

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/FV.697

2 April 1956

ENGLISH

Seventeenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 2 April 1956, at 2 p.m.

President:

Mr. SEARS

(United States of America)

1. Conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika [5a]
2. Conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi [3b]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.697. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

56-08538

CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TANGANYIKA: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE
(T/L.657)/[Agenda item 3 a]

Mr. GERIC (United States of America)(Chairman of the Drafting Committee):

I think that this report (T/L.657) of the Drafting Committee has been in the hands of all members of the Council for one or two days now. The introduction to this report on the first three pages, which indicates the way in which the Drafting Committee thought that the recent recommendation of the Trusteeship Council could best be handled -- particularly with reference to previous Assembly resolutions -- is self-explanatory. On the bottom of page 1, paragraph 2, it is indicated that sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) inclusive of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 752 (VIII) and the material under them are set out in the various appropriate places in the first part of this report. There is a separate section on page 50 of the report, section VI, which puts together in one place the point of view of the Administering Authority -- in this case the United Kingdom -- in regard to the question of a time table, as we popularly refer to it. There are certain recommendations on pages 51 and 52 of the report, at the very end of this document, which represents what the Committee thought in general language might be at least one appropriate way of giving the points of view of the various countries and interests concerned with reference to the problem of establishing intermediate target dates and final time-limits for the attainment of self-government or independence. Thus you have before you a document which undertakes to put in various parts of the report the matters called for under the resolution of the Council adopted a few days ago. Perhaps the chief virtue of the report, if any, is its form. The form undertakes to put the material under the various headings where we as a Committee thought it properly belonged. Heretofore, where there was no heading in any of these reports, we put the subject in a separate place. Here it is in section VI on page 50.

I think that none of the members of the Drafting Committee would say that this is the most perfect way of presenting the report to the Council, but we lay it before the Council on the basis that general agreement, we hope, might be secured.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I think that it would be appropriate at this time for me to make a brief comment in relation to the reservation which I made in the Drafting Committee, of which I was a member, on behalf of my delegation. This reservation is recorded in paragraph 7 on page 2 of the report.

Members of the Council who are familiar with the debate on this issue of target dates and time-limits which took place at the fifteenth session when Tanganyika was under discussion will know why my delegation cannot go along with the present recommendations which my colleagues in the Drafting Committee have brought forward. The development of each Trust Territory presents particular and often unique problems. There is no reason for us to believe that the situation in Tanganyika fits into any pattern that may work in other Trust Territories or, for that matter, in other parts of the world. There is great enthusiasm and there is much hard work being done in Tanganyika aimed at achieving self-government for the Territory, inspired by the present policy of the Administering Authority. There has been no demand there for these time-tables.

As my delegation said last year, the plain fact with regard to political, as well as economic, social and educational, development is that there is only one way, and that is by making each step in the progressive process firm and building on it as quickly as possible, keeping in mind a general objective but refusing to let new theories blind one to the facts. When a Trust Territory has reached an advanced stage in its progress towards self-government, it may sometimes be both possible and politically desirable to forecast certain limited and imminent steps in political development, but no one claims that this is the situation in Tanganyika. It remains our view that the Administering Authority concerned is in the best position to judge whether and in what fields it is possible or practicable to establish target dates or time-tables.

In the light of what the Administering Authority is recorded as having stated on this matter in the report before us, my delegation sees it as inappropriate that the Council should seek to press what amounts to a contrary point of view by these recommendations.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): The report of the Drafting Committee which we are now considering contains on this occasion a new element, namely, chapter VI which is headed, "Establishment of intermediate target dates and final time-limit for the attainment of self-government or independence". The chapter is a brief one consisting of five paragraphs out of a total of 156. Although I may have a few comments to make on one or other of the recommendations which are proposed in the earlier part of the report, my comments at the present time will be devoted to chapter VI.

Representatives will be reminded, when reading this chapter, of the unfortunate differences of opinion which arose at the fifteenth session of the Council when the report of the 1954 Visiting Mission to the Territory was considered. Nevertheless, although in the event the United Kingdom delegation had to oppose the report of the Council at that session, not without considerable regret, that situation did not arise because the Council decided to adopt the main recommendation of the 1954 Visiting Mission. In fact, representatives will remember that no proposal on the subject of time-limits was put forward by any delegation in the Council at that session.

