

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



GENERAL

T/PV 291
12 June 1950

ENGLISH
DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT

MASTER

14 JUN 1950

4	1	11	11	11
---	---	----	----	----

Seventh session

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Monday, 12 June 1950, at 2 p.m.

President: Mr. Max HENRIQUEZ-URENA (Dominican Republic)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.291 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

QUESTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGIME FOR THE JERUSALEM AREA AND THE PROTECTION
OF THE HOLY PLACES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 303 (IV) OF 9 DECEMBER 1949)

On the invitation of the President, Mr. Eban, Representative of Israel, Mr. Rouchdy, Representative of Egypt, Mr. Ashu, Representative of Syria, and Mr. Garreau, Former President of the Trusteeship Council, took their places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I extend a cordial welcome to those who are present to participate in the discussions of the Council and to render their assistance and co-operation.

As the representatives know, the first part of the task assigned to the Trusteeship Council by the General Assembly has been accomplished; that is to say, a statute has been drafted and, in the interest of the implementation of that statute, Mr. Garreau has already informed the Council of the negotiations which he undertook during the interval between the last session and the present one.

Since the contents of Mr. Garreau's report are familiar to representatives, I should like to hear the ideas and suggestions of the Council, as well as of those other representatives who have taken their seats at the table.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am now in a position to make a few remarks on the report of Mr. Garreau, the former President of the Council, and with your leave, Mr. President, I shall proceed to make them.

The report which Mr. Garreau put before the Council on the question of an international regime for Jerusalem is the outcome of what must have been a thrilling journey to ancient Rome. Its shortness and modesty leave out the zeal and ardour with which the author addressed himself to his task, as, indeed, the dust and hardship of the trip, and while he could have made sure before leaving Geneva whether the journey was really necessary, nevertheless, indomitable as he is, he embarked on it valiantly; all, no doubt, in the service of this Council and of internationalization, of some sort though it is. This was a worthy task -- one could almost say a holy one -- taken in a Holy Year to an eternal city. The resources of the United Nations could not have served a

more notable journey, and for that the Council must accord its former President the appreciation that is his due.

One must read between the lines of the report, since there is very little in the lines themselves except for the evident happiness which the former President seems to have derived from treating with the Israeli plenipotentiaries. I would be the last man to envy Mr. Garreau his happiness, no matter in whose arms it may be. I wish him all the happiness he deserves; indeed, I have always done so in my fashion. I feel sure that not even the elusiveness of his negotiators could have diminished the enchantment of the occasion. It certainly had an appropriate background in the Roman ruins. What charms he may have drawn from his contacts should have been enhanced by the centuries portrayed in stone around him. One may surmise that while he was not overburdened with his heavy work and could obtain time to visit the sites in Rome, its ruins must have served to remind him that such worldly happiness is ephemeral and that political marriages are of doubtful value. What a pity his Israeli friends could not promise him internationalization, or the spot where they had embraced each other in Rome would have been immortalized and, in time, taken its proper place among the palaces of the Caesars.

The report of the former President quenches no thirst. It leaves the matter where it was.

He has, however, seen fit to transmit from the Israeli Authorities a document of unusual dexterity. It aims more at diversion than at co-operation. They have rejected the General Assembly Resolution in no uncertain terms and, therefore, there is no question of their co-operation under that Resolution. But, having realized the weight of world opinion in favour of internationalization they found a byway which they are now exploring at the expense of the Trusteeship Council, with the purpose of putting others in the wrong and themselves in the right.

It would be difficult to find, even among the Israelis--and, in fact, among the Israelis -- a responsible man who could say that this plan of theirs could have a chance of being applied. That is exactly what they want: a plan that they know will not go through.

And yet they can tell the world how co-operative they are, how willing they are to internationalize somebody else's territory. Such tactics should not mislead the world. If the Israeli Authorities are to co-operate, their way is clear: they should do so under the General Assembly Resolution of 9 December 1949, that is, full international regime for Jerusalem.

The Israeli plan is not new. It calls for some sort of internationalization only for the Holy Places under a United Nations Administrator. This possibility had been considered more than once in the past and rejected on many grounds. As a matter of fact, it was part of what was called some months ago the "Garreau Plan". This had occupied the Trusteeship Council for some time in Geneva and was found inadequate. But Mr. Garreau never gave up hope. One would understand a certain loyalty ^{on his part} to that plan. It is his child, although not a legitimate one, since other people have proposed it in the last session of the General Assembly.

But his persistent attachment to it in the face of convincing facts to the contrary is somewhat surprising. He himself had once marshalled lucid arguments against it by implication. I seem to remember that some years ago when, among others, the small chasm that now yawns between the two ends of this table, kept Mr. Garreau and myself from leaping at each other's throats, at that time he was the implacable defender of the principle of complete internationalization. With a zeal that would have done credit to the early Christians -- not to say Christian converts to Zionism -- he held forth second to none in this holy task. Nothing short of complete internationalization would meet his desires. Arguments were put forward with the force of a Cartesian logic. What changes

time has wrought on these ideas are now, alas, only too evident. Then the winds were blowing east, and Mr. Garreau blew with it. Now the wind is blowing west, and he is again blowing with it. The illustrious predecessor of the President has twice gone with the wind. Let us hope that some time the Trusteeship Council will divert him to reality.

Why is the internationalization of only the Holy Places impractical, unjust and, therefore, unacceptable? It is easier than easy to give away someone else's property. It is easy to tell a third man to go and have the property of a second man, and ^{when he will have done so} will he please give the first man five per cent -- no doubt for putting forward the clever idea. If the third man is not careful enough he will be caught in the trap. If the second man is not foxy enough he will be duped. But in all this the first man is giving not a thing.

What the Israeli Authorities are proposing is precisely that. They are telling the Trusteeship Council to go and get the territory now under the occupation of the other authority and, when the Trusteeship Council has secured it the Israelis are to be guaranteed the right to worship there. This is the five per cent.

But the question arises that, even if such a transaction were feasible, what are the Israelis giving in return? Admittedly, the Holy Shrines, including the Wailing Wall and Rachel's Tomb, both sacred to the Jews are under Jordan ^{now,} authority/ and the Israelis would like free access to them. One would expect that, to secure this result, they would be prepared to give something substantial in return, at least for the appearance of co-operation. But short of telling the Trusteeship Council how to conduct its business, they are giving nothing substantial. All must come from the other side. I have never underrated Israeli intelligence, but at times I have marvelled to what extent they can go in underrating other people's intelligence.

The territory which the Israeli plan proposes to take over is so small that neither the plan itself would have any semblance of international regime, nor would the area be ^a viable and a going concern, both economically and administratively.

To be sure, the Israeli paper prudently avoids labelling the term "international regime" for what they propose is really not that but a curatorship of the Holy Shrines only and, although they do say that a United Nations Governor could be appointed to those shrines, the name is certainly a misnomer. There would be no authority or work for a Governor because there would

be nothing to govern. If it is merely curatorship we need not go to the trouble of either establishing a separate regime or sending a governor.

To give an interesting analogy: The Israeli Authorities are themselves aware, no doubt, that the Arabs since time immemorial, were the curators of even some of the Christian Holy Shrines. I think I am right in saying that the curator of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre had always been an Arab. Many a time the Christian denominations have differed among themselves as to who should have the honour of the curatorship of one shrine or another. The result was that they entrusted it to the Moslem Arabs. So far, there have been no complaints.

The area proposed for this curatorship is so small as to be impossible to maintain as a corpus separatum. Economically, ethnically, administratively, it is closely connected either with the rest of Jerusalem or with the territory now held by Jordan. It cannot exist by itself. If it does, it would be accepting willingly a fatal blockade, which, in the long run, would make it easy prey to the other part of Jerusalem, the New City. With the present state of mutual suspicion happily existing between Jews and Arabs, no one should expect that the old City would be willing to sign its own death warrant by alone accepting a separate existence.

The Israeli plan overlooks a great fact which, true to form, they good-humoredly pass under the counter. This fact is that not only the few shrines in the old City are sacred, but all the City of Jerusalem is sacred -- the City and its environs too. This is the City of the great prophets and the one hundred and one saints. Can one say that the small locality of Bethlehem is not sacred or not part of the Holy City? And yet, Bethlehem is neither in the old City nor is it included in the Israeli plan.

Need I demonstrate how utterly unconfirming is the Israeli plan to the General Assembly's Resolution? I shall have occasion presently to recite part of that Resolution, and it will be seen how vast and complete is its scope of an international regime. Suffice it to say here that the General Assembly never envisaged a curatorship for a small fragment of Jerusalem torn, so to speak, from its context.

I have recited these arguments not merely to show the invalidity of the curatorship plan, the impracticability and injustice of it, but also to point out the extent of our willingness to accept the total principle. I have shown that neither the former Garreau plan, nor the Israeli plan, which Mr. Garreau supports, can go any distance towards solving the problem. It is painful to see a man of ^{the} imagination and passion of Mr. Garreau husbanding a piecemeal plan bereft of both realism and justice. I do not ask Mr. Garreau to adopt my policy or to have a soul like mine; but I do ask him to meet me, in logic and wisdom, halfway in the service of a great principle, of which he himself had once been a staunch defender. It is apt, perhaps, to quote to him a line from a great French work fitting the occasion. Henri de Montherlant puts into the mouth of the King of Portugal of other times, these words in addressing his prodigal son: "You believe that I am scolding you and that this is not like me. That is not quite the case. I am scolding you because you did not aspire to the heights to which I myself aspire. Like the King of de Montherlant I do not reproach Mr. Garreau for not being like myself, but rather for not aspiring to the height of my ambition. If Mr. Garreau had not been swayed, or if he had steadfastly pursued his old stand, we would have marched hand in hand in a worthy cause till, in God's good time, we would have prevailed upon the tardy and the insular to answer the prayer of the world and to preserve the Holy City for all mankind. But this was not to be. Mr. Garreau had made his pact elsewhere.

