnormal situation.

It will be noted that the six non-administering members support the representative of the USSR in this particular problem. This is a continuation and extension of the same discussion which we had on the
/inclusion of

inclusion of the old Part II in our report to the General Assembly.

I cannot see any other reasons for such actions other than a desire to deprive the delegation of the USSR of its normal rights in this Council, particularly when the President said yesterday that any member of the Council can submit any counter-observations or corrections. That was the ruling of the Chair and it gives every member of the Council that right.

As can be seen, I have no observations. These are not observations but corrections and clarifications which I am submitting and I do not understand, at all, why such a line must be taken as suggested by the representative of France; to turn the Trusteeship Council into some body other than the Trusteeship Council. There is nothing in the Charter of the United Nations which would give us the right to transform this body into some other kind of body.

I wished to draw the attention of the members of the Council to this situation because I feel that this entire matter deserves the very, very serious consideration of the members of the Council. As far as I, personally, am concerned, I am surprised and amazed at this reaction which has arisen in reply to an innocent effort on the part of the representative of the USSR to clarify certain comments which were made on Part III of the report.

The PRESIDENT: It is now seven o'clock. I can put this to the vote again, immediately and there will still be another report remaining and two other items including certain procedural matters which have just been brought to my attention by the representative of Belgium.

There is still the date of the next session to be determined and I am quite prepared to prolong the meeting if we feel that we can finish the present session's work this evening. But if the Council feels that it might not be able to do so, then I wonder whether the Council feels that it would be profitable to carry on against evidence of fatigue which I have noticed among the members of the Council and among the members of the Secretariat.

I should like to have some indication of the wishes of the Council before I proceed.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): We have already suffered sufficient working days at Lake Success and we find ourselves in no position whatsoever to resist an overload of work at the present time.

My delegation greatly regrets that this incident which occurred at the eleventh hour has, in this way, prevented us from closing this session of the Council's work in more jovial countenance.

/But my delegation

But my delegation has faith that it will be possible to find a solution to this apparent impasse. There can be no doubt whatsoever that all of us who voted for the insertion of the observations of the USSR, did so because we felt that we were responsible for the future of the Council, so to speak.

As far as my delegation is concerned, this is not a case simply of the USSR or of France. It is much more; it is a question of principle. We have voted for the insertion of the counter-observations made by France and, in the interests of reality and in view of the events which have taken place in the Council, we believe that there can be no objection to likewise inserting the other counter-observations.

For what has occurred, we are all equally guilty because the real state of affairs is this: In the future we should name a rapporteur so that someone ^{would be responsible} for this part dealing with observations. In this way, the rapporteur can present us with these observations and their most controversial points during our debate. In doing this we would avoid these lengthy discussions, these minority reports, etc.

/I should therefore suggest

I would therefore suggest to the Chair that we adjourn the meeting for ten minutes or so, so that the representatives can at least exchange their views in an unofficial way and try to find some sort of a solution to this imbroglio.

I think that it would be a very unfortunate precedent to consider that, if, within the series of agreements which have been reached, there was ^{not} given an opportunity to one delegation to express its views. We certainly hope that such a precedent is not established. We hope that we will not be faced with similar situations in the future, but one can never foresee everything and we would not ever want it to be considered that in the United Nations or in the Trusteeship Council there might occur such a situation -- that is, six votes preventing the delegation of Mexico from expressing certain views or comments on a specific chapter or report.

For these reasons, I suggest that we adjourn the meeting for ten minutes in order that we may exchange views on this subject unofficially. We will thus rest our nerves and in this way we may be in a position to find some sort of solution to this problem.

The PRESIDENT: What I had in mind was that if the Council wants to go into several of the questions that remain and feels that another meeting is necessary to wind up the work, then I would put this question at the next meeting. If the Council is determined to finish everything tonight, then I am also prepared to square things according to the wish of the Council.

I am now told that there is a general rule in the Secretariat that there should not be any evening meetings.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I have a great deal of experience in this sort of pother and I know nothing more conducive towards bringing to an end a long and loquacious meeting than a good case of fatigue, and I am in favour of proceeding with this session. -- I regret to say, irrespective of the comfort of the Secretariat as of that of the representatives -- until we have finished the work of this session.

