

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 190
21 July 1949

English

21

MASTER FILE

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING
(Transcription from sound recording)

Lake Success, New York
Thursday, 21 July 1949, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. Roger GARREAU

France

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.190 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I declare open the twenty-fifth meeting of the fifth session of the Trusteeship Council.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (document T/382)

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council has before it document T/382 in which states:

"The Secretary-General has the honour to report to the Trusteeship Council that he has received, in application of rules 14 and 16 of the Trusteeship Council, credentials for the following representatives to the Trusteeship Council:"

I think that the list is accessible to all members of the Council and therefore we can go on to the next item on the agenda.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS - PACIFIC ISLANDS, FIRST REPORT - REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/378)

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Before taking up again the item on revision of the rules of procedure and the question of South West Africa, we can, this morning, take up the consideration of the report which was presented to us by our Drafting Committee on the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.

The Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Khalidy, presented us with an excellent document and I believe that this document can be discussed and adopted very rapidly by the Council. I would therefore like to call upon Mr. Khalidy, the Chairman of the Committee, to formally present the report to the Council.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): If I were to say a very brief word I might adopt the maxim of Julius Caesar and say "veni, vidi, vici", "we came, we saw, we achieved." I am very thankful to the members of the Committee, who gave me a great deal of help and indeed, in no small measure, to both the Secretariat and the representatives of the Administering Authority who were very helpful in explaining and incorporating.

It will be noted that the report is comparatively brief. We thought that brevity would be a virtue here and that unnecessary discussion would lead nowhere. I should be very glad to answer questions and I might conclude by saying that what good there is in the report is a credit to the members and I take the responsibility for its bad points.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I only wished to say that on page 13 of the report, on the fifth and the eighth lines of the observations attributed to me, where it is stated "He had only two misapprehensions" and "His second misapprehension", they were not
/misapprehensions

"misapprehensions", they were "apprehensions." I think that can be corrected without the need for an amendment.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I think that these modifications are accepted by the Council.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I have certain observations to make on Part II of the report. Perhaps I might make these observations when we come to Part II.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Yes, we can do that.

We shall continue discussing the report part by part. First of all we have the Introduction on page 1 of the document. If there are no remarks on the Introduction we shall go on to page 2, Part I, "Outline of Conditions as Stated in the Annual Report of the Administering Authority and by the Special Representative." 1. General, 2. Political Advancement, 3. Economic Advancement, 4. Social Advancement, 5. Educational Advancement. There is a section which refers to information, which is a summary of the report presented by the Administering Authority.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The USSR delegation has always been consistent with the following position and attitude.

The report of the Administering Authority ^{does not} /have to be included in Part of the report, as has been done in the report on the Pacific Islands. The USSR delegation has always opposed having Part I of a report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly based entirely

on the information received from the Administering Authority. That is to say that it should contain the ideas of the Council itself, but we feel that Part I should be limited to expressing the ideas of the Administering Authority.

We, therefore, have always opposed the preparation of a report in such a way as to include /in Part I of the report the matter which has been included in this case. In the present case, the USSR delegation opposes the inclusion of Part I of the report, in its present wording, in the report of the Trusteeship Council.

Therefore my delegation will vote against the inclusion of Part I in the report.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council is very well aware of the consistent attitude of the USSR delegation regarding Part I of the report, but we shall nevertheless take a vote on Part I.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I of the report was adopted by 10 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now go on to Part II of the report, "Conclusions and Recommendations Approved by the Council." 1. General. Are there any remarks on the general considerations? 2. Political Advancement. Are there any objections to this section?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): Usually we vote on and adopt each recommendation individually. How are we going to proceed on this matter?

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall definitely vote on each of these recommendations separately.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): Before we go on to a vote, I should like to put before the Council, very clearly, the attitude of the USSR delegation regarding the recommendations proposed by the drafting committee in Part II of the report.

/The recommendations

The recommendations that have been presented to us by the committee in document T/378, Part II, as the "conclusions and recommendations" of the Trusteeship Council, do not take into account sufficiently the concrete conditions existing in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. These conclusions and recommendations especially do not take into consideration the conclusions and recommendations that were made by a number of delegations in the Council, including the Soviet delegation, during the course of the examination of the report of the Administering Authority.

I should very much like to point specifically to certain recommendations presented by the Soviet delegation which have not been taken into account in Part II of this report.

During the discussion on the report of the Administering Authority, the Soviet delegation pointed out that the Administering Authority has not taken such measures as would bring about the participation of the indigenous population in the executive, legislative and judicial organs of the Trust Territory.

It was pointed out that in the Trust Territory all posts are occupied by United States officials. There is not one administrative post filled by a representative of the indigenous population. Furthermore, in the Territory there are no legislative organs in which the indigenous population might participate. Thus, the entire authority in the Trust Territory is concentrated, in fact, in the hands of U.S. functionaries.

The Soviet delegation also noted the fact that, from the report of the Administering Authority as well as from the answers given by the special representative, it was perfectly clear that the Administering Authority does not intend to carry out measures to ensure the participation of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory in the executive, legislative and judicial organs of the Territory.

The delegation of the Soviet Union also noted something that was considered normal: that is, that the central organs of the Trust Territory are not in the Trust Territory itself, but are in the Hawaiian Islands and on the Island of Guam, both of which are United States colonies.

Therefore, the Soviet delegation considers that these things should be put in the form of recommendations, and that the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority that it establish administrative organs in the Trust Territory itself and, in order to carry this out, that it establish certain
/measures

measures which would ensure the participation of the indigenous population in the executive, legislative and judicial bodies of the Trust Territory.

These recommendations of the Soviet Union were not sufficiently taken into account in the recommendations presented for our consideration by the drafting committee in Part II of this report.

I would say that they were not only insufficiently taken into account; they were, in fact, not taken into account at all.

Furthermore, the delegation of the Soviet Union also presented certain recommendations regarding the tribal system. The Soviet Union delegation noted that the Trusteeship Council could not consider as normal the situation under which the Administering Authority does not take the appropriate measures which would ensure the transition of the tribal system to a system organized on a democratic basis.

Our delegation noted that, on the basis of information presented by the special representative, one must draw the conclusion that the Administering Authority not only maintains the tribal system, but in large measure utilizes it in the administration of the Trust Territory. Instead of creating a system of self-government built up on democratic principles, the Administering Authority has instituted the organization of so-called municipalities, the administration of which is carried out on the basis of the existing tribal system.

In addition, the USSR delegation adduced a whole series of facts, taken from the report of the Administering Authority and the answers of the special representative, which confirmed this conclusion drawn by the delegation of the Soviet Union. The subsequent explanations given by the representative of the United States in the Trusteeship Council did not, and of course cannot, do away with the facts that had been brought to the cognizance of the Council during the examination of the report.