What is our stand? It is very simple. We ask a complete international regime for Jerusalem, intact and undismembered. We will accept nothing less. We shall not be influenced by manoeuvres of outside forces that do not have at heart the interest of that matter. We shall not be moved by the cries of hired propagandists who serve politics. We shall not consider valid artificial arguments concocted of malice and faithlessness designed to deceive the world and camouflage real long-term aims of aggression, from whatever source it may come. The same arguments that were marshalled against the partial internationalization

apply in a reverse manner in support of complete internationalization.

The President will probably remember that since the past General Assembly our policy had not changed. We stood then for complete internationalization and we stand for it now. We had not wanted it at the beginning but, in order to answer the prayer of mankind to preserve the Holy City for the three main religions to which it belongs, we deferred to it. We had said repeatedly that it was a sacrifice on our part. But we see no reason why such high motives and sacrifices should be compromised by political considerations which have no regard to the Holy City itself.

And this is not our opinion alone. All Christians rejoice in the prospect of preserving the Holy City from fractional domination. How many times Christian leaders have clamoured for it from their pulpits, how many letters were written to the Press from all types of people, how many men and women pray every day that such a thing may come to pass. Since when could devout Christians or devout Jews concur in the ugly sight of cutting the Holy Places into fragments and dismembering the one City in the world sacred to the three religions at once? Religions had, at various times in the past, served politics when the soul of man was pervaded by degradation; but never as now would politics make such a travesty of religion if such a dismemberment should be allowed to take place.

Against all the hope and clamour of mankind to internationalize the Holy City, we are now being asked to do it only partly and ignominiously. What sanctity that city may still have left to it when it will have been dismembered would serve as a monument to sin when the purpose is to preserve the virtue. The sense of right and wrong would have been stricken in the face of such an operation. If the Council is to embark upon a plan of this nature, so cold-bloodedly conceived as to shatter the holiness of the Holy City, it would be hoping against hope and sinning against sin and doing the wrong thing. The Israeli authorities, no doubt, would like to see us embarked on such a cause and become, in the words of Dante, "Hateful to God and his enemies."

It is a source of encouragement to the high-minded men and women who learn that the Vatican, a true defender of the faith, should favour the complete internationalization of Jerusalem. No voice in Christendom could speak with more authenticity and power than that of the Vatican. In a dispatch in the New York Times of May 31st last, its correspondent in Rome reported as follows:

"The new Israeli proposal to accept United Nations authority over the Holy Places in Jerusalem instead of the internationalization of the Holy City was considered inadequate today by well-informed Vatican circles. They have made it clear that the Pope's views concerning the Palestine question were unchanged. In many pronouncements over the past years Pope Pius has advocated that Jerusalem should become a separate area administered by the United Nations Trusteeship Council. The Vatican, according to these sources, still feels that nothing short of an international regime for both new and old Jerusalem would give sufficient guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places, ... provided means were supplied to the United Nations to carry out the task... The Vatican feels that the Jerusalem question is juridical and not political, in other words it believes that the city of the great religious shrines should be outside the jurisdiction of any government, and therefore protected against all political vicissitudes... The view of the Vatican circles was that Israel's latest plan -- and her former proposals -- stemmed from nationalist feeling that was primarily concerned with safeguarding Israeli sovereignty. This, they said, was a basic obstacle to understanding.

"The establishment of an international regime in Jerusalem means that that City will be administered not by one given nation, but by a body, which because it is international, has no nationality of its own."

Again, on 2 June, the New York Times published a letter from Father Hector Giuliotti, of the Franciscan Third Order, some passages of which are worth quoting. Father Giuliotti says:

"The members of our Franciscan Third Order were disturbed by the suggestion of some Protestant Bishops and other Americans for solving the Jerusalem question... The work of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations was criticized as 'based on neither a legal nor a practical reality.' We regret that while the whole world looks to the United Nations for a solution to the great problems of our times we are told that one of the main organs of the United Nations is doing illegal and impractical work... With regard to the problem of Jerusalem, we praise the Trusteeship Council for the work done in Geneva. The Statute of Jerusalem is a unique document, considered by scholars in international law as being of great value. With regard to the practical reality on which the statute is based, according to information we have received from Palestine and from the people of Jerusalem, both Jewish and Arab, we are convinced that the immediate implementation of the Resolutions of the General Assembly can no longer be postponed. We know from first hand information that the population of Jerusalem is eagerly awaiting the final step toward the internationalization of the City of Jerusalem. We therefore express the hope that this final step may be taken during this session of the Trusteeship Council."

What is the position now? The Council is operating under a Resolution of the General Assembly. This resolution reads in part:

"In relation to Jerusalem:

Believing that the principles underlying its previous resolutions concerning this matter, and in particular its resolution of 29 November 1947, represent a just and equitable settlement of the question,

1. To restate, therefore, its intention that Jerusalem should be placed under a permanent international regime, which should

envisage appropriate guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places, both within and outside Jerusalem and to confirm specifically the following provisions of General Assembly resolution 181 (II): (1) The City of Jerusalem shall be established as a corpus separatum under a special international regime and shall be administered by the United Nations; (2) The Trusteeship Council shall be designated to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority... and (3) The City of Jerusalem shall include the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Abu Dis; the most southern, Bethlehem; the most western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); the most northern, Shu'fat, as indicated on the attached sketch-map (annex B);

2. To request for this purpose that the Trusteeship Council at its next session, whether special or regular, complete the preparation of the Statute of Jerusalem (T/118/Rev.2) omitting the now inapplicable provisions, such as articles 32 and 39, and, without prejudice to the fundamental principles of the international regime for Jerusalem set forth in General Assembly resolution 181 (II) introducing therein amendments in the direction of its greater democratization, approve the Statute, and proceed immediately with its implementation. The Trusteeship Council shall not allow any actions taken by any interested Government or Governments to divert it from adopting and implementing the Statute of Jerusalem."

It is therefore a complete and all-round internationalization, with no strings, with which the General Assembly has charged the Council. This has been repeatedly made clear, and accepted, in the last session in Geneva. Accordingly, the Council drew up a statute which, notwithstanding some shortcomings, is still the best approach to the question, and the most faithful discharge of duty under the General Assembly's resolution. This was passed unanimously. The Council then requested its President to transmit the text of the statute to the governments of the two states at present occupying the area

and to request from the two governments their full co-operation in view of paragraph 2 of the General Assembly's resolution, namely, that the United Nations call upon those two states "to make formal undertakings at an early date and in the light of their obligation as members of the United Nations that they will approach these matters with goodwill and be guided by the terms of the present resolution."

The gist of the efforts of the former President is that no satisfactory result was obtained from either of the two parties in occupation of the City. That leaves the matter where it was on 4 April. But the Council is still under the operation of the General Assembly's resolution. The invocation contained in the last sentence of the second paragraph of that resolution, which I have just quoted, namely, "The Trusteeship Council shall not allow any actions taken by any interested government or governments to divert it from adopting and implementing the statute of Jerusalem", this invocation needs to be emphasized and understood in its full import. Nothing could be more clear or categorical. The Trusteeship Council, therefore, is still under obligation to put into effect the statute it prepared. This attitude we readily support, and would repeat here, in conclusion, that we consider this not only as an article of faith with this Council, not only as its express duty, not only as meeting the wishes of the world and all religions, not only as a point of honour with the United Nations, but also as the only right thing to do to preserve the Holy City from political designs and fratricidal strife.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I suggest to you, Mr. President, and to the Trusteeship Council that it is time, high time, long past time, for the Council to terminate this sorry farce and to bring to an end all further discussions on Jerusalem except those required to prepare its report to the General Assembly. It is, of course, in no way the fault of this Council that it has been obliged so fruitlessly, so unnecessarily and so extensively to waste time, energy and money on the impossible task imposed upon it by the General Assembly. The Trusteeship Council had no option in the light of the General Assembly's resolution of 9 December 1949.

This is neither the time nor the place to discuss that resolution, but I must not be misunderstood. There was a case to be made for the view that the status of Jerusalem had been disposed of by the General Assembly in its resolution of 29 November 1947, and that, notwithstanding all subsequent developments, the decision at that time that Jerusalem should be established as a corpus separatum should stand and, if necessary, be enforced, by means prescribed and provided by the General Assembly, against all who might object.

On the other hand, there was a case to be made for the contention that, in view of the tragic developments since 1947 and, in particular, in the light of the determined opposition of Israel and Jordan, a decision should be postponed until circumstances might have become more propitious or, alternatively, that an attempt would be made to reach an acceptable solution.

But there was, and is, no case -- no case at all -- to be made for the decision which was in fact reached by the Assembly instructing this Council to establish Jerusalem as a corpus separatum, irrespective of opposition and enjoining upon this Council -- and I am now quoting the exact words of the resolution in case they might be regarded as incredible -- "that it must not allow any actions taken by any interested government or governments from adopting and implementing the Statute of Jerusalem".

Now, it was obvious at the time to all who would think, just as it is obvious now to all whether they think or not, that the Trusteeship Council neither possessed nor possesses nor could or can obtain the means by which it could prevent itself from being, in the words of the resolution, "diverted" from implementing this decision in the face of resistance, and that this irresponsible provision -- the only reference to enforcement -- was in fact completely meaningless and ineffective.

The Trusteeship Council has done its very best, and great credit -- the very greatest credit -- must be extended to Ambassador Garreau for his determined and unflagging efforts, but the Council has failed, as it had to fail, and as any other body would similarly have failed in the circumstances. The Council failed, in short, because the Assembly failed; because the Assembly's resolution of 9 December 1949 was not a solution but an evasion.

The Council must now prepare its report to the General Assembly. This report, in the opinion of the New Zealand delegation, should be a short and succinct statement of the steps taken and attempted, and of their failure, and the report should, of course, include Ambassador Garreau's recent statement to the Council and the communication addressed to the Council by the Government of Israel on 26 May of this year.