It is, therefore, with much disappointment that my delegation finds that on the present occasion we are faced with recommendations which revive all the bitter controversy which prevailed on the occasion when the affairs of this Trust Territory were last considered. I find it hard to understand the motives of those delegations which seek to provoke a head-on clash with the Administering Authority. There is no doubt that the Trusteeship Council can be an instrument of value to an Administering Authority. My delegation has always held that view and has sought to co-operate fully with the Council in its deliberations. But the effect of a head-on collision between the Council on the one hand and the Administering Authority on the other can only be to undermine the Administering Authority's confidence in the Council throughout the field of its work. There can be no doubt that this is the result. Is it the result which is desired by those delegations which have taken the initiative in this matter of time-limits for self-government?

I find myself in some difficulty in attempting to analyse the reasons which have caused the delegations primarily concerned to pin their faith to this concept of timed political development. It is, of course, easy to argue -- since time-tables for development in the economic, social and educational spheres are commonly undertaken by Administering Authorities -- that there is no logical reason why time-tables for political development should also not be undertaken. The recommendation which the Council has before it on this matter purports to maintain that there is no difference between timed political development and timed economic, social and educational development. These four spheres of development are mentioned twice in the recommendation as though there were no difference, but members of the Council know perfectly well that there is a profound difference. Development in the other spheres is fundamentally development of a physical nature. One sets a target to get so many children into as many schools as possible by a certain date, or to build so many hospitals within a certain period of time. Timed political development, however, would have to be absolute guesswork since there could be no physical or factual basis on which to calculate.

Our responsibility under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement is to prepare the peoples of the Trust Territory for self-government, and preparation for this responsibility depends on the interplay of numerous imponderable forces. Advances have to be made after a very close assessment of the conditions in the Territory at the time in question. It is unthinkable that those responsible for carrying on Her Majesty's Government could, in the proper discharge of their duties under the Trusteeship System, plot out a timed course of political development for a Trust Territory based on nothing more than guesswork.

I fear that the motives of those who favour this concept are less theoretical than their recommendations give the appearance of being. The setting of successive targets and dates in the political field, if that course were followed by the Administering Authority, would, of course, be used as a lever with which to apply direct pressure on the Administering Authority from the moment such targets and dates were set.

(Sir Alan Burns,
United Kingdom)

Nothing I have said hitherto will come as a surprise to members of the Council, nor the fact that my delegation could not in any circumstances accept the recommendation which is included in Chapter VI of the report. I do not need to comment in detail on the terms of the recommendation itself. There is, however, one feature to which my delegation takes strong exception. In the third paragraph of the recommendation, we read:

"... the Council commends to the Administering Authority ... the opinion that ... the drawing up of successive targets for political, economic, social and educational plans and programmes would tend to induce an atmosphere of understanding and confidence in which the Territory would be able to move ahead more rapidly and harmoniously."

In the first place, it is quite untrue to suppose that the atmosphere of the Territory is such as to prevent it from moving ahead harmoniously. On the contrary, relationships in Tanganyika are harmonious, and we trust that they can remain so. This part of the recommendations seems to suggest that either they are not harmonious or that they will not remain so. But what right has the Council to make such a baleful prediction?

In the second place, this part of the recommendation talks about inducing an atmosphere of understanding and confidence. This implies that there is a lack of confidence at the present time. On what basis has the Council reached this conclusion?

These points are, however, subsidiary to the theme of the recommendation as a whole -- and I have no doubt that the Committee, in framing its recommendation, did not wish to convey the unfortunate implications which my delegation considers that it does convey.

I have not dealt in this statement with other than the question of substance which is raised in the terms of the recommendation itself. Nevertheless, I am bound to place on record my profound regret that the Council should decide, if it adopts this recommendation, to throw overboard its procedures for the examination of conditions in the Trust Territories by treating this question of the attainment of self-government or independence as in some way a matter divorced from the realistic appraisal of the present

conditions and the future prospects of the Territory, judged according to objective merits and criteria.

I regret having had to take so much of the Council's time to explain the views of my delegation in this matter, but I considered it necessary to do so since the recommendation in Chapter VI which we now have before us has, in my view, far-reaching implications.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): When I spoke a few moments ago, I was speaking in my capacity as Chairman of the Drafting Committee, and I had assumed that perhaps statements on the question which has just been referred to would be made when we come to Chapter VI of the report. But, since the representatives of New Zealand and the United Kingdom have already spoken on this subject, I think that perhaps I should, in my capacity as representative of the United States, make a few comments as to how we consider both the substance and the implications of the subject matter contained in Chapter VI of the report. Therefore, I should like to explain at this point the sense in which we propose to vote on the recommendations contained in Chapter VI.