Therefore, the USSR delegation considers that, given the fact that the existing tribal system in the Trust Territory is not compatible with the political advancement of the indigenous population and with their progress towards self-government and independence, the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority that it take measures to ensure the transition from the tribal system to a system of self-government built up on democratic principles. This recommendation presented by the USSR delegation was, likewise, not taken into account in the recommendations now presented to the Council by the committee in Part II of document T/378.

/Furthermore

Furthermore, the USSR delegation also presented certain recommendations regarding the abolition of the head tax. This USSR recommendation was not taken into account either; the recommendations now before the Council do not contain any that would reflect the proposal presented by my delegation to the Council.

As the Council very well knows, the USSR delegation noted time and again that in the Trust Territory there is still maintained a backward form of taxation, the head tax, and the USSR delegation considers that the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority the adoption of measures for the abolition of the head tax and for its replacement by a progressive income tax or, at least, by an income tax that takes into consideration the property status and ability to pay of the population.

The USSR delegation is also of the opinion that the recommendations which refer to health and education should be much more concrete. In particular, the USSR delegation had in due course proposed the adoption of a recommendation to the effect that the Administering Authority should increase appropriations for the needs of education, especially for secondary and higher education, as well as for other cultural needs. The Soviet delegation also proposed the adoption of a recommendation which would provide that the Administering Authority should increase the appropriations for the needs of public health.

As members of the Council will see when reading Part II of this document presented to us by the committee, a considerable number of recommendations of other delegations were likewise not given attention and are not sufficiently reflected in this Part II.

On the other hand, in Part II of the report we see that a number of recommendations have been included which, let me put it this way, are not sufficiently well-founded.

From what I have just said, the Soviet delegation is not able to support the recommendations contained in Part II, and shall vote against a number of them.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am intervening on a matter of procedure. Since I have not heard any other divergence of opinion from other members of the Council and since the representative of the USSR has declared that he will vote against the whole of Part II, would it not be more convenient for the Council to vote en bloc on all the recommendations unless, of course, other members take exception to certain paragraphs. I believe it would be a waste of time to vote separately on each paragraph.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The remarks of the representative of Iraq are based on a misunderstanding of my statement. I quite clearly said that, on the basis of all that has been said before, the USSR delegation cannot support the recommendations contained in Part II and will vote against several of them. Thus the statement of the representative of Iraq is not based on my statement.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think the time is such that there is no purpose in my answering the suggestions made by the USSR representative. Instead I simply refer him to the answers which have already been made. I refer to the answers appearing in the verbatim report, document T/P.V.183, for the proceedings on Wednesday, 13 July 1949.

The representative of the USSR has raised five different points, the first of which was that the Administering Authority had sufficiently permitted the indigenous inhabitants to take part in the government of the islands. I refer him to pages 58/60 and 61 of the document which I have just mentioned.

He also referred to the fact that the tribal system has not been supplanted. I refer him to page 56 of that same document. He raised objections concerning the head tax not being abrogated. I refer him to the remarks appearing on page 68/70 of that report. He referred to matters of public health. I refer him to page 68/70 of T/P.V. 183.

I do not think this is the time nor the proper place to enter into another discussion.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): It is superfluous to reopen a discussion that has already been closed. The Council has now come to the moment for voting on the recommendations contained in the report prepared by the sub-committee.

The Council will vote first on section 1 "General". I shall
/read the first

read the first paragraph to the Council:

"The Trusteeship Council, taking into account the comparatively brief period that has elapsed since the Administering Authority assumed responsibility for the administration of the Territory, and recognizing the difficulties arising from the destruction caused by the war, commends the Administering Authority for the progress it has already made in the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants, and for the full nature of the information submitted both in the annual report and in the supplementary data provided by the special representative."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 2:

"The Trusteeship Council, recognizing the desirability of the closest possible contact between the Administering Authority and the inhabitants, notes that the Administering Authority is giving consideration to the possibility of transferring the seat of government from Guam to a site within the Territory itself, and believes that this will facilitate closer association between the Administering Authority and the indigenous inhabitants."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 3 under section 2 "Political Advancement:"

"The Trusteeship Council notes with gratification that the Administering Authority has under preparation an organic act for the Trust Territory."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 4:

"The Trusteeship Council, while noting with approval the extent to which purely local forms of self-government have been fostered and encouraged, recommends that the Administering Authority increase its efforts to develop regional governmental organs on a representative and elective basis and that it endeavour to bring
/representatives of

representatives of the indigenous population into the territorial government, if only in an advisory capacity in the initial stages."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read these paragraphs because all the members have a copy of this document before them. The Council will vote on paragraph 5.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 6 appearing at the bottom of page 9 and the top of page 10.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): Even if the President does not read the text aloud, some time should be allowed to members of the Council to read the text for themselves.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Very well, I shall read the text aloud as I started to do. I think that will make it easier for all the members to know what paragraph we are voting on. Paragraph 6:

"The Trusteeship Council, noting that generally speaking the people of the Marianas Islands are relatively advanced, noting also that they do not yet possess a regional council, and noting the willingness of the Administering Authority to consider the possibility of establishing an appropriate regional organ for the Marianas, recommends the Administering Authority to press forward with this measure."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 7:

"The Trusteeship Council welcomes the steps taken by the Administering Authority to effect a real separation of administrative and judicial powers and expresses the hope that, wherever practical, further steps will be taken to effect this separation."

/A vote was taken

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will now go on to paragraph 8 of section 3 "Economic Advancement":

"The Trusteeship Council welcomes the declaration of the representative of the Administering Authority that it seeks no profit or aggrandizement from the Trust Territory. It further welcomes the stated policies of the Administering Authority to protect the indigenous inhabitants against loss of their land and institute a sound programme of economic development along lines which will ensure that the profits and benefits accrue to the inhabitants and will assist them in achieving the highest possible level of economic independence."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 9:

" The Trusteeship Council, noting the arrangements in force for the purchase of copra by the Island Trading Company, recommends that the Administering Authority keep these arrangements under constant review in order to ensure that the interests of the copra producers are safeguarded by receiving a fair return for their industry."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 10:

" The Trusteeship Council, noting with concern that, in spite of the recommendation of the United States Commercial Company in 1946 that the entire output of the Anguar phosphate mines should be retained as soon as possible for use within the Territory, arrangements to export the entire estimated tonnage of phosphates to Japan are still in force, and noting further that apart from a royalty of 25 cents per ton, the Trust Territory derives no benefit even from a processing tax from the phosphates, recommends that the Administering Authority subject this arrangement to further serious review and, in the light of this review, reassure the Council that the interests of the Territory and its inhabitants have been safeguarded."