The Council has no functions in this matter other than those imposed upon it by the General Assembly's resolution of December 1949. In particular, the Council has no authority and no mandate to consider the Israeli or any other alternative proposal. We should not, therefore, make any such attempt, and we should refrain -- and the New Zealand delegation most certainly will refrain -- from any further discussion in respect of Jerusalem except that which is necessary to prepare and approve the Trusteeship Council's report to the General Assembly. The problem should be returned where it belongs: to the General Assembly.

Mr. GARREAU (Former President of the Trusteeship Council)

(France) (Interpretation from French): I did not think today that I would have to speak again in my capacity as former President of the Council. I think that if the President had asked me to come and sit next to him it was in order to be able, if necessary, to reply to any observations made concerning the report which I submitted at the first meeting of this session, in order to set forth the results of the mission with which the Council had entrusted me.

In point of fact, I shall have to make a few observations on this report since it has been the subject of the observations of my eminent colleague and friend, the representative of Iraq, observations which sometimes were somewhat ironical, and to which I must reply.

Mr. Khalidy recalled ^{the} part which I had taken in the last three years in the work of the General Assembly and of this Trusteeship Council regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem. He very rightly recalled that I took part actively -- and I must say with the greatest personal convictions -- in all the work, the purpose of which was to set up an international regime for the Holy City. But Mr. Khalidy seems to think that I am not at the present time of the same opinion, and that the internationalization of the Holy City had ceased to interest me at the time when I undertook the mission with which the Trusteeship Council had entrusted me. I do not see upon what Mr. Khalidy may have based this point of view because I think that the report which I submitted to the Trusteeship Council does not allow any inference that I have given up, in any kind of way, my efforts for the internationalization of Jerusalem. I have simply given an absolutely objective account of the results of the negotiations carried out by me from 6 April until my return to New York.

I have never ceased to work in the same direction, that is, with a view to obtaining the internationalization of the Holy Places. On the other hand, I might recall to Mr. Khalidy -- as he recalled himself -- that for eighteen months he himself, in this Council, was most forcefully opposed to any form of internationalization of Jerusalem. I therefore undertook the negotiations with which the Trusteeship Council entrusted me. As I indicated in the Report which I submitted to you, the Report on my mission, I found amongst the members of the Israeli Government, at any rate, the necessary courtesy; that is to say, as soon as I transmitted the Statute to the Government of Israel requesting it to be good enough to inform me of ^{the} conditions under which it thought it could co-operate in the implementation of this Statute, the Israeli Government

replied to me that it was prepared to discuss the matter with me. It invited me to go to Israel in order to confer with the actual heads of the Government. And as I myself had to give up this trip, the negotiations continued in Rome and Paris, and then, in the last phase, in New York. Finally, the Government of Israel, taking into account to a great extent the observations and suggestions I had made, handed in the memorandum which you have before you.

In this memorandum you may all note that the Government of Israel in good faith, while refusing to grant its co-operation for the implementation of the Statute drawn up by the Trusteeship Council, nevertheless thought it appropriate to present counter-proposals which constitute, in relation to the proposals made previously before the General Assembly by the Government of Israel, progress in the direction of a compromise. As I pointed out in the Report which I submitted to the Trusteeship Council, this of course was a meager result, and I noted that I had met with a refusal on the part of the two Governments to co-operate in the implementation of the Statute, but that, at any rate, I had received from one of the Governments concerned a courteous greeting, and that this Government had wished to present counter-proposals which might serve for a later consideration of the matter, with a view to reaching a satisfactory result for all the parties concerned. Now, to my great regret, I cannot say the same about the ^{other} Government concerned because the Government of Jordan did not make any reply to my communications -- not any reply whatsoever.

It is not a question of the reply which this government should make to me personally. I was speaking on behalf of one of the main bodies of the United Nations. I was speaking on behalf of the Trusteeship Council and I was addressing myself to a government which we had courteously invited to take part in the debates of the Trusteeship Council, the representative of which had come to take his place among us during practically the entire duration of the Geneva session. Of course, I expected at any rate, to receive a reply from this government, even if the reply had been completely negative. It is customary among governments or between responsible bodies to send at least a reply to a communication.

I leave it to the Trusteeship Council fully to appreciate the attitudes which the Government of Jordan thought it appropriate to observe, not in regard to me personally, but in regard to the Trusteeship Council and the United Nations.

I took no sides in this matter. I did what I could to try to bring the two governments to submit at least proposals which would enable us to proceed usefully with the consideration of the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem. It is either up to the Trusteeship Council or to the General Assembly of the United Nations, if we think we have to seize it again of this question. It belongs to one of these two bodies to consider and give any decision they consider appropriate to this matter as regards my investigations on behalf of the Trusteeship Council.

I do not see anything more to say as regards the results of my mission. Each member of the Council may appreciate the spirit in which I had twice undertaken negotiations with which the Trusteeship Council entrusted me: the first time in December and the second time in April.

Mr. Khalidy also referred a short while ago to the proposals that I submitted to the Trusteeship Council at the beginning of our Geneva session. You will recall that having been invited by the Council to consult with all parties concerned and to present suggestions to the Council as regards the manner in which the resolution of 9 December 1949 might be applied, I presented to the Council what was improperly called a "plan," when it was simply what I considered for my part as being a liberal interpretation of the resolution of the General Assembly. If I decided to undertake the serious personal responsibility of submitting such suggestions to the Trusteeship Council, it was because I considered, honestly, that a rigid application of the resolution adopted on 9 December 1949 by the General Assembly would meet inevitably with very serious difficulties of implementation indeed, and I considered that the Council would be

well advised to seek the most liberal possible interpretation of the General Assembly in order to make it possible of implementation.

The Council did not deem it appropriate to follow this course, and the Members will recall that I, myself, told you, "Here is the result of the consultations I undertook. Naturally, if you consider that you are to take up the Statute as it was elaborated in 1948 by the Trusteeship Council and only bring small changes of detail into it, I can only wish you good luck in the work you are undertaking." This work has been accomplished very loyally by all of us and we voted, by a very extensive majority, for the statute which I afterwards had to present, in the Council's behalf to the two governments concerned. The reception by the two governments, in different forms, was negative. That is the situation in which the Trusteeship Council now finds itself.

The question for the Council to answer is what attitude it is to take from now on; either to take up once again consideration of the statute it adopted itself, or to require its implementation? Also, with what means? It is up to the Council to determine those means that are in its power immediately to implement the statutes it had adopted.

It is needless for me to say that the delegation I represent in the Council had its opinion on this problem. I will speak of that later, when I take my seat as the representative of France. I hope that this is the last time that I have to speak as President or Ex-President of the Trusteeship Council on this Jerusalem question.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) The General Assembly's resolution of 9 December 1949 concerning an international regime for the city of Jerusalem requested the Trusteeship Council, first, to complete the preparation of a Statute for the city of Jerusalem; second, to approve the Statute and third, to proceed immediately with its implementation.

Because it could see no practicable way to enforce and implement such a Statute and because such an arrangement was apparently opposed by the inhabitants themselves of the Jerusalem area, the United States, in the General Assembly voted against the resolution of 9 December. Nevertheless, the Resolution was adopted by more than two thirds of the General Assembly and it became the duty, therefore, of the Trusteeship Council, as a first step, to complete the preparation of a Statute for Jerusalem and to approve it.

CT/11

The United States understands it as the very heart of democracy that the minority should accept and loyally co-operate with the expressed will of the duly constituted majority. In the session of the Trusteeship Council which was held at Geneva during the last winter, therefore, the United States wholeheartedly co-operated in the preparation of the Statute of Jerusalem in accordance with the request of the General Assembly embodied in the resolution of 9 December. Together with the other members of the Trusteeship Council we explored the possibilities in taking further steps to find practicable ways and means for the implementation of the Statute.

On 4 April 1950 the Trusteeship Council approved the Statute which it had drafted for Jerusalem. It also voted to submit the Statute to the Governments of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and to request their co-operation in its implementation. The Statute was transmitted to these governments on 6 April 1950.

The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Government of Israel during the sixth session of the Council expressed their opposition to the principle of internationalization as embodied in the Statute. The Government of Israel, in its communication of 26 May 1950, reiterated its inability to co-operate in the implementation of the Statute as drafted and presented certain new proposals with regard to Jerusalem and the Holy Places. These proposals, like others looking toward a solution of the problem, are worthy of careful examination and study. We do not, however, think that this is the time to comment on the merits of the Israeli proposals. Suffice it to say that it has been, and still is, our hope that the two Governments most directly concerned will be able to agree on arrangements for Jerusalem which will be satisfactory to them and to the interests of the world community in the City.

In the light of the statements which have been made by the interested parties and of all the existing conditions, it would seem clear to my Government that it is impracticable at this time to proceed with the implementation of the Statute. My delegation, therefore, agrees that the wisest course for the Council to follow, as has been suggested by my old friend, Sir Carl Berendsen, is indeed it is not the only course open, is to refer the question back to the General Assembly for its further consideration. My Government is prepared to support any appropriate proposal to that end, informing the General Assembly of the steps which the Council has taken in compliance with its Resolution and transmitting the pertinent documents, including the new Israeli proposal, to the General Assembly for its further consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER-COCKE (United Kingdom): As has been suggested by the representative for New Zealand, my delegation does not feel that the Council need spend a very great deal of time on this Jerusalem question. We wish to associate ourselves with the observations which have been made by the representatives of New Zealand and of the United States, and we feel that the proper course of action for this Council is to submit a factual report to the General Assembly with all the relevant documents.

In particular, I wish to record that my delegation feels, together with the delegation of New Zealand, that the Trusteeship Council is most certainly not the place, in view of the terms of the original General Assembly Resolution, under which we are working, to discuss the proposals made by the Israeli Government in their reply to Mr. Garreau's letter. But while we feel that the

Council is not the proper place for a discussion of these proposals, and while we hope that the Council will not in fact embark upon any discussion of these proposals, nevertheless we do regard them as serious proposals and consider that they should receive careful consideration by the appropriate organs of the United Nations. We hope, therefore, that a resolution which we shall be in a position to support will be forthcoming along the lines suggested by the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation is to a great extent in agreement with what has just been said by the representative of the United Kingdom. I say, to a very great extent, inasmuch as I have a reservation to formulate. The representative of the United States of America and the representative of the United Kingdom have pointed out and stressed the plan submitted by the Israeli Government to the President of the Trusteeship Council. They consider that this plan deserves the consideration, if not of the Council which is not competent to discuss it, at any rate of the General Assembly. The representative of the United States has proposed that the Trusteeship Council pass a resolution to refer the question back to the General Assembly. Here I do not entirely agree with him.