I would agree at the same time that I do not think it would be wise to take a second and final vote on the matter that we have just been discussing. I am entirely in agreement that if there is any chance of an accommodation we should take that chance. My suggestion is that

/we go right on

we go right on with the next item--referring to the matter that we have just been discussing at an appropriate time -- without food and without rest until we have finished.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): For my delegation's part, I think it would be advisable to finish our work tonight. Even though that might present the representatives and the members of the Secretariat with a superhuman effort, it would be worth while, I think, to continue with the work tonight. Most of us have made arrangements which could not be altered at the eleventh hour.

The PRESIDENT: We will go on. I do not think it would be advantageous to adjourn for ten minutes because that would mean ten good minutes and I am told by the Assistant Secretary-General that we cannot carry on the meeting beyond eight o'clock. If we are going to have a brief adjournment at all, I must limit it to five minutes only.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): Might I ask why we cannot carry on after eight o'clock?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I think if we started to vote quickly now, we would probably finish in ten minutes which would save us having to adjourn for ten minutes.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General): I am told by the Department of Conference and General Services that the members of the Secretariat who have been working the whole morning are not asked to stay, but for ^{the} interpreters and verbatim recorders it would as a general rule be very difficult to work after eight.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Mexico persist in his request for an adjournment?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Yes, I do -- with this condition, that the representatives do not leave the Council Chamber because if they take off to the Delegates' Lounge we will certainly have a twenty minute adjournment.

The PRESIDENT: I adjourn the Council for five minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 7.05 p.m. and reconvened at 7.12 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will come to order.

I now ask the Council to vote again on the USSR proposals for additional insertions into the Part of the report containing observations made by individual members of the Council.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposals were not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In view of the result of the vote, the USSR delegation reserves the right to avail itself, if it finds it necessary, of rule 54 of the rules of procedure and submit its own minority report.

The PRESIDENT: Under rule 54, the USSR delegation will have that right. Inasmuch as these reports will not go to the General Assembly until after the June session of this Council, I think the representative of the USSR may exercise his right if he finds it necessary.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I likewise reserve my right to submit my own comments separately and in writing as regards this situation which was created in the Trusteeship Council, as a document to be also added to the report of the Council to the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France will be free, of course, to circulate any document to any organ of the United Nations, but I do not know whether he wants to circulate it appended to the report as a minority report, under our rules.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): It seems to me that we have necessarily finished the consideration of this report. Will we come back to it at the next session?

The PRESIDENT: No, because the main body of the report will have been adopted. But under our rules of procedure, a representative who holds a different opinion and feels that the report does not include his views sufficiently is entitled to have a so-called minority view appended to the report.

Last year, the Council had to call a meeting especially to look into that minority report. That is why I said that if the Council does not feel that it can accede to the request of the USSR representative

/for a minority

for a minority report, that matter can be taken up at the next session, without prejudice to the formal adoption of the report as it stands.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Under that ruling, I take it that the President means that we will have full opportunity to see the report and discuss it before anything is done with it.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, but that report does not require endorsement by the majority before it can be appended.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): That is quite true, but as the President will remember, last year we were confronted with the same situation. Mr. TSARAPKIN asked to put in a minority report. All of us felt that he should have that right, but we insisted that it should be put in before we adjourned the session. He did put one in and it contained one or two paragraphs which were so scurrilous that the Council eliminated those two paragraphs. I am not sure whether it was one or two.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): First of all, I must point out that there was no minority. There was a vote of 6 to 6, a tie vote. I do not know whether a report of this type can really be called a minority report since the vote was 6 to 6.

Therefore, if one of the sides which had 6 votes confers upon itself the right to submit a report, then certainly the other side also enjoying 6 votes can have the same privilege.

Secondly, last year we voted finally on the report of the Trusteeship Council only after having taken cognizance of the minority report. This minority report was voted upon. I had already called attention to this fact during the day's meeting.

I would therefore ask that we do not vote on the Cameroons report as long as we do not have in hand the minority report. It goes without saying that the net consequence of this will be that we cannot conclude our meeting today or tomorrow. We will have to postpone it until a later date.