Several weeks ago, in referring to the subject of the attainment of self-government or independence, the United States delegation said that, although we do not believe in the laying down of long-range time-limits as being generally useful or practical, we do think that the setting of intermediate targets for political as well as for economic, social and educational advancement can give a sense of purpose and direction to peoples who are on their way to the final goal, a goal which was described recently in the Washington Joint Declaration as "self-government and independence of all countries whose people desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence".

We are now considering whether such a suggestion could have any utility in the particular case of Tanganyika. In the light of the conditions there and in the light of our own experience in former non-self-governing territories, my delegation does believe that the suggestion of setting intermediate targets may be of some value in this case.

In saying this, we remember and often recall that no country in the world has done more than the United Kingdom to spread over the world the basic concepts of freedom, rights of minorities, protection of individual rights, democratic processes of government, judicial procedures, and a number of other basic foundations of free government. Moreover, we see before our eyes the unfolding of free and independent government in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, a process which some people actually think may be developing almost too fast for stability. We doubt whether any of us sitting around this table or in the Fourth Committee of the Assembly is in a position to offer much advice to the United Kingdom on the subject of developing free and stable governmental institutions. In fact, we are sometimes quite amazed at the advice which we hear so freely proffered when we view it against the prevailing practices. Therefore, when we invite the Administering Authority in this case to consider the practicability of adopting programmes of planned development in Tanganyika in the form of intermediate targets and dates in certain political, economic, social and educational fields, we do it knowing that a good deal of practice of this kind has already been experienced and leadership taken by the Administering Authority itself.

Our affirmative vote is also based on the understanding that the Administering Authority in this case, as in every case, has a responsibility for deciding how far and how fast such programmes can be carried out, having regard to their feasibility and to the budgetary possibilities. But we recommend this programme also because we know that there are tremendous and hopeful forces of national aspiration emerging in our contemporary world which deserve the support and sympathetic understanding of all of us -- an understanding, I am glad to say, which the Administering Authority is showing in full measure.

Finally, let me say that if it is thought difficult to apply in the political area targets of planned development comparable to five-year or ten-year economic and social development programmes, or road-building programmes, or programmes of building hospitals, or whatever it may be in that sphere, we do believe from our own experience that in such fields as the widening of universal suffrage, the increasing of legislative and executive powers or the building of representative institutions based increasingly on the consent of the governed, there may be found opportunities for the progressive achievement of such goals. And let me add that

experience has shown that such programmes, whether in the economic or political field, must be kept flexible enough so that changes and adaptations can be made during the course of their operation. It is in this sense that the initiative which we took several weeks ago and which in part only is reflected in this report is being supported by the United States delegation.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation has listened very carefully to the statement recently made by the representative of the United Kingdom. We should like to explain that the draft recommendation in Chapter VI of the draft report is in response to General Assembly resolutions on the subject. It does not, unfortunately, take up a position on the question of a time-limit for the final objective of self-government or independence. On the contrary, it simply asks the Administering Authority to indicate intermediate targets on the road to the final objective. We do not agree that this modest recommendation need provoke a head-on collision with the Administering Authority. It does, however, represent a point of view which is different from that of the Administering Authority. But, in our opinion, such differences are inevitable in this Council occasionally.

9

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

We do not, however, accept the implications which the representative of the United Kingdom has read into it, namely that there is lacking in Tanganyika an atmosphere of understanding and confidence in the Administering Authority. From our experience we can say that the atmosphere in that Territory is a most hopeful one, and we feel sure that this modest recommendation contained in chapter VI will serve to lay firm foundations of lasting co-operation between the Administering Authority and the people.

Mr. CUTES (Australia): I asked to speak merely in order to express the hope that the members of the Council would not consider this the appropriate time to express their views on the texts of the recommendations made in chapter VI. My delegation has some views on this subject, but we would hope to express them when we come to chapter VI in due course, when we have taken up the other recommendations.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 8 on page 3 of the report the Drafting Committee recommends that the Council adopt the outline of conditions and the draft conclusions and recommendations as the basic text of the chapter on Tanganyika for inclusion in its next report to the General Assembly. The Council will proceed to vote on the recommendations contained in the annex.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 5 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 12 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 21 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 26 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): (interpretation from Russian): At the end of the fifth recommendation in paragraph 34 is a statement that the Council hopes that the Administering Authority will continue to take extreme care and caution in the application of the Societies Ordinance and other regulations in order that there may be no suspicion that the free development of political consciousness and organization is being impeded in the Territory. Perhaps instead of "suspicion" we should use the word "obstacle"