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I suggest that we delete the word "serious". The Council pre-supposes that it is serious whenever it speaks of a "review" and therefore there is no need to say so.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Will the Council accept this amendment to delete the word "serious" before the word "review"? The amendment is adopted and that line would read: "...further review and, in the light of this review...."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 10 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 11: "The Trusteeship Council urges the Administering Authority before granting any permits to outside fishing companies to develop the marine resources of the Trust Territory, to explore again the possibility and practicability of

/ developing the

developing the fishing industry as a purely indigenous enterprise with assistance from the Administering Authority itself."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 12: " The Trusteeship Council recommends the Administering Authority to keep the taxation system in the Trust Territory constantly under review with a view to the ultimate abolition of the head tax and its substitution by a more progressive system of taxation based upon the capacity of the individual to pay."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: We will go on to Chapter 4, "Social Advancement." Paragraph 13: " The Trusteeship Council, noting that the living standards of the indigenous inhabitants are still below pre-war levels, recommends that the Administering Authority take such steps as may be practicable further to raise the standard of living."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Chapter 5, "Educational Advancement." Paragraph 14: The Trusteeship Council commends the Administering Authority for its achievements in the educational field but recommends that it consider the possibility of establishing secondary schools in the Territory to meet its progressive needs."

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to request that this paragraph be voted on in parts. First, "The Trusteeship Council commends the Administering Authority for its achievements in the educational field." That is one part. Then a separate vote on the second part of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will vote on it in parts then as suggested.

The first part: "The Trusteeship Council commends the Administering Authority for its achievements in the educational field."

/ A vote was

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The first part of paragraph 14 was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: Now the second part: "but recommends that it consider the possibility of establishing secondary schools in the Territory to meet its progressive needs."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The second part was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Now we will vote on paragraph 14 as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 14 as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 15: "The Trusteeship Council notes that the Administering Authority is sending promising indigenous students to Hawaii and the continental United States for higher education, and urges it to continue doing so."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 6 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will vote now on the entire Part II.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): What is the meaning of this vote? I cannot vote for Part II as a whole. I have voted for some recommendations and I have abstained on others. What am I to do now? I still maintain my votes in favour and my abstentions so what am I to do? I would like a clarification from the President. I think that there is no need to vote on Part II as a whole.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I agree with the representative of Belgium. I do not think we need vote on Part II as a whole so we will not do so. We have voted on it paragraph by paragraph and I think a global vote would be superfluous.

We will go on to Part III, "Observations of Individual Members of the Council." Chapter 1, General. We will vote on it in parts. The first part is "Form of Report". Are there any objections?

/ Mr. SOLDATOV:

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): There is one item that is not clear. When we spoke of the form of the report there was agreement among us that Part III would be called, "Observations, conclusions and recommendations of the individual members of the Council." Here I see only "Observations of Individual Members." Apparently this must be an error, for we had a very firm agreement and the President re-stated the ruling made at the fourth session. By the President's ruling he re-stated the fact that Part III would be called "Observations, conclusions and recommendations of the individual members of the Council." It seems to me that this must be a technical error.

/ The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Secretary will verify the fact if there is a modification, if there was an inadvertent slip in Part III. If the previous report says "Observation, Conclusions and Recommendations" that title will be maintained unless any member of the Council objects, then we shall have to take a vote.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I shall not dispute that the Council did reach an understanding on this point but whether it was a wise understanding to have reached is another question. What exactly is the difference between an observation and a conclusion on the part of an individual member of the Council? What is implied in this distinction? It seems to me to be pointless.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Last year this same doubt was expressed regarding the difference between observations and conclusions. The difference, as far as I can see, is the following: an observation merely points out facts, takes note of what a situation is and a conclusion is an expression of opinion.

At that time I remember that I gave an example: If one observes that a house is dirty one concludes that the housekeeper is a person who is not neat in herself. I think the difference is rather clear-cut.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): It seems to me that the observations of the Soviet Union representative are quite sensible, for in Part II we said: "Conclusions and Recommendations Approved by the Council." In Part III there are conclusions and recommendations which were not approved by the Council and it seems to me normal to say here: "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members." It is of no importance but it seems to me that the Soviet Union representative is right.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I sense that we are on the verge of entering a prolonged discussion on a relatively unimportant subject. May I suggest a middle way, namely that we entitle it as follows: "Observations and Conclusions of Individual Members of the Council"? Leave out "Recommendations."

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
(Interpretation from Russian): I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the drafting committee on Nauru considered this question and the decision of the committee was that Part III will be called: "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members of the Council." Now when I see the document, T/381, Part III again simply reads: "Observations of Individual Members of the Council." I think that this must be an error for the drafting committee on Nauru very definitely considered this question and it was reaffirmed on several occasions by all the members of the committee. Now a document is presented to us in a different form.

The Chairman, the representative of Belgium and Mr. Carpio of the Philippines can support my statement. We had an understanding on this and now that we have the document on Nauru Part III has a different title than the one decided upon in the committee.

I also repeat that unofficially we had an understanding. After my speech the Chairman re-stated it and said that it will be called "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations..." I can recall the meeting of the Council when I asked for explanations from the President and the President gave such explanations. The same thing happened at the fourth session. It seems to me that we should keep to decisions that are once accepted.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We do not want to prolong this discussion too much; it is rather superfluous. I think we can satisfy the representative of the Soviet Union; that is my opinion as President.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France) (Interpretation from French): I should merely like to say that I do not recall that we argued this point on "Recommendations" in our committee. I do not think we did so. It is the true sense of the matter, as was pointed out by Mr. Soldatov, but I do not think we discussed the words. Of course I entirely share the point of view expressed by the representative of Iraq which I think to be much wiser than any other.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I must recognize that I was wrong and recognize that the representative of

/Iraq was right.

Iraq was right. It was a question of the recommendations of individual members and I am ready to say: "Observations, Conclusions and Draft Recommendations of Individual Members of the Council." I think that technically this would be correct.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Would the representative of the Soviet Union accept that title?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to give an explanation. First, the Chairman of the drafting committee on Nauru has supplied the wrong information. I personally raised this question in the drafting committee on Nauru, twice or even three times. If the representative of the Secretariat will remember it or if the Secretariat has notes, it can give us the necessary information. I then asked how Part III was to be entitled and said that we used to call Part III "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Individual Members of the Council." The Chairman of the drafting committee on Nauru reaffirmed this, the representative of Belgium also reaffirmed it and did not have any objections against calling Part III in such a way. The representative of the Philippines also agreed. We can find the appropriate passages in the minutes of the meetings of the drafting committee on Nauru so that this information may be supplied and no misunderstanding persist.