As long as this so-called minority report, so-called because there is no minority properly speaking, is not before us, we must prolong this meeting even if we have to prolong this session of the Council until June or later. I formally move that we do not suspend or adjourn this session until we have all the documents in hand which might be annexed to the report.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I believe that the representative of France may not be describing the procedure quite accurately. We can adopt the report and certainly nothing prevents us from appending later a minority report which the Council would have to deal with. Certainly the Council can deal with this minority report at the next session.

The report, after all, has to be before the General Assembly only for the next regular session next September. Therefore, nothing prevents one or many minority reports, because perhaps other delegations in addition to the USSR and the French delegations may wish to move minority reports.

Let these minority reports be considered and studied by the Council at its next session. It seems to me nothing prevents this procedure.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I remember that last year when the so-called minority report was submitted it was decided that certain paragraphs were not relevant and could not therefore be appended. I recall the matter very well and I think that rule 64 is quite clear.

It says: "A statement of minority views may be appended to a report or recommendation of the Trusteeship Council at the request of any member,"

If the Council wishes to look at it before it is presented to the General Assembly it is only in the sense that the Council may want to see whether it is a matter that could properly be appended to the report without the necessity of the Council, as such, endorsing or adopting such a report. Because here it only says that a statement of minority views may be appended.

I think ^{that although} the representative of France formally moved that no report should be adopted until all the documents had been made available, I feel that the Council would be doing itself an injustice if at this hour, after all the work in connexion with the report, it should refrain from adopting any report because a member has invoked the right of appending a statement of minority views to such a report.

I have already given the Council every safeguard by saying that such statements of minority views may be submitted during the next session of the Council in as much as the report of the Council for the General Assembly will not be presented to the General Assembly until after the next session.

Therefore I would like to ask the Council to come back to Part II of this draft report.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I shall withdraw the proposal I advanced a moment ago, but I would like to have some assurance that I will have the right to answer any assertions which might be made in a minority report. I formally reserve my right to vouchsafe some reply to some comments made in a minority report if the minority report includes such flagrant inaccuracies as it implies.

In that case we can also give certain replies which should be annexed to the report; otherwise there would certainly be overt abuse of the right of members of the Council.

I therefore reserve my right to make some answer to all the inaccuracies which might be contained in the minority report, and I

/ should like

should like this statement to be formally noted in the summary record. Let it be understood that in any event, even if we vote the report now and if we close this session of the Council, I shall never be prevented from answering the minority report at the next session.

The PRESIDENT: The French delegation will have the same right as any member to request that a statement of minority views be appended, if the delegation concerned feels that that is a minority view. When I say that that report may be presented to the Council, I again emphasize that it is to see whether the statement is relevant or not; for instance, if the statement of minority views states that the annual report concerning a certain Trust Territory does not bear out certain information, or that certain recommendations, like the tribal system, for instance, should be abolished, that is a statement of view that is relevant.

But the statements which I heard a little while ago as to the conception of democracy could not, if I were in the Chair, be presented under the guise of a statement of minority view.

Therefore I will say that if the representative of France wishes to append a statement to say the tribal system should be maintained - if the majority has already said that it should be abolished and his view is that it should be maintained - then it is his right to treat that statement as a minority view. But if he says that the minority view in the Soviet minority report is not true, then I cannot anticipate what the counter-report would be. But if it is an observation on the minority view, then I would like to see whether it is in fact a statement of minority view. Because it seems to me that there would be a comment on the minority view, and I do not know whether that would come under that rule.

But as I said, any representative has the right to circulate to delegations whatever document he thinks fit, provided that it does not emanate as a Council document, that is, as a document discussed and adopted by the Council.

I would like to come back to Part II of the draft report, which will become Part III.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to clarify one thing. Will the parallel report be distributed before the next session as a separate document, / or will it be

or will it be distributed after the next session - the fifth session - of the Trusteeship Council?

The PRESIDENT: Reports adopted by the Council during the present session will form part of the general report to the General Assembly. For all purposes, they would not be officially issued until the time when the general report is presented before the General Assembly.

To come back to Part II - Observations of individual members with additional insertions passed by the Council.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 6 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask the Council now to vote on Parts I, II and III together, taking the draft report as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 7 votes to none.

TONGALAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION.

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/278, T/278?Add.1).

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France has also submitted certain observations but I will take Part I of the report first.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted by 11 votes to none.

/ We will now turn to Part III.