The General Assembly has decided in the matter. The General Assembly has passed a Resolution deciding on the internationalization of Jerusalem. The Belgian delegation voted for this Resolution. There is nothing which allows the Council to invite the General Assembly, so to speak, to revise its position. So far as we are concerned, the Resolution of the General Assembly is still valid. The Trusteeship Council was entrusted with a specific mission, and that task has been accomplished. The Trusteeship Council has voted for the Statute of Jerusalem with the modifications that were requested. The Trusteeship Council was also entrusted with the implementation of the Statute as voted by it. I consider that here again the Trusteeship Council has fulfilled its task. The only course for us and the only possible action for the Trusteeship Council in the field of realization and implementation was to invite the occupying powers of Jerusalem to collaborate in the implementation of the Statute.

The President of the Trusteeship Council entered into communication with the Governments concerned and these Governments have shown, one in a courteous manner and the other in a discourteous manner, that their intention was not to collaborate in the implementation of the Statute. It is impossible for us to go any further.

We have no means at our disposal to go any further in the face of such a refusal by the occupying powers in Jerusalem. The Trusteeship Council has no armed forces; the Trusteeship Council has no means to apply sanctions; and it is absolutely impossible for the Trusteeship Council to implement the Statute except with the collaboration of the Governments directly concerned.

The question was to find out whether this collaboration could be assured. It has been shown that such is not the case. The Trusteeship Council has concluded its task and all it can do now is to inform the General Assembly of this fact. The representative of Iraq a short while ago said something which is not quite correct. He said that the Garreau plan had been considered and had been found inadequate. The Council did not find the Garreau plan inadequate. The Trusteeship Council considered that it was bound by the decision of the General Assembly and that it was not up to the Council to discuss a plan which was not consistent with the terms of the Resolution of the General Assembly. For precisely the same reason, the proposals which are at present submitted to us by the Israeli Government are entirely outside the competence of the Trusteeship Council. We cannot discuss these proposals any more than we could discuss the proposals contained in what was called the Garreau plan.

To conclude, I am also prepared to vote in favour of a resolution reporting our activities and informing the Assembly of the manner in which we have carried out the task entrusted to us. Nevertheless, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that, in order to obtain the support of the Belgian delegation, the resolution cannot again raise as an issue the decision of the General Assembly to internationalize Jerusalem, either expressly or implicitly. It is not up to the Trusteeship Council to give any indication as to the manner in which the General Assembly should consider the proposals which were made to us by the Government of Israel.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (Interpretation from Spanish): Apart from some general remarks, which the delegation of the Dominican Republic wishes to reserve its right to make later, if necessary, we would like to speak on the suggestions made by the representative of New Zealand and supported by the delegation of the United States. We wonder whether it might not be possible for the representative of New Zealand to present his proposals in writing, in other words, to submit a formal proposal, so that we might have a basis for discussion. Then the Council might be in a position to arrive at a final decision on this matter.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I agree entirely with ^{the} statement just made by the representative of Belgium. I believe that, at the stage we have reached, the Trusteeship Council cannot go beyond what it has done and that it should report to the General Assembly, both on the statute it has adopted and on the measures it has taken to obtain the co-operation of the two Governments concerned for implementation of that statute. I believe, as does Mr. Ryckmans, that, in referring this question for a further consideration by the General Assembly, the Trusteeship Council cannot mean in any way to propose to the General Assembly that it revise its former decisions or modify them. That is the business of the General Assembly itself. In fact, we are seized of the statute of Jerusalem. We are not only seized of the question, but we had imperative duties imposed by the General Assembly. Those duties were to adopt a statute according to the indications in the Resolution of 9 December and to implement that statute as soon as possible. We have accomplished the first part of our task, but, unfortunately, we cannot carry out the second part in present conditions. As the representative of Belgium has very rightly said,

we have no means of coercion to impose the implementation of a regime which is not desired by either one of the two Governments which have de facto authority in Jerusalem.

As regards the interesting counter proposals submitted by the Israeli delegation, the Trusteeship Council cannot discuss them. These counter proposals can only be the subject of detailed consideration in the General Assembly. It is not within our competence to examine any other possibilities of internationalization than those clearly defined by the Resolution of the General Assembly of 9 December 1949. Therefore, we should ask the General Assembly, after reporting on our activities, to give us new instructions so that we may know the conditions under which we are to continue to work. It is possible that, after further consideration, the General Assembly may consider it appropriate to adopt a different attitude from the one indicated in the Resolution of 9 December 1949. It is possible that the Trusteeship Council might not be considered the proper organ for the implementation of any form or system of internationalization. In that case, we would no longer be seized of the matter. However, for the time being, the only Resolution which is still valid is the Resolution of 9 December 1949. Therefore, we can only tell the General Assembly what we have done so far. We can say that we consider that we have not the means necessary to continue our task. We can ask the General Assembly to consider this new state of affairs and to indicate the necessary and appropriate new instructions which will be necessary to continue our task.

That is the spirit in which I believe a resolution might be couched and sent to the General Assembly by the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. EBAN (Israel): I do not intend to participate at great length in this discussion, especially in view of the procedural suggestions which have been advanced on behalf of the delegations of New Zealand, the United States and the United Kingdom.

My Government has devoted careful and profound consideration to the question of Jerusalem ever since the Trusteeship Council rose from its recent session in Geneva. The results of our reflections are fully embodied in the document which I have submitted for the consideration of the Trusteeship Council. We are gratified by the interest which those proposals have evoked through every corner of the international community and by the spirit of sympathy with which they have been greeted in many international and religious circles.

Confronted with an insoluble deadlock, arising from a proposal the impracticability of which has been proved in varying circumstances over a period of three years, my Government embarked on a serious and conscientious effort to find means whereby the international and universal objectives in Jerusalem could be reconciled with the freedom and independence of the City. To this end, we were privileged to consult with the President of the Trusteeship Council, upon whose shoulders the Trusteeship Council itself had laid certain duties of consultation. During conversations with him and with leading delegations represented in the United Nations, a clear picture was built up in our mind of the organized will of the international community that a compromise solution should be found. It is to that purpose that the document, in the name of the delegation of Israel, has been submitted.

It was never our view that we should seek to persuade the Trusteeship Council to identify itself with the substance of those proposals. Our object was to illuminate, in advance, for the General Assembly, certain possible lines of conciliation along which it might advance. If the Trusteeship Council should consider that constitutional propriety requires that the discussion of those proposals be postponed to the General Assembly itself, my Government will be content to pursue that discussion in that forum.

We deeply regret that both the motives and the spirit of our proposal should have been represented with such sardonic irony in the eloquent speech made on behalf of the Government of Iraq. We cannot forbear to recall that this very eloquence was used only two years ago to destroy the very conception of an international regime, amidst the echoes of brutal war and siege, at a time when Jerusalem called aloud in agony and Iraqi forces, astride the water supply of the City, were condemning it to death by pestilence and thirst. When we recall that truculent boycott and destruction to the distant echoes of war, with Mr. Khalidy himself visibly buoyed up by the picture of Jerusalem's imminent conquest, we feel that these contemporary tones of pity and religious concern strike a hollow and unconvincing note.

There are only two ways of effectively preventing the fulfilment by the United Nations of its recognized responsibilities in Jerusalem. One is to require rigid adherence to a scheme which has been proved impracticable over three years and the implementation of which would today require the deliberate disintegration of all democracy, all freedom, all institutional life, all the cherished links of sentiment and allegiance, and all sources of livelihood and subsistence whereby the life of Jerusalem has rallied, after wild carnage, into the dignity of normality today.

To us it seems that to inflict upon Jerusalem so drastic an upheaval cannot be reconciled with any genuine regard for the peace or tranquility of the City or its surrounding area. This principle that you cannot secure religious peace by political suppression underlies the first part of our document in which we seek to illustrate the objective defects of the statute adopted in Geneva.

Extremist doctrines of internationalization attempting to detach whole areas from the scope of their natural allegiance defeat their own purpose by remaining inevitably unfulfilled, with the result that the United Nations remains unrepresented, even in its own recognized sphere of responsibility.

The second way of preventing the effective discharge by the United Nations of its responsibilities in Jerusalem is to repudiate the very existence of an international interest in Jerusalem, to deny the United Nations the right of access or discussion, to institute a procedural boycott of its representatives and its organs, to act as though the Holy Places of Jerusalem fell within the unfettered jurisdiction of the local Governments in the Near East alone.

The first method of preventing the effective discharge by the United Nations of its responsibilities is upheld by the majority of the Arab States. The second method is upheld by the remaining Arab State. We are left with the gloomy conclusion that at this time the Arab world is not available for any co-operation in the settling of this acute international problem. Nevertheless, my Government believes that this problem should be solved and cannot be left as it is; for the Holy Places of the three world religions are not subject to free access by those who hold them sacred. In particular, the shrines and sanctuaries revered by the Jewish people over thousands of years and now under the occupation of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan are cut off permanently and completely from all access by their worshippers, while access to Christian shrines is very often granted conditionally and for periods of limited duration.

The proposals offered by my Government intend a solution of this problem by establishing an international authority under whose jurisdiction the unique religious associations of the City can be unified, harmonized and fully expressed.

Akin to the problem of the Holy Places, there are problems of access of pilgrimage, of immunity, and the maintenance of existing rights, and our proposals envisage that these matters too should fall within the jurisdiction of the United Nations authority established for that purpose.