In general, with regard to the proposal to delete the word "Recommendations" from the title of Part III, this proposal cannot be accepted. It is a new decision. We had a clear-cut understanding on how to call Part III. Let us stick to it; let us call it: "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members of the Council." We had this agreement in unofficial conversations and I even repeated it. Everybody agreed with that and I said that I hoped that this time there would be no foul play and the members all agreed that there would be no foul play. When in the Trusteeship Council I raised this question the President reaffirmed that it will be so titled and that there will be no foul play introduced in the Trusteeship Council.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am sorry to intervene again. When the representative of the Soviet Union was speaking about Nauru I requested Mr. Laurentie at my side not to answer because we are not discussing Nauru here. When the report on Nauru comes up we shall give it our full consideration but the report on the Pacific Islands is under consideration here.

Would it not be better to take the sense of the Council on the proposal I made? The title would be: "Observations and Conclusions of Individual Members of the Council." That would be an easier way.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Another proposal was made by the representative of Belgium who suggests "Observations, Conclusions and Draft Recommendations of the Individual Members of the Council."

There cannot, it is true, be a technical recommendation from one member of the Council. A member can present a draft recommendation but the Council is the only body that can present a recommendation. A member can present a draft recommendation but it is only a draft recommendation. If the draft is not accepted it is left, we could say, a still-born recommendation, but individual members cannot present a recommendation to the United States regarding the Pacific Island, for example; it is the Council that must do that.

At any rate, I shall ask the Council to decide between the suggestion of the representative of Iraq which is: "Observations and Conclusions of Individual Members" or the suggestion of the Belgian representative, if he maintains it, "Observations, Conclusions and Draft Recommendations of Individual Members of the Council."

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): There was a decision of the Trusteeship Council on this matter. Before a new decision is to be taken, the old one has to be set aside. Therefore I want a quite clear-cut attitude so that there should be no misunderstanding here. Before a new decision is taken, the old one has to be formally set aside.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Could the representative of the Soviet Union recall what that decision was, because I do not recall whether there was a decision or not? I will ask the Secretary to refresh our memories, because I do not remember.

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Trusteeship Council): I cannot say with certainty whether there was a decision or not but This is what was said by the President during the last session at the forty-sixth meeting.

The President summarized the opinions expressed and said there would be, following Part II, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council, a Part III, Observations of Individual Representatives. The new Part III would include observations that had not been submitted to the Council for approval and had not been approved by the Council, and so on.

He gave an explanation. We cannot find in the summary records any other reference to any decision of the Council. It may be that I am wrong, but I have no time to check it now.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I do not think this is a matter of great moment. So far as my memory serves me there was never any agreement in the Trusteeship Council on this matter. In fact I do not think that the question of the wording of Part III was under active discussion by the Council. Whether or not there was an agreement seems to me aside from the point. It seems to me that the suggestion made by the representative of Iraq is a very reasonable one and I suggest that we proceed to take the opinion of the Council on Mr. Khalidy's proposal.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Does the representative of Belgium feel that he has made a formal proposal?

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): No. If the Soviet Union representative would say that he could agree to this formula and if it were acceptable to everyone, then I would introduce it. But the representative of Iraq has introduced a formula which is acceptable to me.

I was wrong in saying that "recommendations" could be maintained, for individual members do not present recommendations but draft recommendations.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Then we have only one proposal upon which we can vote.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): It is obvious that one can change his opinions not only in a minute but even in a split second and such changes of opinions and convictions are the responsibility of the man who changes his convictions. He usually has grounds for it.

But I would like to recall once more that the question of the form of the report of the Trusteeship Council on each of the Trust Territories was considered at an unofficial meeting of all members of the Trusteeship Council and in particular this question of the title of Part III was raised by me at this unofficial meeting. All those present agreed and no one objected to Part III being called "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members." I would request that it should be found -- and perhaps the verbatim report shows it correctly.

When the Trusteeship Council was convened I re-stated that Part III would be called "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members of the Council" and the President affirmed and reaffirmed it. Therefore I personally did not have any grounds to suspect that at the end of our work someone would introduce and suggest a new title for Part III.

In this case I can only repeat what I have said before. I was of the opinion that this understanding was a gentlemen's agreement among us, and a gentlemen's agreement as a rule does not allow any foul play. But I must say that at the present time it appears that these gentlemen's agreements are not always gentlemen's agreements in the end and some partners in these agreements reject them and introduce the rejected principle -- a principle which should not be /accepted by anyone,

accepted by anyone -- the principle of foul play.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of the Soviet Union has a certain idea and I do not think there is anything further we can do on the matter, but I have asked the Secretary to find out what the result of the discussions was, but this research has resulted in nothing. If the Council wishes, therefore, we shall take a vote on the Iraqi suggestion. We will reserve the matter of the title of Part III until this research into the summary records has been completed.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I merely wanted to say this, that I do think it is most unfortunate that the representative of the Soviet Union should be under the impression that there has been a breach of faith with him. I am quite that no one around this table would wish such a situation to arise. I do not recollect any such arrangement, but then of course I have not been present at all the meetings and I would suggest that if anyone else recollects such an arrangement it would be useful for that member of the Council to announce the fact.

For my part -- and I want to be perfectly plain about this -- I do not intend to make any difficulties at all. As the President knows, I never do, and I am not going to begin now. I do not think it matters very much what the heading is of this particular part; I think it is quite improper to include Part III in any case. In my judgment -- for what it is worth -- nothing should appear in the report of the Council that has not been approved by the Council.

I do not want to be difficult about it, but it does not seem to me to be very much ^{more} absurd to refer to recommendations of individual members -- absurd as that is -- than it is to include the observations of individual members. I do not intend to vote one way or another but my suggestion is this, that if anyone does recollect the arrangement that the representative of the Soviet Union has referred to, I think it would be useful if he would bring the matter up now.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): That will be finally clarified later. I would therefore ask members of the Council to continue the discussion of this report. As I said
/before, we

page 23, "Suffrage." If there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Suffrage" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): "Judicial Organization" -- if there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Judicial Organization" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will now go on to Chapter 3, "Economic Advancement," the first section, "General Economic Policies." If there are no remarks, we will go on to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "General Economic Policies" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will go on to page 26, "Copra Industry." If there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Copra Industry" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The next, "Phosphate Mining," at the bottom of page 26 -- if there are no remarks, we will go on to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Phosphate Mining" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): "Commercial Fishing" -- if there are no remarks, we will vote on it. It will probably be adopted by 5 votes.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Commercial Fishing" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): It was adopted by 5 votes, as I said. "Standards of Living" -- I see no remarks. We will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Standards of Living" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): "Taxation," in the middle of page 29 -- if there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Taxation" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Chapter 4, "Social Advancement," "Wage Disparities" -- we will vote on this section.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Wage Disparities" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We are now discussing the fourth Chapter, "Social Advancement." If there are no remarks on the first section, "Wage Disparities," we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Wage Disparities" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): On page 31, the section on "Public Health." If there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The section entitled "Public Health" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Chapter 5, the last Chapter, "Educational Advancement" -- I think we can vote on this as a whole. If there are no remarks, we will vote on it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Chapter entitled "Educational Advancement" was adopted by 5 votes to none.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I have abstained because I do not see the meaning of the voting; I did not wish to waste the time of the Council asking for a vote by division. The only reasonable thing that I can say is that my own observations are well summarized and I could vote in favour of them. As to the other parts, it is only a question of whether they express properly the views of the members concerned.