The PRESIDENT:

/ We will now turn to Part III of document T/278, "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council". The representative of the Soviet Union has presented certain proposals which I believe are similar to the ones presented in connexion with the Report on the Cameroons under French Administration. They shall be put to the vote separately.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 2.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 3.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 4.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal 5.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: Those who are in favour of Part III in document T/278 beginning with page 28 to page 30, please raise their hands.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I just want to raise one question. I know it is out of order.

On page 30 the second paragraph commends "the French and British medical authorities". I wonder why that clause does not appear also in the report on British Togoland, which I admit at once we have already dealt with.

The PRESIDENT: It was never proposed. We will vote on Part III.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part III was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: Now we will go back to Part II of document T/278. The representative of the Soviet Union has submitted certain proposals for insertion and the French representative has already proposed additional insertions. I think that after the debate in connexion with the Report on the Cameroons under French Administration we could proceed to vote without debate.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I should like to explain my vote. I would have had no difficulty in supporting the admission of the remarks of the French representative but in view of the attitude manifested by certain members of this Council on a similar proposal my delegation is constrained to vote against the French proposal.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): We wish to make the same comment.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): My delegation would like to associate itself with the remarks just made.

The PRESIDENT: I think voting can be done without explanations. An opinion may be registered by the vote.

We will vote on the insertion of the paragraphs proposed by the representative of France.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.36 and resumed at 7.37.

The PRESIDENT: Will the meeting please come to order?

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): The vote which was just taken may have very serious repercussions and very serious consequences as to the vote on the report as a whole.

I should like to remind members of the Council that it is following a compromise solution, whose initiative was taken by the representative of Mexico and myself. We decided upon a solution which would make it possible for us to get out of the impasse in which we were the other day. It is quite evident that if the French proposals are not adopted by the Council, /then I shall vote

then I shall vote against old Part II and I shall vote against the report as a whole. It may be that we will then be in the same situation which occurred when I raised the question of knowing whether or not it was advisable to retain old Part II as it had been adopted last year in previous reports.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves and I wished in all good faith and in all loyalty to advise my colleagues of this -- that is, those of my colleagues who have just voted against the French proposal.

The PRESIDENT: We will vote again on the proposal of the representative of France to insert the paragraphs presented by him in the new Part III of the report.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of the Soviet Union proposed certain insertions only in the event of the French proposal being adopted; since it was not adopted they do not have to be put to the vote.

I will put Part II, as it stands, to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.38 and resumed at 7.39 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: Will the meeting please come to order?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): This entire discussion which has revolved around the Part on Observations has been grounded on a question of principle, namely that the views and observations which have been made during the discussion of this debate should be reproduced. This policy was advocated because we felt that our Report to the General Assembly should comprise quite independently of the conclusions reached by any organ of the United Nations, should comprise also the views -- whenever this is desirable -- of the various delegations.

/If the situation

If the situation has now become so crucial that Part II may be rejected entirely, then I really wonder in what situation we shall be placed later, and whether it is desirable to vote against, for instance, the report as a whole --^{or} whether those of us who wish to do so could not resort to a minority report.

It seems to me that the position at present is a very critical one now that the compromise solution has been set aside simply because of certain accidental circumstances.

The PRESIDENT: The results of procedural development sometimes cannot be foreseen, but the result has to be accepted.

Those who are in favour of Part II as it stands please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part II was not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no Part II. Part II is not adopted.

I will therefore ask the Council to take Part I and Part III of document T/278 together and to vote on them as a whole.

Those who are in favour of the Report as a whole, ~~that is~~ the present document T/278 minus Part II -- that is, the Review of General Conditions, Part I, and the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council forming the final Part, which will be taken together -- please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

There was no majority, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority. The Council is adjourned.

The Council adjourned at 7.42 p.m. and re-convened at 7.43 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is re-convened. Those who are in favour of the Report as a whole, that is, /Part I

Part I and Part III of document T/278 please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I and Part III of the Report were not adopted, 6 votes being cast in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: There is no majority, and therefore the Report is not adopted and there is no report on Togoland under French Administration.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (T/293)

The PRESIDENT: There is another document to which I would like to draw the attention of the Council, document T/293, in relation to the examination of Annual Reports, the requests for additional information.

I will ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to speak.