(Mr. Grubyakov, USSR)

since we are not suspecting the Administering Authority of anything. The text would then read "...that there may be no obstacle to the free development..." and so on. I do not think any delegation has voiced any suspicion about the motives or the actions of the Administering Authority. I would also suggest that the words "is being impeded in the Territory" should be dropped.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): This is a rather difficult recommendation for my delegation to support, either in its original form or in the amended form as was proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union. In fact, we like the amended form less than we liked the original. I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that it is hardly appropriate for the Council to express the view or even to imply that there may be grounds for suspicion that the free development of political consciousness and so on is being impeded. But I think it is even less admissible to suggest that there is an obstacle to the free development of political consciousness. For these reasons, I shall have to oppose the amendment and, whether or not the amendment is adopted, I shall also have to oppose the recommendation.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): (interpretation from Russian): I do not think that one would interpret my suggestion as seeking to make this recommendation worse than it is. I consider that the local authorities must see to it that the ordinances and regulations are respected. I am not trying to make it more complex. This is in the normal course of the Administering Authority's activities. Does the representative of the Administering Authority considers that this suggestion is undesirable or dangerous?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I propose to abstain in the vote on the paragraph as it now stands but I must certainly vote against the Soviet Union amendment, since to say "in order that there may be no obstacle" implies that there is an obstacle now.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put the Soviet Union amendment to the vote. It is to replace the words "suspicion that" by the words "obstacle to" and to delete the words "is being impeded in the Territory".

Mr. GRUVYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): If the Administering Authority feels that there exists suspicion about its intentions and they want the word "suspicion" to remain in the recommendation, that is agreeable to me. Of course, I will withdraw my proposal in that case.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I suspect that there are suspicions.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): As I have already said, if the Administering Authority knows better than we do about the existence of such suspicion, of course I will not object to that. I merely wished to improve the text, but I do not object to having it remain as it is.

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet amendment having been withdrawn, the Council will now vote on the recommendation as a whole.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 34 was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 40 was adopted by 13 votes to none.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 43 was unanimously adopted.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like a vote to be taken paragraph by paragraph as regards the recommendation contained in paragraph 62.

Mr. BARGUES (France)(interpretation from French): I should like to have a vote in three parts on the recommendation contained in paragraph 62. I would ask that the first paragraph of the recommendation should be voted on separately, followed by another vote on the first sentence of the second paragraph, and finally, another vote on the last part of the second paragraph.

The first paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 62 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The first sentence of the second paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 62 was adopted unanimously.

The second sentence of the second paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 62 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 62 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 66 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 71 was adopted by 13 votes to none.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 79 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 83 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 89 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 92 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 96 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my abstention. The recommendation expresses the hope that the efforts of the Administering Authority to encourage the development of women's activities will be continued and that they will lead to a fuller enjoyment by the African women of the Territory of the rights and privileges due them. I do not think that any privileges need be accorded to these women.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 103 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The words "as soon as conditions permit" in the recommendation contained in paragraph 114 seem superfluous to my delegation. Therefore, I should like a separate vote on these words.

The phrase "as soon as conditions permit" in the recommendation contained in paragraph 114 was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 114 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 119 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 127 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 133 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 139 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 151 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I should like separate votes to be held on some sections of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156. In the first place, I should like a separate vote on that portion of the second paragraph beginning with the words "For the time being" and ending with the words "or independence".

In the third paragraph in the recommendation reference is made to "successive targets for political, economic, social and educational plans and programmes". I would ask for a separate vote on the word "political" in that paragraph.

In the fourth paragraph of the recommendation it is stated that "The Council accordingly recommends to the Administering Authority that it indicate such successive intermediate targets". I would ask for a separate vote on the word "such" and also on the word "political" at the beginning of the third line of that paragraph. I would also ask for a separate vote on the final words "as will create conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence".

Mr. CLAEYS-BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Before the vote I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the French text where it is said that "for the time being, and pending such further decision as the General Assembly may wish to take on the question of a time-limit...". I should like to state my delegation's opinion on this. The General Assembly is not qualified by the Charter to take any "further decisions" in this matter.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation shares the view just expressed by the Belgian delegation. The General Assembly has no competence in this regard because the powers of the Trusteeship Council derive from Trusteeship Agreements. The General Assembly cannot be competent to set a time-limit for the termination of this trusteeship. The Charter has not conferred these powers on the General Assembly.