This attempt to reconcile universal religious interests with the maintenance of freedom and independence of Jerusalem's population has guided us in formulating these proposals and will guide us further in the discussions to be held in the General Assembly itself. My delegation would only request that in any report which the Trusteeship Council might make on its labours, the text of our proposals should be submitted in full, together with the communication adjoined to it.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): This is not a second speech, nor a second intervention in substance, but I wonder if I could have one point clarified.

I understand that, technically, the debate revolves round the report of Mr. Garreau which has been presented to the Council. Would it be in order if I asked him a question on the report?

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): What is it?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): The question is, would Mr. Garreau be good enough to tell the Council whether, while in Rome, he saw the Pope?

Mr. GARREAU (France) (interpretation from French): I do not see what relation a visit to the Pope can have to the problem of Jerusalem and our present discussion. Of course, I saw a number of persons, both publicly and privately, while I was there. Might I ask Mr. Khalidy the exact purpose of his question? I do not think he is trying to be indiscreet. What is the significance of his question?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I was going to ask the same question.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): To make the situation easier, I might say that information has reached us that Mr. Garreau did see the Pope. That is a fact, I think. The reason for my question is this. The Council would be helped if it knew the official views of the Vatican on the internationalization of Jerusalem.

After all, there is a large Christian population in Jerusalem, as well as many Christian shrines. I believe we are entitled to know the official views of the Vatican? I would not press Mr. Garreau against his better judgment, but if he cared to answer, I for one would be grateful to him.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (interpretation from French): I do not quite see how I could officially express the point of view of the Vatican on any question. I am not a pontifical prelate. I have no ^{such} qualification, and in the circumstances I really do not see how I could inform Mr. Khalidy concerning the point of view of the Holy See as regards internationalization of Jerusalem. I think the attitude of the Holy See is sufficiently well known. There is even a papal encyclical on the matter, as well as several statements from the Holy See. I suggest that Mr. Khalidy refer to these official documents.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That is quite clear.

The Council is now in the following position. There is a proposal before us which has not yet been made concrete; in other words, it has not been submitted in writing. The representative of the Dominican Republic has addressed himself to the representative of New Zealand, who first made the proposal. Such proposal was apparently received favourably by several representatives. It is now really a matter of drafting, although I recall that the representative of Belgium made a reservation to the effect that the matter should not be referred back to the General Assembly. Mr. Garreau said substantially the same, namely, that the Council might request the General Assembly to give new instructions, not that the question actually should be referred ^{back} to the General Assembly. Therefore, in order to proceed with the matter, a text should be presented, and I would request the representative of New Zealand to let the Council have a written text. Possibly he would wish to present it as a suggestion, not as a formal proposal.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I am very slow in understanding, and I find it quite difficult to appreciate the evident desire to shove me into the firing line in this matter. I have a recollection of a gentleman named Uriah many many years ago -- that is not a complete example, but it is sufficiently adequate for the purpose of illustration.

I had no part, and the New Zealand delegation had no part in the creation of this mess -- none whatsoever. Every one who is interested in this subject knows that we voted for the Resolution of November 1947 and that we took no part whatsoever either in the discussion or the voting of the quite astonishing Resolution of 9 December 1949. I would be the last to decline to help, if I thought I could help, but my modesty is such that it would compel me to say that I think it would be much more becoming for those who voted for that Resolution to find the way out of it.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): Might I suggest the following procedure to the President? We might perhaps suspend the meeting for twenty minutes and, during those twenty minutes, those of the members of the Trusteeship Council who have expressed an opinion as regards the referring of the matter to the General Assembly might succeed in finding a formula for a resolution which would be submitted jointly by a certain number of members of the Trusteeship Council.

I think that a very small amount of time would be sufficient in order to find an appropriate form of resolution for the purpose of reflecting the views already expressed by certain members of the Trusteeship Council. We could then finish with this matter today.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The suggestion just made by the representative of France is, in fact, a very practical one. Since several delegations hold the same view, it is a matter of finding a wording that would be acceptable to all. We shall, therefore, adjourn the meeting for twenty minutes and we shall resume our work at five minutes to four.

The meeting was suspended at 3.42 p.m., and resumed at 4.26 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The English text of a proposed resolution has just been distributed, the purpose of which is to sum up the views that have been expressed during the debate we have had today. Some of the representatives, in particular the representatives of France, Belgium and others have come to an agreement and drafted this agreed text. Therefore, this proposed resolution is now before the members for discussion.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I stated that the Belgian delegation was prepared to support the suggestions made on the condition that certain corrections be instituted. These corrections were made. The situation now is that nobody wishes to recognize the paternity of this proposed resolution. Under the circumstances, in order to render a service to the Council I agree to present this resolution. The representative of France is of the same opinion as I am.. We are devoted to general interests and we recognize joint paternity of this text.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): For the same reasons as those which have been expressed by the representative of Belgium, I also accept paternity for this proposed resolution, although it is in English. If I were the real father, I would have done it in French.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The members of the Council have the text before them. Even though we have had a discussion on the matter, we might perhaps have a discussion on the proposed resolution just submitted in order to know what the general views are.

Mr. RAUCHDY (Egypt): My remarks will necessarily be brief, in view of the fact that I agree with a good part of what has been stated by the representatives of Iraq and Belgium.. With regard to the former, I agree that this Council should proceed to the full implementation of the General Assembly's resolution.

I should like to take exception, however, to the suggestion of the representative of Belgium, and several others, that the Council stop at the point already reached in this connexion and submit a factual report to the General Assembly, asking it for further instructions. Indeed, as the representative of Iraq stated -- and which has even just been mentioned by the representative of Belgium -- we must avoid doing something which lies outside the unequivocal scope of the General Assembly's resolution. We must carry out the full mandate of the General Assembly.

In view of what I have just stated, my delegation disapproves of the proposal submitted and suggests that the Council should exhaust all possibilities of implementing the General Assembly's resolution, including the demilitarization of the area of Jerusalem and appointment of a governor to that area, which had been proposed to the Council by my delegation on the last day of its meeting at Geneva.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the representative of Egypt. My delegation fully supports the statement made by our colleague from Iraq. In examining this proposed resolution, I should like to ask this question: Is it within the terms of reference of the Trusteeship Council under the terms of the General Assembly Resolution to consider and to submit new plans? I believe that the duty of the Trusteeship Council is well defined. I see no reason why we should attach the reply of the Government of Israel to the report of the President of the Trusteeship Council.

I wish to state again that my Government has not changed its position and will always fight for the internationalization of Jerusalem. I also associate myself again with the statement made by the representative of Egypt by urging the Trusteeship Council to take up the problem again and not to stop at this stage.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): I have now had an opportunity of seeing the text which is before us. I should like first to draw attention to a very small point of drafting. I think that in the last line but one of the last paragraph but one we should keep the same word "approve" rather than the word "voted".

Secondly, I presume that the attached report, which, of course, is not before us, will be a purely factual report of the discussions, the comments and, if necessary, the amendments and so on, with no conclusions beyond that which is in this resolution. On that understanding, my delegation will be able to vote in favour of this resolution.

I would say, in reply to the representative of Iraq, that I think it is appropriate to include as one of the many documents which have been received the proposals which the Government of Israel has submitted, not because this Council has considered them -- and here I would make issue with the representative of Egypt who said that it would be improper for the Trusteeship Council to consider them. I entirely agree with him and I also think it would be improper, but I do not think we have considered the plans by including them with the documents to be sent to the General Assembly; that certainly must not be taken to imply that we have considered them.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Before I finally tell the Trusteeship Council what is our stand concerning the resolution as a whole, I should like to point out, as a matter of technicality, one point which the Council might like to consider.

Towards the end of the draft resolution occurs the phrase "which includes certain new proposals" when referring to the reply to the Government of Israel. I would point out that this seems to be a little out of place because, first of all, the Council has not discussed these proposals, and secondly, these proposals are not in conformity with the Resolution of the General Assembly. Technically and legally the Trusteeship Council is still bound by the stipulations of the Resolution of the General Assembly. Therefore, to attach such a phrase to the reply of the Israeli, into which the Council has not delved, will suggest support, which I believe is rather out of place technically.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The suggestion of the representative of Iraq is that the phrase "which includes certain new proposals" be deleted. The purpose of that phrase was to mention the Garreau report and, of course, the only reply to that report, that is to say, the Israeli proposal. However, it is not necessary to include that phrase which the representative of Iraq has mentioned.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): I entirely agree.

Mr. GARREAU (France)(Interpretation from French): I agree also.

Mr. EBAN (Israel): I simply want to point out the status of our new proposals from the view point of the Trusteeship Council. The representative of Iraq may well wish that these proposals had not been made, but the fact is that they have been made and the submission of these proposals constitutes, purely from the narrative point of view, a certain landmark in the work of the Trusteeship Council. These proposals were not spontaneously generated; they were elicited in response to a resolution of the Trusteeship Council and to the requests of the President of the Trusteeship Council for an elicitation of views which should not be completely negative. If the General Assembly is simply informed that there has been a communication from the Government of Israel, and is not informed that that communication consists primarily of new proposals, I frankly feel that this resolution will not be telling the truth. It will be a definite distortion of historical accuracy and I feel that the moral weight of this resolution will suffer accordingly.

The submission to the General Assembly of a document and of an accompanying recording of the fact that that document contains new proposals does not, of course, prejudice the substance of those proposals one way or the other, but I fail to see what the Trusteeship Council could have in mind if it made a conscious effort to elicit compromise proposals from certain parties and then ignored those proposals once they had been made. I therefore consider the retention of that reference is the least, the minimal reference that should be made to our proposal consistent with the requirements of objective truth.

Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina): To be factual and fully factual, we could tell the General Assembly that the reply of the Government of Israel includes new proposals but we should go on to say that those proposals have not been considered by the Trusteeship Council. I wonder if the representatives of Belgium and France would accept an amendment which would state "which includes certain new proposals which have not been considered by the Council".