Mr. LIN (China) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee): We have before us document T/293 which contains a compilation of requests made by members of the Council for additional information during the examination of the Annual Reports.

I wish to say, as Chairman of the Drafting Committee, that the committee felt that these requests need not be included in the Council's Report to the General Assembly but might be transmitted directly to the Administering Authorities concerned for their consideration and action.

It is desirable, of course, that the Administering Authorities should receive these requests as early as possible, for in most cases they relate to information which members of the Council wish to see in the next Annual Reports, some of which may now be in the process of compilation.

May I suggest that the Council consider disposing of these requests by some such simple resolution as the following:

/THE TRUSTEESHIP

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

"TAKING NOTE of the requests for additional information made by members of the Council during the examination at its fourth session of the Annual Reports from Trust Territories,

"DECIDES to transmit these requests for information to the Administering Authorities concerned, and accordingly

"REQUESTS the Administering Authorities concerned to include in, or transmit with, their next and subsequent Annual Reports the following additional information."

There is a list of requests to follow, and these requests may be addressed to each individual Administering Authority concerned.

I have used the phrase "include in or transmit with", because some of the information may be included in the Annual Report and some may be sent together with the Annual Report to the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Council prepared to accept this request from the Drafting Committee, which felt that the requests for supplementary information should not be included in the report on the Annual Reports?

I would suggest that the Council consent to its transmission to the Administering Authorities concerned. After all they are requests of individual members for information during the examination and in many cases the Administering Authorities' representatives have undertaken to supply such information.

If there is no objection, then this is adopted.

There remains another matter which has just been brought to my attention by the representative of Belgium concerning suggested procedure for the consideration of Annual Reports. I am sure the Council is aware that procedural matters require very lengthy consideration and particularly procedure for consideration of the Annual Reports.

But looking at the procedural suggestion, perhaps I may save the Council time by expressing the wish from the Chair that if any representatives reading the Annual Reports that are circulated in advance of a session feel that they have

/certain

certain questions on which they wish to have supplementary information, they will request from the Secretary-General that such supplementary information be obtained from the Administering Authority as early as possible so that the Administering Authority can supply it before the beginning of the session or the special representative may be prepared to supply such supplementary information.

I do not think that requires any debate, and I will leave this matter at this stage. If there is any further suggestion for procedure for the consideration of Annual Reports, I would suggest that the representative of Belgium should bring it before the next session of the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I only ask that as the Reports for Nauru, New Guinea and the United States Pacific Islands are in the hands of the members of the Council, instead of asking supplementary questions at the beginning of the next session, we might just as well do it now -- when we study the Reports for the first time, we could send our questions in so that the replies should be ready when we convene for our next meeting.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I have another point to bring up on behalf of the Iraq delegation -- that is, the translation into the working languages of the Council of the Annual Reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories. We suggest that such an item should be included in the next session.

The PRESIDENT: I think that question involves many considerations, including budgetary considerations. It can be put on the agenda for the next session, but I do not think we can discuss it now.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I am not suggesting that we should discuss it now; I am merely apprising the President that we are going to bring it up.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: That brings us to the next session, and I would like to ascertain, as far as possible, the wishes of the Council as to the date of the next session. According to rule, it should be held in June, the latter part of June.

If the members of the Council feel that that rule can stand as it is without any specific reason for changing the date provided for in the rule, perhaps we can leave it to the Secretary-General to determine the date in accordance with that rule.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): May I ask how long it is estimated this next meeting is likely to take?

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Trusteeship Department): We will have only three reports to examine, instead of five, as at this session. This session has lasted two months, so probably the next session may last four to six weeks.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): We have got to bear in mind the forthcoming General Assembly, and those of us who are working horses -- and I speak with some emotion in this respect -- really have got to try to allocate our time and to get some little time for the necessary recuperative processes.

I would like to see some arrangement made for the next meeting of the Trusteeship Council under which, if I am representative of New Zealand, I will be able to get away from this Council in time to pull myself together for the September meeting of the General Assembly. And therefore, the earlier, within reason, we can decide to sit, the more convenient it will be to me.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Trusteeship Department): We must finish our next session by the end of July, because the report of the Trusteeship Council must be printed and sent to the General Assembly. So the Secretary-General will convene the Trusteeship Council, taking into consideration the agenda which we will have, so that we can finish by the end of July. If we think we can finish in six weeks, the Council would be convened by the middle of June. If it takes longer, we will convene a little earlier.