As regards the whole of this draft resolution, I wish to say that my delegation will have to vote against it, and I do not think I have to dwell upon the reasons why. My delegation took a position with regard to this problem during the fifteenth session when the question of Tanganyika was first discussed. At the beginning of our discussion the representative of the United Kingdom made a much too clear statement for me to have to return to it. There is no doubt that to set a time-limit for reaching independence or self-government means to misunderstand completely the conditions that prevail in Territories, especially in a Territory that is still very under-developed. I am of course referring to these intermediate target dates. It is not easy to set target dates for economic, social and cultural development. Four-year, five-year and ten-year plans have always met delays. If it is possible to set approximate deadlines in those matters, it is absolutely senseless to set deadlines for political development since these involve human problems.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): I think that perhaps there may be some translation difficulty although that would not take care of the whole difficulty of some of the delegations here. However, I think that many delegations would agree -- mine certainly would, at least -- that it would be impossible for the Assembly to set a definite deadline. All it could do would be to make a

recommendation, but the French text apparently has the word "décision". The English text has the word "action". "Action", I think, is much broader. Action may mean any suggestion or any recommendation that the Assembly may wish to make on the subject. Such action might take many forms, but it probably would not take the form of a decision. The word "decision" is one of the difficulties here, I think. Perhaps the French text could be brought into line with the English text in that respect.

Mr. GRUBIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In addition to what was said by the representative of the United States, I should like to point out that what we have here is "further action" of the General Assembly on the question of a time-limit. The General Assembly is therefore not being recommended to set a time-limit; it is merely suggested that it take appropriate action regarding the question of setting a time-limit. It does not mean that it will specifically take such a decision. It merely is to take action on the problem. Perhaps it will act in the spirit in which it has acted in the past on such matters. As far as my delegation is concerned, therefore, there does not seem to be any conflict between the powers of the General Assembly and what is stated here. The action of the General Assembly is not being prejudged in any way. Of course the General Assembly is entitled to study the matter and to take some decision as a result of that study.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): Mr. President, you will no doubt put to the vote the first short paragraph and then the part on which I have requested a separate vote. However, as several members of the Council have given their reasons and views on the part on which I have asked for a separate vote, it might be in order for me to explain my views on that paragraph. This paragraph as a whole deals with the very important matter of time-limits. I do not propose to say anything regarding the views of my delegation on this question as they are well known and I will not have to explain my vote on that portion of the paragraph. These first words, in respect of which I have asked for a separate vote, raise a different issue altogether. They raise the issue of the relations between this Council and the General Assembly. Whatever our views are with regard to the rest of this paragraph, my delegation could not accept the implication in these lines regarding

the relations between the General Assembly and this Council. As we read it, it does carry the implication, whether intended or not, that this Council operates and takes its decisions subject to the approval of the General Assembly -- which is a situation we cannot accept. This paragraph states:

"For the time being, and pending such further action as the General Assembly may wish to take on the question of a time-limit..."

Why should this Council take any decisions "for the time being, and pending such further action as the General Assembly may wish to take"?

For these reasons, and without any reference at all to the substance of the remainder of the paragraph, my delegation will vote against the words in respect to which I have sought a separate vote.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): In our view there is no question here of the General Assembly fixing any time-limits. The General Assembly has already exercised its competence on the general question of the attainment of self-government or independence. It will undoubtedly wish to take further action on this question, and it is to provide for that contingency and in order not to prejudice such further action by the General Assembly that this particular clause has been introduced in the opening part of this paragraph. We shall naturally vote for it.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further comments, the President will state to the Council that the Secretariat will make the proper correction.

We will now vote on the first paragraph in paragraph 156 of document T/L.657 beginning with the words "The Council" and ending with the words "as outlined above".

The paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the phrase in the first sentence of the second paragraph beginning with the words "For the time being" and ending with the words "self-government or independence" in the third line.

The phrase was adopted by 8 votes to 6.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the remainder of the second paragraph beginning with the words "the Council" and ending with the words "self-government or independence".

The remainder of the second paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The second paragraph as a whole was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We come now to the third paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156. A separate vote has been requested on the word "political" in the last line on page 51 of the text.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I should like to explain very briefly why I have asked for a separate vote on this word. As the representative of the United Kingdom pointed out in the statement which he made to the Council earlier, whatever may be said for the merits of drawing up successive targets for economic, social and educational plans and programmes, these considerations simply do not apply in the political field. My delegation is in complete accord with that view, and we feel that, whatever may be the merits of adopting a recommendation with regard to economic, social and educational plans, the Council is on dangerous ground in placing political plans on the same basis. We would, therefore, hope that the word "political" would not be adopted.