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): I think we are running a very grave risk of writing our report in the last paragraph of this resolution. Once we start putting into the resolution what has been done and what has not been done, we should be repeating in the last paragraph what I hope is going to appear perfectly clearly in the attached report. So far as I am concerned, we could stop quite easily at any point in the last paragraph. We could stop at the words "attached report" because the "attached report" by definition will contain all the documents, I would assume. We could stop after the words "reports of President Garreau to the Council", because the last report of Mr. Garreau does in fact contain the reply of the Government of Israel. I do not think it is necessary to go on and on explaining what is in each report and document which will by definition be in the attached report.

We therefore have several alternatives. I would be quite content to stop at the word "reports of President Garreau to the Council" and let the General Assembly see there are certain new proposals without making a particular reference to them. It will also become clear from the report that the Council did not discuss these proposals or their merits or demerits, but merely that they were laid before them as part of the reply.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I feel like associating myself with the first observation of the representative of the United Kingdom. Clearly, I take it that all of us agree, the word "voted" in next to the last line of next to the last paragraph should be changed to "approved".

With regard to his comment on the meaning of the words "the attached report" in the last paragraph, I should again like to associate myself with him. I believe that expresses the thought of all of us, namely, that the attached report shall be merely an objective, factual statement reciting the bare facts of what took place during the Council's consideration of the Statute for Jerusalem.

As to his suggestion that the words "which includes certain new proposals" should be omitted, I confess that, although I think the point is not one of major importance, I am inclined to disagree. I think it is only fair to mention the outstanding documents or communications we have received in this last paragraph. It would seem to me that the reply of the Government of Israel, dated 26 May 1950, is an outstanding document. Whether we agree or disagree with it, it is certainly a document which the General Assembly will, presumably, wish to consider. It seems to me that mention of it as a communication "which includes certain new proposals" is a fair recital of the honest-to-goodness facts and, personally, I should prefer to see the language of this last paragraph retained as it stands, although, as I said, I do not feel that it is a point of major importance.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): This very interesting event, at which we have all assisted, the production of a Franco-Belgian infant which speaks only English, seems to me to contemplate a twin. This resolution, as presented to us, depends for its actual effect upon the second half of the report of the Council, which has not yet been prepared. It certainly has not been produced, and the Council will certainly have to discuss it and pass it. Without that report, I suggest that this resolution takes us nowhere at all. I am inclined to agree with the representative of the United Kingdom, except that I go further. He suggests eliminating the last paragraph, or portions of it; I would suggest eliminating the whole resolution. I have no particular objection. If passing this resolution means that we get rid of the subject, I shall warmly support it, but I cannot conceive of any report of the Council -- and we agree that we must have a report, though it has not yet been produced -- which will not set out each and every one of the facts set out in this resolution.

I am not going to discuss the matter any longer. If the Council wants to pass this resolution, I shall vote for it; if the Council wants to do the sensible thing, it will pass on and leave this until we have the report containing all these matters and pass the report.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): We had hoped to keep out of this discussion, but we lay much store by the observation of the representative of New Zealand to the effect that this resolution calls for an action which is contingent upon the consideration of another matter, namely, the report to be submitted to the General Assembly. In view of this inescapable fact, we are confronted with a procedural difficulty. We would urge that the Council consider this procedural difficulty before proceeding to a vote on this resolution.

We share the impatience of some members of the Council with the rather slow deliberations on this question, but this resolution is an important one. It is something upon which every member of this Council should pronounce himself after mature reflection and consideration. So far as my delegation is concerned, such mature reflection and consideration is impossible without further consultation with my Government. Therefore, even if there were a move to proceed to a vote on this resolution this afternoon, we would be constrained to ask the Council to postpone the vote thereon until, at the earliest, tomorrow afternoon.

We also wish to associate ourselves with the reservations of the representative of the United Kingdom with respect to the scope and the narration of the report to be appended to this proposed resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER-COKE (United Kingdom): I just wish to make one small point for the record. In his remarks, the representative of the United States referred to my suggestion that the words "which includes certain new proposals" should be deleted. As I think he will agree, it was not my suggestion but the suggestion of the representative of Iraq. I was making some general remarks upon the whole of the last paragraph without making any particular remark on that suggestion.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I wish to express appreciation to the representative of the United Kingdom for that correction. I assure him I had no ulterior motive in mind in making that mis-statement.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): As a result of the suggestion of the representative of the Philippines, there is a question of adjournment. Every delegation has the right to propose adjournment for at least twenty-four hours. However, I believe that, as that is the case, we might in future adopt the following procedure. The Secretariat might prepare the report that is going to be transmitted together with the resolution. In that way, we would have the complete set or, at least, the list of documents which is going to be transmitted to the General Assembly. The documents would be prepared and, after that, we would discuss the resolution in detail. That would, of course, take more than twenty-four hours; it might take several days. We could advise the Council of the date when we could meet again to discuss a final decision on the Jerusalem question. This might be more practical and more complete.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I was going to make a suggestion very much in line with what the President has already made, but I wonder whether it is necessary to wait for several days. I am told by the Secretariat that they probably could have this report circulated by tomorrow. I think what we have in mind is a very simple report which would merely recite the different statements of fact, would recount what took place in the Council in its consideration of the situation, and if that can be circulated by tomorrow, presumably we could finish the business by tomorrow afternoon. In other words, I hope that we shall not delay unduly the conclusion of this problem of Jerusalem.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I think that I owe a reply to the representative of Argentina, who has made a new suggestion regarding the end of the last paragraph.

In view of the fact that the spirit of this draft resolution is that the Trusteeship Council does not consider that any part of its work is in opposition to the General Assembly Resolution of December 1949, I stated that I did not see any difficulty in deleting the words, "which includes certain new proposals". For my part, I think the draft resolution is better without these words. Naturally, when we transmit to the General Assembly the reply of the Government of Israel it is understood that it is with the hope that Members of the General Assembly will read such reply. If they read it they will see that the Government of Israel makes certain proposals. They will appreciate how far these proposals may constitute a new factor and to what extent these proposals are beyond what the Government of Israel had proposed previously. However, if the majority of the representatives of the Council consider that omission of any mention of the fact that the reply of the Government of Israel contains new proposals would constitute a lack of fair play vis-a-vis the Government of Israel, I would not see any objection to adopting the formula suggested by the representative of Argentina, stating that this communication includes certain proposals which the Council has not discussed.

To sum up, for my part I consider that the best procedure is to delete the words, "which includes certain new proposals". If, however, the Council prefers to maintain them, I would agree to the addition proposed by the representative of Argentina.

The PRESIDENT:(Interpretation from French): I think the Secretariat might prepare its report in forty-eight hours, but the Council must also take into account the day on which it will begin discussion of Nauru. Of course, the Special Representative from Nauru will not be here for the time being, and therefore we might have this discussion instead, and then we should not need to devote a morning to the question of Jerusalem. We shall not have another agenda and we cannot put forward the date of discussion of other territories. On the day when Nauru was to be discussed, this particular matter might be considered instead, and in the meantime the Secretariat could prepare the necessary documents. In that way the Council can meet the wishes of the representative of the Philippines, who requested at least twenty four hours for examination of the documents.

If there are no further remarks on the subject, discussion of the Jerusalem question might be adjourned until tomorrow afternoon.

It was so decided.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): Did I understand the President to say that discussion on Jerusalem would be adjourned until tomorrow afternoon and that the report will take forty eight hours to prepare? In that case, what do we do tomorrow afternoon?

The PRESIDENT:
New Guinea. That discussion must be finished.

Tomorrow we shall discuss

PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE EWES

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Before proceeding to another item, there is one point which was left in abeyance. The representative of the United Kingdom was asked for information regarding the Ewe Island and when he would wish to have it discussed. Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom could report on this question.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): The representatives will recall that two or three days ago the representative of Iraq asked when the Joint Anglo-French proposals relating to the Ewe question would be circulated to the Council. I am now in a position to say that these proposals will be made available to the Secretariat today week; that is, Monday, 19 June.

REVISION OF THE PROVISIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): With regard to the revision of the provisional questionnaire, I should like to know whether representatives are prepared to consider the appointment of a committee, or whether, in accordance with our discussion of last week, this matter should be left to the end of the session. It is a committee to deal with this particular question.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): The last time we took up this matter the consensus was that we could very well leave the appointment of a committee charged with the matter until towards the end of the present session. The procedural picture that led to that decision has not changed in these last few days, and therefore I would again ask the President to defer action until the time previously agreed upon by the Council.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): I think there may well be reasons for following the suggestion of the representative of the Philippines, but I am wondering whether, if we do not in fact set up a committee now -- and, as I say, there may well be reasons why we should not -- it will be of any great use to set up the committee towards the end of the session. In the first place, experience has shown that committees of the Council are reluctant to work when the Council is not sitting; and secondly, by the time the Council next assembles there may be changes in its composition which would mean that many of those who had not participated in the work of the committee but who were, nevertheless, members of that committee, would not in fact be available. Therefore, the point seems to me to be either to set up a committee now or, if the Council feels that it is not ready to attack the problem, to leave it until next January.

Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina): On the previous occasion when this item was discussed, I suggested that the Council should not appoint a committee until it had discussed the question itself and could give some directives to such committee. Therefore, I think, as the representative of the United Kingdom has said, that it would be useless to appoint that committee at the end of the session unless in the meantime the Council reached some general ideas on the matter and could give terms of reference to the committee.

I also referred previously to the possibility of the Trusteeship Council recommending to those countries which have not replied to the questions put to them. I think that only one country has so far replied to the questions: I had made that suggestion so that when the occasion arises when the Trusteeship Council will be in a position to appoint a committee, those replies will already be in the possession of the United Nations. I wonder if the Trusteeship Council is now in a position to express itself regarding the second suggestion of mine.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that if Belgium has not replied to the question which was put to it as regards the questionnaire, it was essentially only because the Belgian Government wants to reply to any questions that are put to it, and to show only the greatest good will in the drafting of the annual report on Ruanda Urundi, exactly in consistence with the terms required by the Trusteeship Council.

In this field the Belgian Government would not have any other observations to make than those which could be made by the delegation of any other country represented in the Trusteeship Council. It is up to the Trusteeship Council to appreciate in what form the report must be submitted, and the Belgian Government will comply with this requirement.