But then I must observe the fact that the next General Assembly,
/which is convening

which is convening in April, may give us some supplementary work regarding the Italian colonies. In that case, I think we would have to meet earlier.

Sir Cerl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): If we are working for the deadline of finishing by the end of July, that is quite satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDENT: In that case we will leave the date to be sometime in June, and the Secretary-General will have to take other factors into consideration and determine a date in accordance with the rules of procedure and notify members a month in advance.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I did understand the other day that the Council might try to indicate approximately when the three reports, which have to be considered at the next session, will come up for discussion. It would be very useful indeed -- at least for my Government -- to know that.

The PRESIDENT: In that case if, for instance, the meeting should begin, say, the third week in June, we can safely count that the examination of the first report would begin three or four days afterwards, and, if you allow one week for each report, I think when the agenda is circulated to members of the Council, an approximate date can be then estimated.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Is New Guinea likely to be the first report?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Trusteeship Department): New Guinea first, then Nauru and then the Pacific islands under United States Administration.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think it is advisable to determine the order of examination of the three. So far as the United States is concerned, we are glad to fit in with whatever seems agreeable to the

agreeable to the Council.

In addition, I should like to fit in with whatever is agreeable to the representative of Australia.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Trusteeship Department): May I take it then that we will examine them in the following order: New Guinea, Nauru, ^{the} Pacific islands?

If that is all right, we will try to arrange that you will examine them in that order, and the first report will be examined, then, three or four days after the beginning of the session, because we will have some very small matters to settle before then.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): May I ask the Assistant Secretary-General if he can give a rough estimate as to how many days after the opening we would be examining the Pacific islands.

I take it the Nauru examination will not be very long.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Trusteeship Department): Yes, after the second week probably -- about ten days after we begin examining the New Guinea report.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): If I understand correctly, if the special representative is here, let us say, ten days after the opening of the meeting, that would be ample.

In that connexion, may I urge those who do have written questions, to get them in as far in advance of the opening of the meeting as possible, particularly if it requires collecting data from the Pacific islands, because the report is already in, as you know. It can be read and studied at any time, and I hope, under the suggestion which the President has made -- the desirability of having all written requests for further information in prior to the opening of the session -- those requests will be in as long before the opening of the session as can be conveniently done.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): If the work of the Trusteeship Council for this session has now concluded, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Iraq delegation to extend to the President its warmest congratulations on the manner in which he has conducted the business of

/the Council

the Council throughout this session, and we would like at the same time to extend our thanks to the members of the Secretariat, the interpreters, and all who are concerned in the work of this session.

The delegation of Iraq regrets the fact, of course, that one report shall not be submitted to the General Assembly, and we hope that this flaw in the work of the Trusteeship Council will soon be remedied.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I take the very greatest pleasure in associating myself with the remarks of the representative of Iraq.

I want to express to the President my own personal sense of gratitude for the way in which he has conducted these proceedings. His technical competence, his amiable patience in circumstances exasperating, even infuriating, his invariable impartiality and objectivity have been, I am sure, an inspiration to the whole Council.

I have learned -- and I am sure the Council has heard -- with the very deepest of regret that we are not to be favoured with his presence at the next meeting. To me that is a very serious loss; to the Council it will prove to be a very serious loss indeed.

We have been exceptionally fortunate in our Presidents, and I think the Council will agree with me that we will lose our present President with a sense of very great loss indeed.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Just one word, in personal appreciation to the President. He has guided us through some pretty troubled waters; he has helped in many ways; he has been obviously objective, fair, unbiased in his rulings and ^{the} conduct of his high office.

I take pleasure also in associating myself with what has been said by the two previous speakers.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): It is for me personally, as well as for my delegation, a pleasure to extend to the President once again warm congratulation for the work he has done here in the Council. We wish to express to him the admiration which we feel for his very great competence and qualifications, which have been made so manifest in his conduct of the work of the Council.

/I wish to say

I wish to say also to those who are sitting around this Council table that if, in the course of any statement here in the Council, there was anything which might have seemed uncalled for on my part, I certainly beg their pardon.