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Trusteeship Council): I have before me the verbatim record of the meeting after this informal meeting of the drafting committee. I will read what Mr. Soldatov said:

"Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): What is the President's decision with regard to the form of the report that we are going to prepare? Will the form be the same as in the fourth session? That is, that Part I will be the summary of conditions, Part II, conclusions and recommendations...and Part III, observations, conclusions and recommendations of the individual delegations.

"Or does the President suggest a different form for the report?"

"The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I do not think that the question arises because it was already put to a vote at our last session. The vote was not reserved to the work of the third or fourth sessions, it was a vote of a general character. Therefore I do not think it is appropriate to return to this problem which has already been cleared up."

As I have said before, it has not been "cleared up."

May I just say that in the report on Togoland under French Administration, Part II was "Observations Made by Individual Members of the Council," and so I do not think the Secretariat has overstepped its powers in using the same formula that we had used last year. In view of the lack of an indication by the Council of how to do it, I think it was proper for us to follow last year's procedure.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I must admit that when the representative of the USSR, in our sub-committee, spoke of "fair play" and "foul play," I did not understand him. My understanding was that he asked whether we will have three parts in our report, and that proposals which were not accepted would be inserted in the third part. This was my understanding and the understanding,
/apparently

apparently, of the President.

If there is a question of "foul play" -- I do not ascribe any "foul play" to the representative of the USSR -- but if one wished to be suspicious, one could say: You ask us: "Is it clear that it will be like last time, namely 'Observations, Conclusions of Individual Members,'" and the President replies: "It seems to me that was what had been decided last time. It is agreed, it will be like last time." Then the question: "Therefore, it is clearly understood: Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Members." The reply is "yes," but later it is seen that last time there had been neither conclusions nor recommendations. Who was responsible for foul play? I am not accusing him but I do not admit that he should accuse, because no one ever intended to commit a breach of faith. I must admit I did not understand what he was saying about gentleman's agreements and foul play. I did not know what it was all about.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I stated quite clearly, both at the unofficial meeting and in the Council, as is shown by the verbatim report, that the report would consist of three parts, and Part III would clearly be called "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of Individual Delegations." I said that, and then I said that it should not be "Individual Delegations" but "Individual Members of the Council."

I remember that the representative of the United Kingdom indicated that, and I reaffirmed that naturally it should be "Individual Members of the Council."

Therefore the position was quite clear, both at the unofficial meeting and at the Council meeting itself. Obviously members of the Trusteeship Council are free, if they think that a new decision should be taken, to reject the agreement and understanding reached at the beginning of the session and accept a new decision. Obviously every member of the Council will act in a way which is decided by his own conscience. But the USSR delegation, from the experience of this unofficial meeting, will make the necessary conclusions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I think the representative of the USSR is quite correct in saying that he made that suggestion. What I wonder is, what happened after that? Was that suggestion accepted? My recollection is that it was never even discussed. A question was asked of the President and it went no further.

I cannot remember having agreed to anything. I am not going to take part in any breach of a "gentleman's agreement" or any other agreement. I remember the representative of the USSR raising that point, but I cannot remember that any decision was taken by the Council.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France) (Interpretation from French): I did not want to speak on this matter, but I believe that the representative of the USSR, in a way that I must take as personal, and in a general way, has gone rather far.

Regarding the committee on Nauru, I told the Council earlier that the question of whether the word "Recommendations" could be inserted in the title had not been discussed. I repeat that the question of whether or not to use the word "Recommendations" was not discussed in the committee on Nauru.

It is therefore not a case of telling me today that I said one thing, and am now saying something else. That is not accurate and not in accordance with the facts.

/As far as

As far as the matter itself is concerned, I do not quite remember, but it is probable that we may have asked the committee, or that a delegate may have asked the committee, whether the title would be "Conclusions, Recommendations and Observations of Individual Members of the Council." I may have said: "Yes." But, as the representative of Belgium said, that does not imply the taking of a special position regarding those recommendations.

I do not give this very great attention. In point of fact, as far as I am concerned, we have not tried to seek the exact title of that part of the report, nor was it incumbent upon us to do so. Therefore it is hardly a matter now of putting anyone in one position or another, and discussing the phrase anyone suggested for that title.

It is necessary to recall that the words of any member could be understood in a certain way, without one knowing that they are being understood thus.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I must say, that what said in the sub-committee of four which was considering the preparation of the report on the Island of Nauru does not bind the Council. It can be given as an indication of what was felt or understood by four members of the Council, but it would in no way bind the Council as a whole.

We are not discussing the report on Nauru at present. We are discussing the draft report on the Pacific Islands. As far as what happened regarding the indications given us by the Secretariat, the question seems to be a moot one.

In the last report examined by the Council, that which referred to Togoland under French Administration, the title was "Observations of Individual Members of the Council" -- only "Observations". But we shall verify the matter and see what were the titles of the other three reports that were discussed and adopted at our last session.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I am very reluctant to enter this discussion because I think that this is a very unimportant point. I do not see why we waste time over it. I think that the label of the part is not a matter of real importance, whether we call it "Observations", "Observations and Conclusions", or "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations."

/Furthermore

Furthermore, as I understand the representative of Iraq has made a proposal, it would seem to me that we should vote on it: a proposal that, whether there was an understanding before or not, the desire of the Council now is to adopt the suggestion which he made.

I think maybe I ought to contribute my memory of ^{what} took place, for what it may be worth. The representative of the USSR refers to a small conversation which took place in the President's office, behind closed doors. During that conversation we were discussing the procedure to be followed in the making of these reports.

You will remember that there was a question whether we should follow the procedure which had been adopted at the last session, or whether we should try out some new form. We concluded, all of us being present, that we should follow the procedure of last year.

The question then arises as to what that procedure was. I have here before me the report on Togoland, document T/278, where you will see that the corresponding title is: "Observations made by Individual Members of the Council." I believe that, in the conclusions that we reached, which were to follow the practice of last year, there may have been some misunderstanding regarding the title. I think I remember the representative of the USSR stating that the title should be, as he says, "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations made by Individual Members of the Council."