On the other hand, the Belgian Government and the local authorities of Ruanda Urundi are accustomed to answering the questionnaire, while recognizing that this questionnaire is extremely imperfect. In view of the fact that we have adopted this questionnaire and that we have replied to it several times in this form, the Government fears that any changes in the questionnaire may complicate the work of the local authorities even more, and I do not believe that the Government will reply to the questions beyond the work which can be done by the Belgian representative, if he were a member of any committee entrusted with consideration of the questionnaire.

As to the substance of the matter, the Trusteeship Council will perhaps recall that last year I pointed out as regards one of the Trust Territories of France, that the Administering Authority, replying sincerely to each of the 225 or 232 questions put to it, was led to repeat in its reply five times a statement concerning motor cars containing some kind of cinematographic appliance.

In the last few days I have worked on the report of the United States of America concerning the Pacific Islands. Those who read this report attentively will note that at least five times, if not more, we are told that the natives of the Pacific Islands who wish to follow higher studies for medical training may go to the Medical School of Guam, which is annexed to the Memorial Hospital of Guam. That is said five times in reply to questions which are put. The United States of America would not be replying adequately to the questions if they did not mention the fact that this school for medical training does exist in Guam.

Also repeated four times, and perhaps five, is the statement that in September 1948 the Normal School was transferred from Guam to Truk. Why was that repeated four times? It was repeated four times because there were questions for which the necessary replies were that the Normal School had been transferred from Guam to Truk.

Reference is made four times in this report to the fact that the head tax is \$2. Why is it said four times? It is said four times because replies had to be made to the questions as they are put in the questionnaire, and in order to make four replies it was necessary to say ^{each time} that there is a head tax of \$2.

All this goes to prove that this questionnaire is very badly drafted. If you compare the report drawn up by the powers which have followed the questionnaire literally, as was the request and desire of the Trusteeship Council, and if one compares this to the report on Samoa, which is a document prepared by an administration which wishes to inform the Trusteeship Council on everything that it has done during the year and on all the ^{important} administrative questions, one will note that the report of New Zealand is entirely legible and understandable, and logical, whereas the report on Ruanda Urundi is not legible. The first report was a very good one, because it was a report drawn up as was the New Zealand report on Samoa, according to a normal and rational index. The following report became illegible because we had to answer one after another 225 or 232 questions.

In the same way, the report of the United States of America on the Pacific Islands contains very numerous repetitions which are inevitable if each one of the questions of the questionnaire is answered; but that makes the reading of this report absolutely intolerable.

I think if a committee arrived at a conclusion that the Administering Powers should be invited to set up a report according to the form in which they; the Administering Powers themselves desire, placing a table of reference and an index at the end, where one might find a reply to any questions put in the questionnaire, that that would be a very great service. It would make the report better; it would make the work of the Trusteeship Council easier and, at the same time, it would continue to contain all the information that the Trusteeship Council may require.

If, for instance, an Administering Authority during any given year has not taken any steps concerning, let us say, the penitentiary or prison system, it is quite useless to insert a paragraph in the report saying that no measure has been taken as regards the prison system. If no measure is mentioned, it means that nothing has been done, and that is quite sufficient. It is quite useless to make the report heavier by such statements of fact as that or by replies to questions which are in the negative, or replies to questions to which it is impossible to reply. For instance, when you say, what measures have been taken to avoid inequality among the various States Members of the United Nations, the only measure that can be taken to avoid inequality is not to take any measure in order to create inequality. And when a State has taken no measures to create inequality and when, therefore, it is perfectly on the level, it must reply, in its reply to the questionnaire, that it has taken no measure to prevent inequality. And that looks as though it were some kind of statement of the fact that nothing has been done. If, therefore, a committee could simplify the questionnaire by deleting certain questions from the questionnaire when they are obviously useless, or when they are obviously repetitious and if, on the other hand, it could give its consent to the Administering Authorities' drawing up their reports in a rational manner as they wish to do it themselves, rather than in the form of replies to 200-odd questions, which often are repeated many times, this committee would be of great service, indeed. As to completing the questionnaire, adding all the questions which had been suggested by the specialized agencies, I think that the question at present is premature, inasmuch as we do not have all the replies which we have been expecting.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I find myself in general sympathy with much that my colleague from Belgium has just said. As he suggested, there are two separate questions: first, of completing the questionnaire, securing additional questions to fill in such gaps as may have appeared in the first report; and second, the task of revising the questionnaire.

So far as the completion of the questionnaire is concerned, I wonder whether the suggestion of my Argentine colleague -- that is to say, that the Council should send out requests to the Administering Authorities to send in such additional questions as they would like to ask -- is a necessary procedure. All the Administering Authorities are members of this Council. They are not outsiders. They are very much alive to the discussions and the debates in this Council. It certainly would not be necessary for the Council to make a request of the Administering Authorities to send in their questions.

As a matter of fact -- and I suspect that I speak for all of the Administering Authorities -- I know that, so far as my own Government is concerned, it has not sent in additional questions because it was awaiting the replies from the specialized agencies and from others. It felt that it would be important to know the thinking of the other United Nations organs which might want to send in questions.

If a committee is appointed to complete the questionnaire or to revise it, that certainly would be sufficient notice to every Administering Authority. No request is necessary so far as my own Government is concerned. It will send in the additional questions the moment the Trusteeship Council is ready to consider and handle them.

As to the second suggestion -- that is, as to the revision of the questionnaire -- there is much that my colleague from Belgium has suggested. Of course, there are arguments on both sides. The representative of Belgium is bothered by the many repetitions necessary if the questionnaire is retained in its present form. Repetition may be tiresome; on the other hand, it may be that, through those repetitions, there is a better classification of information. It may be that uniformity will be easier to attain. It may be that it is easier if questions are answered in this manner. Then, one can turn to the information

one desires more expeditiously. Surely those are matters which should be debated by a committee, which can consider this whole question of revising the questionnaire. Such a committee could well be appointed now by the President. It might well go to work or at least determine when it would be most advantageous to do so. It could, perhaps, consider some of these questions which the representative of Belgium has raised.

In short, it would seem to me that it is quite unnecessary to send out any request to the Administering Authorities to hasten their suggestions for additional questions. Those will come in as soon as the Trusteeship Council is ready to consider the matter. In addition, there may be an advantage in appointing a committee at this time, which could then discuss the whole question and determine when it will be best to meet and whether or not now is the time to consider such questions as the representative of Belgium has raised.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): We do not believe we have to marshal additional arguments for the revision of the provisional questionnaire. The vigorous representations made by the representative of Belgium, with which the representative of the United States has hastened to associate himself, are, to our mind, the best arguments for revision of the provisional questionnaire.

We believe that the simplification of the questionnaire is, at best, a question of careful editing. This could be accomplished by a committee created by the Council. Yet we are still faced with the practical difficulty adverted to more than once by the representative of Argentina -- do we have the material upon which to work? One view is that we do not have adequate material upon which to start work. In regard to this question, the only Administering Authority which has replied is the United Kingdom.

We would take the word of the representative of the United States to the effect that Administering Authorities do not have to be reminded that their reply should be forthcoming. Yet we cannot content ourselves with that. That is one side of the question.

The other side of the question is that we might conceivably create the committee now, charge it with the work that should be committed to its hands and leave it to its discretion as to when and how to start work. If the

committee decides to start work immediately, it is well and good. But we do believe that, if this afternoon's discussion is to serve a useful purpose, we must agree on three points: first, that in any event the desire for revision of the provisional questionnaire must be undertaken; second, that a committee must be created at the soonest practicable date with the understanding that it will exercise its own discretion as to when and how to start work; and third, whether this committee will merely undertake the revision of the provisional questionnaire or will undertake, besides, the synchronization of the work of the Trusteeship Council, the details of which were amply elaborated upon by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France at a previous session.

The representative of New Zealand has a very picturesque way of describing some of our procedural difficulties. While conversing with him this afternoon, he said that we run around in circles until the circle becomes very small and at once giddy. We would urge our colleagues to avoid further running around in circles.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I would like to make a remark in reply to what has just been said by the representative of the United States. He refers to the question of the invitation made to the administering powers to send in their additional questions. I do not think any question of that kind has ever been raised. If it were a matter of additional questions the administering powers could submit additional questions exactly in the same way as non-administering powers. But if you were especially interested in a question, you would ask that this question be put, if it is not yet in the questionnaire. If I am especially interested in a question I would ask this question to be put. There is no difference here between administering powers and non-administering powers. If we have requested the opinion of non-administering powers, it is to make observations to the Trusteeship Council concerning either questions for which the giving of the reply constitutes a work completely out of proportion with the importance of the question; for instance; if we are asked to give the list of the societies, associations and companies in a territory. If we point out to the Trusteeship Council that we can send an index or something of the sort, that would not be of any interest, but it would also increase our work to a considerable extent, and we would ask if it is really worthwhile; or we might be told that certain questions are obscure or repetitious or negative questions, to which it is impossible to reply. That is why we ask administering powers to make their observations.

As regards my country, if we have not made any observations, it is because we wish to be entirely in the hands of the Trusteeship Council. Whatever is voted upon by a majority by the Trusteeship Council concerning the questionnaire will be accepted by us, and we do not wish to raise any difficulties. It is not therefore at all a question of giving additional questions, but of making observations to the questionnaire as it now exists.

I think that any man, in good faith, when reading the reports which we have already received may discover the defects of the questionnaire, when he sees a series of questions to which replies are given in an absurd manner because the questions are negative ones or absurd ones. Then, any intelligent man reading the report may arrive at the conclusion that many questions should be either deleted or fused with others, or put in a clearer manner. But the task of the administering powers is not at all to seek additional questions. If we had to give additional questions, I would immediately say that the reply is "no".

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand) the phrase for the state of mind described so eloquently by the representative of Belgium with who I fully agree, is, "bewitched, bothered, and bewildered".