It should also always be understood, however, that I have acted in good faith and in compliance with the instructions given me by my Government. I am a man of heart who feels very strongly that the Trusteeship Council has very exalted objectives to attain.

/There was a

There was a Mandates Commission which carried out certain activities. Today there is a Trusteeship Council. Perhaps this institution will solve these problems more rapidly than previous problems were solved by former organizations.

It is not in vain that mention is made in the Bible of Jacob thinking of a ladder which would go up to the high heavens. The Permanent Mandates Commission, as well as the Trusteeship Council, are both rungs in the ladder which will enable the indigenous peoples to attain self-government or independence.

All members of the Administering Authorities can certainly rest assured that in conformity with the statement made yesterday by Mr. Padilla Nervo, of my country, the policy and line of conduct followed by the Mexican delegation in the Trusteeship Council always reflects the terms of reference and the responsibilities placed upon our shoulders by the Charter.

We have recently had before us the result of the work of a Committee which was instructed to study these various reports. There, again, in this Committee we ended so late that we scarcely had time to thank the President, and we did not remember members of the Secretariat, the interpreters, translators, precis writers, etc., who have all rendered such magnificent services to us, and without whose help we certainly could not have carried out our work.

I wish to thank them at this juncture, and I wish to thank all of those who have aided and abetted us in our work in the Drafting Committee, and beg their pardon, since, due to the fact that the last meetings ended very belatedly, we unfortunately did not extend our thanks to them at that time.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I would like to associate myself with the representatives who have already spoken, and to say that I feel that we are losing not only a respected President, but also a personal friend.

I should like to move a formal resolution expressing to the President of this Council the appreciation of the members of the Council and their thanks to him for the way in which he has conducted our proceedings during the past year.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I feel quite embarrassed at allowing further speakers.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I would like to put it on record that the statements made by the representatives who have preceded me represent the unanimous sentiments of all the members of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: After the whole day's meeting, I certainly do not feel that I should hold the Council even a minute longer, but after the very kind words that have been spoken, I should like you to know how deeply touched I am.

I need not disguise the fact that I am leaving the Council immediately after this session: I am leaving with a very deep feeling, because I have been connected with this Council since its inaugural session, and today, I believe, is exactly two years since we started, under my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Sayre. During these two years I have considered it a very great privilege to have worked with my colleagues of the Council and in the Secretariat, and I have cherished some very good personal friendships, and I have always considered coming to the Trusteeship Council as something to be looked forward to.

It is therefore with very sincere feeling that I want to thank my colleagues for the support they have always given me, and for the very pleasant and valid friendships.

I have often wondered whether I have discharged the duties of President properly. My work has been greatly facilitated by the work of my predecessor, who has never ceased to give me valuable counsel, from his experience.

If the Council has sometimes encountered difficulties, I feel perhaps this is because the Council is beginning to feel its way in the discharge of its functions. The reports that have come up under discussion are, in most cases, presented to the Council for examination for the first time, and naturally the Council has to give a more thorough and critical study to them than later reports in the years to come would require.

I can only express the hope that the Council will face an easier task in the forthcoming sessions.

Although I said that the Council may have encountered difficulties, I have never felt that it is nearing any crisis. It seems to me that, if there are differences of opinion, they only tend to prove the earnestness
/of purpose

of purpose and honesty of opinion among my colleagues.

Even if we failed to adopt one report today, I feel that that is not a situation which cannot be remedied in the forthcoming session.

I leave this Council with my best wishes to my colleagues and to the Council, and I want to thank my colleagues from the bottom of my heart, and not merely as a formality.

I am particularly grateful to my predecessor, Mr. Sayre, and Sir Alan Burns, as Vice-President, who has time and again helped me out when I could not attend the meetings of the Council. I think you all know how indebted I feel towards my friends in the Secretariat -- my good old friend, the Assistant Secretary-General, Director of the Trusteeship Department, and all the associates in the Secretariat. To them I want to tender my thanks, both personally and on behalf of the Council.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I must ask the President to put my motion to the vote. This is a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Is this relevant to the discharge of the duties of the Trusteeship Council?

I will take it that, as there has been no objection, it is not necessary to put it to the vote.

My last duty is to announce that the Committee on Administrative Unions will meet on 29 March, at 11 a.m., in Room 5.

The Council is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.