To that proposal, however, there was no agreement. I remember, myself, feeling that the title used in the procedure of last year was a much better one, although not a matter of great importance, so that I did not mention it.

We then came into this room, and in the full Council meeting we discussed the matter on the basis, as I understood it, that we would follow the practice of last year. The representative of the USSR, in describing the practice of last year, may well have used his thought of what the title should be, that is, "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations made by Individual Members of the Council." If he did use that language I am sure that the matter was not discussed by the Council and, so far as my memory serves me, there was no agreement by the Council on the matter.

It seems to me that we are wasting a lot of time. I cannot see where charges of bad faith enter the picture at all, and I hope we shall drop such charges and proceed to the vote on the suggestion put forward by the representative of Iraq.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I do not know whether it is necessary to vote on the Iraqi proposal because the Secretariat has just sought out the precedent. It will be noted in the verbatim record of the forty-sixth meeting of the Trusteeship Council on 24 March 1949, a discussion regarding the title to be adopted for Part III of the report. The report with the title "Observations Only" was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

There is an observation by Mr. Hood of Australia, which says:

"...the President's description of Part III as including individual observations which were not submitted for the Council's approval or were not approved by the Council. It merely emphasized the title of Part III."

There is also an observation by the President, Mr. Liu Chieh, which says:

"..."Observations by Individual Members." I think it is clear enough. I think the explanation would only raise questions of doubt in the minds of representatives to the General Assembly." And the representative of Mexico, Mr. Padilla Nervo, said:

"...we have already voted on the text that the President suggested; I think that it is enough qualification to say 'individual observations.' It will mean to any member of the General Assembly that only the delegation which made a certain observation is responsible for it, and that is enough."

Therefore there was a formal decision taken by the Council, and unless there is a different opinion in the Council now, I do not think we need go back on the previous decision. The decision was formal. I note again that/^{decision}in document T/P.V.162, the verbatim record of the forty-sixth meeting of the Trusteeship Council, held on Thursday, 24 March 1949.

Therefore we shall vote on the entire report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I should like to say that thus the majority of the members of the Council reject the understanding adopted at the beginning of the session, in our unofficial conversations and also in the Council, that this Part should be called "Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations."

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): As I said before, we shall go on to the vote on the report as a whole; that is, the report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, document T/378.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The report was adopted by 8 votes to none.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS: New Guinea, Year Ended 30 June 1948 -
REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (document T/377)

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I shall ask Mr. Noriega, representative of Mexico, who was Chairman of the drafting committee, to formally present this document to the Trusteeship Council and to make whatever observations he considers necessary.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I have the satisfaction of telling this Council that the drafting committee on the report on New Guinea adopted this report unanimously.

The members of this committee worked arduously in a spirit of understanding and compromise and that is why, one way or another, we were able to adopt, either textually or in essence, the different suggestions made by the members of the Council during the investigation of the report on New Guinea.

I wish to add that, having had the help of the alternate representative on the Australian delegation, as well as that of the special representative -- these gentlemen showed a great spirit of co-operation and understanding -- it was much easier for the committee to manage a unanimous adoption of this report. As a matter of practice, I must ask the President to allow us to vote on this report chapter by chapter. A few moments ago, when we were voting on the Nauru report, I thought we were competing somewhat with the Rockettes of the Radio City Music Hall in this matter of raising our hands minute by minute and in such a mathematical and automatic way. I think we could vote on this matter by chapters.

First of all, we could say: Does any member have any objection to a certain paragraph, or does he request a partial vote. Otherwise it is rather uncomfortable and tiring. Besides this, I think that the change made in the title of Part III will have to be done in Part III of this report and the title thereto.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I very gladly accept the suggestion of the representative of Mexico. I think we could gain a great deal of time and we could take a less automatic vote than that which we took on the report on the Pacific Islands. I think we can vote on this matter chapter by chapter.

I should like to ask the members of the Council whether they have any remarks to make. If there are no remarks, we shall go on immediately to the vote. Are there any remarks on the Introduction or the entire Part I, "Outline of General Conditions as Stated in the Report of the Administering Authority and by the Special Representative."? If there are no remarks, we shall vote on that immediately.

If the representative of the USSR is going to make his reservation of principle which he made in the case of the last report, I do not think it necessary for him to say so because his statement the first time covers the two reports.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain why I will not be in a position to vote for Part I of the report on New Guinea, document T/377.

The USSR delegation must repeat that on the basis of its attitude on principle, Part I of any report on any Trust Territory must consist of the decisions of the Trusteeship Council which were taken on the basis of the consideration of this matter, and not only on the basis of information supplied by the Administering Authority.

In view of the fact that Part I of the report on New Guinea is based only on the information of the Administering Authority and does not take into consideration the discussion of the report of the Administering Authority and does not take into consideration the remarks and observations made in this connexion, the USSR delegation cannot support Part I of document T/377 and shall vote against it.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now vote on Part I of the report on New Guinea, document T/377.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part I of the report was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to Part II.

Is the representative of the USSR in a position to vote on the entire Part II? Otherwise I shall have to follow the suggestion of voting on it in parts.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have a few corrections which deal with the section on political advancement. When we deal with the section on political advancement, I should like to introduce these corrections.

I should also like to ask that all the recommendations presented in Part II of the report be voted on separately.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Very well. We shall start with Chapter 1, "General".

Will those in favour of the adoption of paragraph 1 please raise their hands.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I thought that each recommendation would be read and that the substance of the recommendation would be accepted. Here we have recommendations of the Council, and therefore it seems to me that we should not pass directly to a vote, but read each recommendation, after which perhaps members of the Council will have additions and corrections to introduce.

In Part III there is a different situation, for Part III can be voted as a whole since no additions or corrections are called for.

As regards Part II, however, I personally, for example, am in the position of having to introduce certain corrections. If they should be accepted, I would vote for these recommendations; if they should not be accepted, I could not vote for the recommendations, but should have either to vote against them or to abstain.

Therefore, it seems to me that in Part II each recommendation must be considered separately since these recommendations were presented to us by a committee consisting of only four members.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not see that it is practical to waste time reading texts that are very well known to all of us. There is no object in reading out the texts again here. As far as my delegation is concerned, it is an effort and a special sacrifice to be present at these morning meetings: we should be working in our offices, and it is a shame that we should have to waste double or triple the necessary time when we could work just as efficiently with more speed.

I would beg the representative of the Soviet Union that he withdraw his request to have the texts read. Let the President ask:

/"Paragraph 1:

"Paragraph 1: are there any objections or remarks?" The representative of the Soviet Union can then make his amendments; we vote on those, accept or reject them, after which we go on to paragraphs 2, 3, and so on. Otherwise we are going to waste fifteen minutes reading out a text with which we are well acquainted; I do not think anybody comes to the Council to vote on texts without having read them at least the night before. I do not think we should take such an important document as this and, on the spur of the moment, present amendments. This is not a subject for inspiration: we have not got a piano in front of us; we have got an important document before us which I think we have all studied since yesterday.