The word "political" in the sixth line of the third paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156 was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The third paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156, as a whole, was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I should like to explain why I have asked for a separate vote on a number of words in the fourth paragraph of this recommendation. If the word "such" in the second line of the paragraph, the word "political" in the third line and the words after "fields" were not adopted by the Council the recommendation would then read:

"The Council accordingly recommends to the Administering Authority that it indicate successive intermediate targets and dates in the economic, social and educational fields."

This would avoid the reference to political plans and, also, the reference in the final words of the sentence -- a reference which it is rather difficult for my delegation to accept -- to conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence.

The word "such" in the second line of the fourth paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156 was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The word "political" in the third line of the fourth paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156 was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The final phrase, "as will create conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence", of the fourth paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156 was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156, as a whole, was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The fifth paragraph of the recommendation contained in paragraph 156 was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 156, as a whole, was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish):

Before we go on to the next point, I should like to state for the record that my delegation voted in favour of the recommendations appearing in paragraph 156 because we find no objection whatsoever to any of the concepts appearing therein. However, we should like to state that, in the opinion of our delegation, the recommendations as approved do not entirely satisfy the recommendations of this Council or of the General Assembly in this field.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the annex as a whole -- that is, on the outline of conditions and the draft conclusions and recommendations.

The annex as a whole was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I voted against the annex as a whole because it includes the last recommendation in paragraph 156.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): I voted in the same manner as the representative of the United Kingdom because the annex includes the recommendation in paragraph 156 of the English text, which is paragraph 157 of the French text.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): We voted against the annex for the same reason.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): My position is the same as that of the three preceding speakers. The final recommendation was quite unacceptable to my delegation, and any report containing such a recommendation could not have our support.

CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI: REPORT OF THE
DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.653) [Agenda item 3 b]

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee): In introducing the report of the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi, it is only necessary for me to draw attention to the contents of paragraphs 6 and 7, which deal with the question of the attainment of self-government or independence. It will be seen from these paragraphs that the Committee could reach no agreed conclusion as to what it should recommend for the Council to include in its report on this question to the General Assembly. The Committee, however, decided that it might be of assistance to the Council if both the proposals which it examined were brought to the Council's attention, and this has been done in paragraph 7 of the report.

In other respects, the report follows the normal lines. I should like to take this opportunity of extending my thanks to the Secretary of our Committee whose assistance materially helped the Committee to complete its work.

The PRESIDENT: In the first part of paragraph 2 of the report, the Drafting Committee recommends that the Council adopt the draft charter attached to the report. That draft chapter is composed of an outline of conditions and of a number of recommendations. The Council will first vote on each of the recommendations proposed by the Committee.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 4 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to the recommendation contained in paragraph 10, I request that a separate vote be taken on the first sentence, and then another vote on the remainder of the paragraph.

The first sentence of the recommendation contained in paragraph 10 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The remainder of the recommendation contained in paragraph 10 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 10 as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 15 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 19 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 25 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 26 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 29 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 36 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 48 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 57 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 58, may I ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to give me an explanation as to what is meant by the words "biological balance". Does it apply to the soil, to the livestock or to some other aspects of biology?

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): If the representative of the Soviet Union will refer to paragraph 55 of the report (T/L.653), the kind of balance which is intended in the recommendation is there specified. It is in fact a very wide covering balance.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I imagine that it sounds the same in all languages. It would appear from paragraph 55 that two pilot projects were established with a view to setting up a biological balance between man, land, vegetation, water and cattle, and so on. I am not so sure that this really sounds well. Of course I understand what is meant, namely, whether the land with all its resources is able to feed the population. But the draft itself sounds rather inelegant, if I may say so. Therefore, my delegation would not be able to vote for such a recommendation. We feel that it is a rather unfortunate wording, although the meaning seems clear. Perhaps the text should be redrafted.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): I therefore propose that the words in paragraph 55 be included in the recommendation; that is to say, after the words "biological balance" in paragraph 58, the words "between man, land, vegetation, water and cattle, to determine pastoral capacity" be added.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): There was apparently a misunderstanding between the representative of the United Kingdom and myself. I think that to mention a biological balance between a man and an animal is, to tell the truth, quite indecent for a United Nations document. I am sure that the meaning is clear. We are referring to the soil possibilities of this area. But of course we cannot speak about a biological balance between man and animal. Perhaps we should use the words, "to ascertain the soil possibilities" or "the pastoral capacity". But let us leave the biological balance between man and animal out of it.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I do not think that the text as worded means a balance between man and animal. What is the important thing here is the biological balance, and this biological balance, of course, involves the existence of man, as well as the existence of animals, within a given area, bearing in mind the vegetal, water and soil conditions. It is not at all a question here of establishing a balance between the human element and the animal element; it is merely a matter of ascertaining the capacity of the area to see that the balance there is maintained. I think that the semantic scruples of the representative of the Soviet Union are somewhat too excessive.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not deny that it is rather a caricature perhaps, but that is what we read in the text. If we are referring to the economic capacity of the Territory, and assuming that man and animals live there, perhaps this phrase "biological balance" should be changed to the "economic capacity or potentiality of the Territory". Then it would be very clear in the context of vegetation, water and so on. The same thing could be repeated in the recommendation appearing in paragraph 58, where it speaks of the biological balance. Of course, the production of food for both cattle and human beings is involved. The meaning is quite clear, but I do not think the text is very good.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish):