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): From the exchange of views that we have had, it appears that a part of the Trusteeship Council prefer not to appoint the Committee at once, but rather, towards the end of the session in July, because we are still awaiting replies, and so forth. Personally, I can only regret the fact that some specialized agencies have given their views. Some are extremely interesting, for example, those views expressed by the World Health Organization. There are questions on public health which are extremely interesting and which could profitably be added to the questionnaires, and we could modify certain questions in accordance with the suggestions of the World Health Organization. However, perhaps there is a desire in the Council that other Committees would be able to finish, in order to set up a new committee. That is why I ask whether we should settle the matter in that way, to reserve the appointment of the Committee until the month of July, or whether we should do it at once. We still have to decide on it one way or the other.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I would be quite prepared to agree with the proposal of the representative of the Philippines. I believe we could nominate a committee to consider the question of the revision of the questionnaire and we would leave the Committee responsible for deciding at what time it would actually begin its work. If the Committee considered that it should adjourn consideration of the questionnaire because it has not yet received the opinions of certain specialized agencies, it would be up to this committee, which we would nominate, to choose the date at which it would begin its work. In any case, for our part, we do not see any difficulty in a committee being designated immediately.

The PRESIDENT Does the representative of the Philippines wish to make a specific proposal in this respect?

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines) After the manifestation made by the representative of France, we are only too glad to make it a formal proposal.

The PRESIDENT: We shall then have to appoint a committee, but first of all we must decide whether it will be a committee of four or six or a plenary committee.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I would see an advantage in designating a committee. Members of the committee, if nominated, and even if they do not have to work immediately, might do very useful work, such as to read the report on the Pacific Islands and the one on Nauru, placing notes in the margin and question marks before every question which is a stupid one. In this respect, it would be useful to set up a committee at the present time. On the other hand, it is a task which all members of the Trusteeship Council should carry out. In this respect I would prefer to agree with the representative of Argentina. I think it would be advisable at the present time, to ask each member of the Council to make careful notations in the reports which they read and study, that is, from the point of view of the questionnaire. It should be done in such a way so that at the end of the session each one may have a series of remarks which will all deal, or most of them, at any rate, with simplifications of the questionnaire. At the same time, in the written questions which are put, it may occur that information is required when this is not indicated in the report, and simply because it is not in the questionnaire it might be interesting. Let us then take into account all this work, in order to prepare the work of the committee which will be nominated at the end of our session.

But, pending this, let each member of the Council play his part in order to lend us this assistance to the Committee. In this respect, I would prefer not to convene the Committee in order that everybody could do some work; otherwise, only the designated members will do it and the others will abstain, whereas everybody could be equally useful.

(Interpretation from French)

The PRESIDENT: / We can then first decide whether it will be a Committee of four, six or a plenary committee. Then we might go on to the appointment of the members of the committee, but, first of all, how many members should the committee consist of?

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): I scarcely think we have to vote on how many members there should be on the committee. We can very well leave that to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: I think it was decided that there was to be a committee of four.

Mr. FLETCHER-COCKE (United Kingdom): I am not at all clear exactly what this committee is going to do. It seems to me that the discussion is going round and round in circles. From time to time we do have a reference to this procedural revision, what the representative of the Philippines calls the synchronization of the Council's work which, I think, is a good expression. Then it appears to disappear into the background, and then we get back to the provisional questionnaire. Obviously, one cannot consider appointing a Committee until you know what it is going to do and a committee of two, would, in my view, be quite sufficient to redraft the provisional questionnaire, one administering and one non-administering, and the less the better. On the other hand, a committee of four would probably not be big enough to tackle the other problem of deciding how the work of the Council is going to be arranged, and whether

you are going to try and concentrate once a year on each Territory. I should have thought that a committee of six would probably be the minimum for that. Therefore, until you decide ~~exactly~~ when and ~~what~~ work it is going to do, I ^{would} find it difficult, if I were in the President's place, to decide whether the number should be two, four or six.

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of the United Kingdom wants to know my opinion, I will give it. I prefer that the committee be a plenary committee, with a small sub-committee of two for the first draft of a plan for ^{that matter}, and later we can attend to the rest of the matter at the time it arises. But I think the best solution in this matter is to have a plenary committee. That is my opinion, but perhaps the President has no opinion in those cases.

Mr. FLETCHER-COCKE (United Kingdom): There are many advantages in that, but it merely puts the decision one stage later because sooner or later we shall have to decide who is going to be on the sub-committee.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, we can decide. I agree with you as regards a first small sub-committee of two; that is the first solution: a working group of two.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): Will it be easier to find two volunteers for this job?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wish to say that I am always prepared to work in a committee of simplification but not in a committee of amplification.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): May I venture a suggestion: Mr. Ryckmans and Mr. Khalidy can do the exploratory work of simplification.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I deny everything. As I said before, as long as the Jerusalem problem is on the agenda I am unavailable, unfortunately. I regret that very much because I think I have always given my very level best to the Council and I intend to do so still, but this question of Jerusalem engages all my time, to say nothing of my attention, completely. And I regret very much that

for the time being I am not available.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): In fact the representative of Iraq is not really on any of the committees that are now working, and the Jerusalem question will be disposed of very shortly -- we hope within this week. However, this was a suggestion made by the representative of the Philippines -- and I must say that the representative of Iraq has already shown that he has a great capacity for work and great intelligence for any kind of committee work, and his services are always very useful and very valuable.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Indeed, I am very much touched by the appreciation of some of the members, and I have never rejected any advice from the representative of the Philippines, no matter what form it took. However, I will make a bargain with you, Mr. President. I shall be unable to do any work on this Committee, but I shall gladly participate in the first Committee after that.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): In January?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): No. The first Committee to be appointed after this matter.

The PRESIDENT: With respect to the territories, you mean?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Yes, that is right.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I then propose two members be appointed. I should like to know whether the representative of France would take the job, as that delegation has quite a large staff and, perhaps, one of the other members would volunteer, so that no one should think that I wish to throw the work on other shoulders. Perhaps the delegation of the Dominican Republic would like to form part of the Sub-Committee. Perhaps these two members might submit a first report to the Council at the end of the session. We shall then see whether a larger committee should continue to work in the interval between one session and another, in order to submit a final report next year.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): The French delegation is already a member of other committees and every morning our delegation takes part in work of this kind. Could the representative of Belgium, who has shown special confidence in the question of the questionnaire, not be substituted for our delegation? I believe that his collaboration would be extremely useful.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I remember, and those members of the Trusteeship Council in the beginning will remember

with respect to the question of the questionnaire, that I have always been in favour of simplification. I deleted a certain number of matters because I showed the members of the Trusteeship Council that these questions were questions to which it was impossible to get an answer. But because of this I got the reputation of being a saboteur, because people thought that everytime we wanted to simplify the questionnaire and make it more comprehensible, that we were afraid of being interrogated on certain questions of a delicate nature and that this would be disagreeable for the administering power. Therefore, I am afraid I am somewhat a suspect in this matter.

I should prefer that a representative of the Secretariat do this work and he can see what the suggestions given by all the members of the Council are. I can give several interesting suggestions. I believe and think that if we had an intelligent member of the Secretariat do this, we might receive some very useful solutions which would make our report much shorter, more legible, and would make it very complete, interesting and informative in all respects.

Of course, if the President so desires, I am prepared to work. It must be clearly understood, however, that the work of this committee, as I understand it, is a task which should be done all through the session. Also, I am not prepared to work the entire morning. I shall read through each one of the reports that are submitted to me and I shall put notes in the margin. Thus, from the comparison of those notes at the end of the session the result will be quite interesting. We shall have a report on the two Togolands and on all the territories of the Pacific. Therefore we shall have five reports and that will enable us to compare the answers made to ^{the different} parts of the questionnaire. We shall examine the answers to all the questions, and when comparing those answers, if we see that everybody answers incorrectly, that will be proof that the question was badly put. But that is a task which has to be carried out throughout the session. After the session we will compare the notes which we have made during our studies.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Therefore the representative of Belgium accepts, under certain conditions. Of course, it is understood that it is only a preliminary work that will be carried out by the small Subcommittee of two. They will submit a first report at the end of this session and then we shall decide how it is to progress -- whether it is to be a final report or not.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): The Subcommittee of two includes the delegation of the Dominican Republic also.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. This matter is then decided.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I wish to raise another slight matter in connexion with the written questions to be handed in with regard to the Pacific Islands. It will be remembered that according to our schedule today is the deadline for the handing in of these written questions. On the other hand, it will be remembered that according to our schedule the day for the examination of the Pacific Island Report has been postponed from Friday, 16 June, to Monday, 19 June. I would suggest, if it is agreeable, that in view of this slight postponement we should allow one more day for the preparation of written questions. In other words, I suggest that we make our deadline for the handing in of written questions Tuesday, 13 June, and that we require the answers to be returned by the end of Thursday, 15 June. This would allow for the distribution by the Secretariat of the answers on Friday, 16 June. The answers could be read over the weekend in preparation for the examination of the Pacific Islands Territory on 19 June.

The PRESIDENT: That suggestion seems to be practical. However, we seem to have a number of free days. As we cannot change the dates of the examination of reports, perhaps the Committee on Petitions could give us some work for those days.

REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We now come to the third item on today's agenda, the revision of the rules of procedure. We must decide whether there are delegations which wish to submit proposals for amendment of the rules of procedure or whether we should drop this item from our agenda. If there are delegations which wish to submit revisions to the rules of procedure, they are, of course, free to do so. Two other revisions have already been adopted.

Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina): When this question was discussed the other day, I think the great majority of the members of the Council agreed that the item was included because of an extra zeal on the part of the Secretariat. I think this question was discussed at the previous session and that there is no further need for discussion at this time.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of Argentina is right in reminding us that we have reached the same position as at a previous meeting, except that then the question was not on the agenda.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): I only wished to say the same thing. I thought we had agreed that the item got on the agenda by mistake last time; now I see it has been put on by mistake, apparently, again.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): As there are no further comments, I think we can eliminate this point from the agenda.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.