I therefore formally request that the text should not be read, but that the President merely refer to the paragraph which he is putting to the vote. Any representative who has an amendment to propose can then propose it; we can vote on that amendment and then go on to the next paragraph. Otherwise it will be 2 o'clock in the afternoon and we shall still not have finished with this report.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): If there are no objections on the part of the Council, I shall not read the text, but shall merely call out the number of the paragraph. I shall ask if there are any remarks or amendments; if there are none, we shall go on to the vote.

Part II, "Conclusions and Recommendations approved by the Council": Chapter 1, "General". Are there any remarks on paragraph 1, page 7? We shall vote on paragraph 1, "General Advancement".

A vote was taken by show of hands

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Are there any remarks on paragraph 2? We shall vote on paragraph 2.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Are there any remarks on paragraph 3? We shall vote on paragraph 3.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Are there any remarks on paragraph 4? We shall vote on paragraph 4, "Peaceful/^{Penetration}"

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I note that we have fallen back into the Rockettes system of voting: we are voting only paragraph by paragraph again.

I ask that the representative of the Soviet Union tell us what remarks he has on Chapter 2 before we start voting on it; we can then vote together on paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 of this Chapter.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): But the representative of the Soviet Union asked for the vote to be taken paragraph by paragraph. This we have to do; he has the right to vote in favour or against, or to abstain on any or every paragraph. We must follow the rules of procedure, and that is one of them.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): We could work much faster if we gave our explanations and voted either for or against. I could say that I intended to abstain on a certain paragraph for such-and-such a reason. I prefer to vote rather than to give explanations.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I should willingly follow whatever suggestion would permit us to work quicker, but we must follow the rules of procedure.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from French): To paragraph 5, the Soviet delegation introduces the following amendment: to delete point (a); in point (b), to substitute for "study the possibility of establishing", the words: "to establish"; and in point (c), to delete the word "eventual", so that the final phrase reads: "leading to the establishment of an indigenous majority".

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will vote on these three amendment presented by the representative of the USSR; first on the amendment to delete sub-paragraph (a).

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The President suggests a vote at this time. I should like to explain my amendments.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I think the amendments are self-explanatory but if the representative of the USSR considers it necessary to explain his reasons for presenting these amendments, the Council will listen to them.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR introduces these changes in the text in view of its attitude in principle which was formulated when the report of the Administering Authority for New Guinea was considered. In particular, the USSR delegation indicated when this report was examined that there are no legislative, executive or judicial organs in which the local population participates in this Territory.

The USSR delegation then stated that the Trust Territory of New Guinea at the beginning of 1949 was united with the neighbouring colony of Papua and that the Government of Australia passed a law according to which the Trust Territory of New Guinea was united with Papua in a so-called administrative union.

The delegation of the USSR noted that this unification touches upon all the aspects of life in the Trust Territory and puts the political and economic development of the Territory in a position dependent upon the development of the colonial territory of Papua. This unification interferes with, and makes impossible, the further development of this Trust Territory towards independence. The establishment of this union brings about the full administrative and political annexation of this Territory and means the violation of its special status. It is a factual annexation of this Trust Territory.

The USSR delegation considers the creation of this union to be incompatible with the main objectives and tasks of the International Trusteeship System. In this connexion, the USSR delegation introduced a proposal to the effect that the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority the creation in the Trust Territory of
/legislative and

legislative and administrative bodies which will not be subject to any other bodies created on the basis of the union of the Trust Territory of New Guinea with the colony of Papua, and the introduction of legislative and other measures which would assure the participation of the native population in the legislative, executive and judicial bodies of the Territory.

This is the attitude of the USSR delegation in principle toward this matter. The USSR delegation therefore suggests, on the basis of this position, the deletion of sub-paragraph (a) and the introduction of appropriate changes in sub-paragraphs (b) and (c).

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will vote first on the deletion of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 5.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The first USSR amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on the amendment to replace the words in sub-paragraph (b) "study the possibility of establishing" by the words "to establish."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The second USSR amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The vote will now be on the third amendment to delete the word "eventual."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The third USSR amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on paragraph 5 as it appears in the drafting committee's text.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to know the result of the vote on the third amendment.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The vote was 2 votes in favour with 6 against. A vote will now be taken on paragraph 5 in its original form.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 6 under the heading "Indigenous organs."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 7 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 7.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 8.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 9 under the heading "Administrative service."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on section 3 "Economic Advancement", paragraph 10 "General"

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 11, "Agriculture."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 12, "Co-operative societies."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 9 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 13, "Taxation."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 6 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will now go on to section 4 "Social Advancement, and vote first on paragraph 14 under the heading "Human rights and fundamental freedoms."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 15.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French):
I suggest an amendment, that is, to add at the end of the text,
"contrary to the Charter or to the Trusteeship agreement."
I could not vote for a proposal which forbids discrimination
in such cases where discrimination is in favour of the local
population.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will vote
on that amendment. The amendment suggested by the representative of
Belgium is to add at the end of paragraph 15, after the words
"which may involve discrimination" the words "contrary to the Charter
or to the Trusteeship agreement." We will vote on that amendment.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: We will vote on paragraph 15 with that
amendment.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none.

Mr. NORTIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish):
I voted on the paragraph as it was amended but not interpreting
it as Mr. Ryckmans did, that is, the possibility of discrimination
where the discrimination is to the benefit of the indigenous
population. I do not think discrimination can be beneficial to
anybody. I accept the idea, of course, of seeing that the laws be
in agreement with the Charter and the Trusteeship agreement, but
never with the idea that any type of discrimination whatsoever can
be beneficial to anybody. We know perfectly well that discrimi-
nation, by its mere existence, proves the existence of a social evil
and social vice.

I wish these reasons for my vote to be noted.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French) I
will take note and I will remember that the representative of Mexico
thinks that discrimination is evil which forbids Europeans to buy
land belonging to the natives.

/ The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Note will be taken of this exchange of views in the summary records.

I now put to the vote paragraph 16, "Wages and labour conditions."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 17.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 18.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 18 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 19.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 20, "Public Health:"

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 20 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 21, "Penal organization."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 21 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 22.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 22 was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Section 5, "Educational Advancement." Paragraph 23.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 23 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Paragraph 24.

/ Mr. RYCKMANS:

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I would like to introduce a proposal that instead of the words, "a further increase in expenditure" we say "a further development of education."

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I did not quite understand the suggestion of the representative of Belgium.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I could vote for this resolution if, instead of the words "a further increase in expenditure" we say "further development of education."