I did not wish to intervene, but perhaps a clarification is needed. My delegation in the Drafting Committee felt that the present wording was not very felicitous, but the circumstances were as follows. We were referring to the cattle problem, and it was felt that the ubuhake system was a problem that must be solved. From the explanation given to us by the special representative, we reached the conclusion that the cattle was not simply a social or traditional problem of the ubuhake system, but it was an economic problem with very deep roots. It was not that there were too many cattle, but that cattle were sometimes lacking. We tried to find an economic solution to the problem of lots of cattle but a shortage of meat. We felt that the Administering Authority should study the problem from this point of view. That is why we referred to the pilot projects on the question of biological balance.

I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the Drafting Committee used this terminology because it appeared in the explanation given by the special representative and in the annual report of the Administering Authority. That is to say, we were simply identifying a pilot project which was called a pilot project on biological balance. Of course, it is not a question of drawing a balance between man and animals, but rather an economic balance, though naturally it has a biological basis.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUAFERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In order to formulate a constructive proposal and to avoid any misunderstanding, which is, of course, possible since the representative of the Soviet Union has just proved it, I would propose that the sentence read as follows:

"Two pilot projects were established in 1955, one in Ruanda and the other in Urundi, to study the methods that would best assure the conservation of natural resources."

We would delete the words "to study the establishment of a biological balance between man, land, vegetation, water and cattle". The words "to determine pastoral capacity, and to study the disposal of surplus cattle as well as the improvement of remaining stock" would be retained.

The same change would then be made in paragraph 58, which would read:

"The Council notes with interest the inauguration of pilot projects in both pays with a view to studying the methods of the conservation of natural resources."

The remainder of the paragraph, beginning with the words "and hopes that", would be retained.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): In the English text it would be better to say "for the purpose of studying" rather than "with a view to studying".

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): Far be it from me to cause any further difficulties with regard to this paragraph, which I did not think would give any trouble at all, but I wonder whether the suggestion of the representative of Belgium concerning the conservation of natural resources would in fact reflect the nature of these pilot projects, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, give the meaning which the Drafting Committee attempted to give. I will not press this point if the representative of Belgium does not want to accept my suggestion, but I wonder whether instead of speaking of biological balance or of the simple conservation of natural resources, we could not refer to the establishment or the re-establishment of the balanced use of natural resources.

I do not know whether this applies to the English or the French text, but in Spanish, to speak of a pilot project for a biological balance to solve this cattle problem is not very coherent.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The suggestion of the representative of Guatemala is a very good one. It is indeed an improvement on what I had suggested.

The PRESIDENT: According to the suggested amendment, the recommendation contained in paragraph 58 would read:

"The Council notes with interest the inauguration of pilot projects which tend to establish a balanced use of natural resources, and hopes..."
The remainder of the recommendation would be retained.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): My previous suggestion would, I think, help here. It should be "for the purpose of establishing" not "which tend to establish".

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 58, amended to read as follows:

"The Council notes with interest the inauguration of pilot projects for the purpose of establishing the balanced use of natural resources, and hopes that these studies will contribute to the development of methods of stock-breeding, management and marketing capable of improving both the livelihood of the stock-owners and the food supply of the population as a whole."

The recommendation contained in paragraph 58, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to the recommendation contained in paragraph 63.

Mr. GRUEYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The third line in this paragraph contains the words "as a means of providing a livelihood for surplus population". I suggest we drop the word "surplus" here because these industries, after all, are useful for all of the population. This word "surplus" sounds bad in Russian as it implies that they are expendable. I do not think that the meaning would be affected if we dropped the word "surplus". Let us simply say that:

"... secondary industries ... should be of particular benefit as a means of providing a livelihood for the population."