I do not ask the ^{Administering Authority} / to spend more money but I want it to assure more education.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Instead of saying "undertake a further increase in expenditure" the representative of Belgium wants us to say "further development of education."

Does the Council accept that amendment?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): We have come to the adoption of item 24 on "Educational Advancement" in conjunction with the Administering Authority concerned -- it was that Authority who suggested this text. Mr. Ryckmans will understand that the implications of his amendment are very great; they go very far back; because to say "a great development of education" may infer development by better curricula, increase of working hours of the teachers, but not spending more money on education.

As I say, this text was drafted in consultation with the Administering Authority -- it was what took most time in the Committee and besides this we spoke about it amongst ourselves, and the Administering Authority agreed with it. Only in this matter of education did we ask the Administering Authority to increase the budget, and if this is satisfactory to the Administering Authority I do not see why Mr. Ryckmans should object to it.

It is not a matter of principle; it is a practical question which is of concern to the Administering Authority who accepted it. I do not see why this amendment should be made, the text having been accepted by the Administering Authority -- unless Australia has to ask money from Belgium for New Guinea; hat I do not know.

/ Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium):

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): If the Administering Authority agrees to spend more money on education, so much the better. But my reasons for replacing the words "further increase in expenditure" by the words "development of education" are the following.

We can not request the Administering Authority to increase its budgetary item, for this means that at the same time we will ask it to reduce some other budgetary item. Australia supplies a large sum for the support of this Territory and if it can spend more then certainly it is all to the good. But we cannot agree with a situation in which we consider ourselves as having the right to demand that expenditure be increased for one item when it will have to be decreased for another item.

That is why the Belgian delegation could not vote for the present text.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I would like to appeal to the representative of Belgium to withdraw his amendment.

/ On the question

On the question of money I have always tried to be very practical. I completely agree with the representative of Belgium on the principle. I would not ask the Administering Authority to just spend money; maybe they cannot. Where is the money to come from?

Here I believe there is a special case. If the Government of Australia is willing to accommodate the Council on this point I do not think there is going to be much difficulty. The island is a very small one; the population is small in number. I do not think there is much difficulty here and I hope we shall pass the paragraph as it is.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): As far as I am informed, the special representative of the Administering Authority/^{who}worked with the sub-committee on this did not give any express agreement to the inclusion of this suggestion. On the other hand, I do not think that any specific objection was raised to it and, therefore, I think the Council can look at it without any suggestion that there was a commitment on the part of the Administering Authority. In that case the arguments used by the representative of Belgium, that is, the relevant ones for the Council -- they have been followed before in regard to proposals for expenditure of money -- would seem to apply in this case. I see no special reason for making an exception in this case.

After all, the Administering Authority is very well aware of the wishes of the Council in regard to education both in last year's report and again in this one. The mere suggestion of an increase in expenditure is not a helpful one to the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Given the explanations that have been presented by the representative of Australia, will the representative of Belgium maintain or press his amendment?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Yes.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I just want to verify a question of principle. I believe that what is involved here is not merely a question of increasing the expenditure but of spending more money for education, of increasing the proportion of the budget devoted to

/education, because

education, because as observed during the discussions in the Council there was an increase in the proportion of the budget devoted to education from 1.59% to 3.2% and the recommendation is to further increase the proportion of the budget devoted to education.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): The observations made by the representative of the Philippines make me grateful to him as they show how ^{important} my proposal is. As he has just said, this proposal clearly means for the representative of the Philippines that it is necessary to reduce the proportion of budgetary expenses for certain items -- we are not saying which. To say that it is necessary to increase the percentage of the budget applicable to education means that it is necessary to reduce the percentage applicable to some other item. As for myself, I do not think that I have the right to tell that to Australia without adding "You are spending too much for police, you are spending too much for the judiciary, you are spending too much for administration or you are spending too much for the building of roads etc."

We do not have the right to ask a country to change the proportion of its budgetary appropriation without telling it where its expenses are excessive.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): If a budget were something as inflexible as a block of steel which could not in the least be stretched, I would be in agreement with Mr. Ryckmans when he says that one can never make such recommendations to the Administering Authorities in the budgetary field. But we know precisely that a natural law of budgets is either their constant increase or their decrease or their stabilization.

If an Administering Authority is incapable of increasing its budget year by year, then that means that it has failed in its task. The same thing would be true of any government which does not increase its budget as time goes on. It would be an index of absolute failure. I do not think that any Administering Authority here would be disposed to accept the impossibility of increasing its budgets for significant objectives. This would be an admission of failure.

As to the proportion of the budget, I will recall to the members of the committee that there had been provided that no fixed figures would appear in the draft of the report and a formula was adopted,

/in order to

in order to meet Australia half way for the sake of a friendly handling of the matter, not to mention any figures because it was difficult to know precisely what was meant by 1.5, 1.7 or 3.4 etc.

Now the proposal of Mr. Ryckmans is introducing new complications. Perhaps in these conditions, citing the attitude of other members of the committee, I could ask that a clause be included in this recommendation that the proportion of increases in the budget be verified. That is the direction in which the proposal of Mr. Ryckmans tends to lead us. I do not think that he would desire that we make a recommendation to which the Administering Authority would answer: "We have taken note of it but it is something which we cannot support."

Where is the greater harm, where is the question of principle? Is the principle that the Council, so limited, is in a position to recommend absolutely nothing? I do not think that that is the intention. I rather think that the Council is fully authorized to recommend to the Administering Authority an increase in the budget for education because it is explicitly provided for in the Charter that education be promoted and when 1.3 and 1.5 is devoted to this purpose we have a right to say that this proportion is not in accordance with our obligation to promote education.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now take a vote on the amendment presented by the representative of Belgium -- the amendment which consists of substituting in paragraph 24 the words: "a further development of education" for the words "increase in expenditures."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Belgian amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 3.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will proceed to a vote on paragraph 24.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We will now vote on paragraph 25, "Miscellaneous."

/A vote was

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 25 was adopted by 9 votes to none.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to explain my vote on Part II. I would like to say that in view of the fact that the Soviet Union amendment dealing with the important question of the development of the Trust Territory in respect of political, economic and social advancement as well as in the field of education, has been rejected, the Soviet Union delegation has not considered it possible to vote in favour of the other recommendations contained in Part II.

The recommendation would have otherwise been, for the most part, perfectly acceptable had our amendments been adopted. I think that this explanation is sufficiently clear.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I would like to suggest that we vote on Part III en bloc, just one vote.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I was going to make the same suggestion to the Council. If there is no objection, we shall proceed to a vote on the whole of Part III.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Part III of the report was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to a vote on the report as a whole.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The Report on New Guinea was adopted by 9 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall meet again at 3.

The meeting rose at 1.02 p.m.