Perhaps the members of the Drafting Committee will not object to the deletion of the word "surplus".

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): I think it would be better to put in the words "the growing for surplus", which I think would meet the point of the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection to this amendment, the amended form will replace the word "surplus" with the words "the growing".

Mr. MAX (France) (interpretation from French): The text may be satisfactory in English; but I have the feeling that it may sound rather unusual in French, for it would mean that you would be absorbing the growing manpower. It does not sound very good in French.

The PRESIDENT: I hope it will be satisfactory to the French representative if I say that the French text will be adjusted to the meaning of the English text.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 63 as amended was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 71 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 77 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 94 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 95 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to the recommendation contained in paragraph 104 of the report.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is stated at the end of this paragraph that the Administering Authority should pay particular attention to "the education and training of Africans as qualified doctors". We might also add here the words "and the building of new hospitals". In other words it would read:

"... that the education and training of Africans as qualified doctors and the building of new hospitals will retain the special attention of the Administering Authority".

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The draft recommendation as it now stands stresses that 16.74 per cent of the resources of the Territory are being expended on public health. On the other hand, the Government in Ruanda-Urundi of course attaches great importance to the extension of the hospital network and all our past actions testify to this. It is obvious also that the building of new hospitals raises budgetary problems which may slow down the inevitable extension of this hospital network. I do not think that the addition of these words would improve the text or would be of any use to a solution of this problem in the Territory. It is obvious that if the resources of capital are adequate and if the normal natural resources which will enable us to administer and manage these new hospitals are available, the Administration will certainly take steps to build these new hospitals.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): It is my feeling that the amendment proposed by the representative of the USSR to this text would not improve it. In fact, it would read rather oddly to us with this addition. The sentence starts off by expressing confidence that further general expansion of these services will take place -- that is medical services. We start off by expressing confidence that there will be a general expansion, and then we express the hope that the Administering Authority will devote special attention presumably to some special corner of the general problem and that corner is the education and training of Africans as qualified doctors. So far, so good. But if you want it also to devote special attention to building new hospitals, well then you have pretty well covered the whole field of medical services: provision of doctors and of hospitals. It seems to us a pretty strange way for the Council to show its confidence that further expansion in the service will take place by specifying in a most extraordinary manner the kind of special attention it feels the Administering Authority should give to this problem. I would be able to support the recommendation as it stands but not with the amendment proposed by the USSR representative.

The USSR amendment to insert "and the building of new hospitals" after the word "doctors" in the last line of the recommendation contained in paragraph 104, was rejected by 5 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 104 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 109 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 120 was adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 121 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendations contained in paragraphs 122, 123 and 124 were adopted unanimously.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 125 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the outline of conditions submitted by the Drafting Committee on pages 8-32 of the report.

The outline of conditions was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the recommendation contained in the second part of paragraph 2 on page 1 of the report.

The recommendation was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat will communicate with each delegation in order to prepare the summary of individual observations.

I now wish to draw attention to paragraph 6, on page 2 of the report. In this paragraph the Drafting Committee informs the Council that, in acting upon the instructions given to it by the Council in resolutions 1254 (XVI) and 1369 (XVII) concerning the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence, it considered two proposals which were both rejected. The text of these proposals is set forth in paragraph 7 of the report. I suggest that the Council take note of these two paragraphs.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I would request the President to put proposal B to the vote, and to take separate votes on parts A, B and C thereof.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): Since a request has been made that proposal B should be put to the vote, I should like on behalf of my delegation to ask the President to put proposal A also to the vote.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Since Part A is being put to the vote, I should like to give a few additional explanations. I did not have a chance either in the Drafting Committee or elsewhere to give the views of my delegation regarding the text of this draft.

If one needed a further illustration of the dangers to which my delegation has often wished to draw the attention of the Council, the text which we have before us would provide a perfect example. We find not only a simplified text -- or, rather, a text which makes the various situations deceptively simple -- but a text which indeed distorts them.

In Part A of Proposal B, the following is stated:

"The Council noted that the present constitutional and political situation of the Territory... are not based on any form of popular consultation."

This means that the Trusteeship System was established without popular consultation. I think there are many existing States whose present historical form is not the result of public consultation but of historical circumstances, and Ruanda-Urundi is no exception to this situation. However, the internal political structure of the Territory, if it was not the subject of popular consultation, is nevertheless based on existing political situations and facts to which the structures have been adapted, and these structures, which existed even before the setting up of the Trusteeship System, corresponded to a normal historical evolution and reflected their aspirations to some extent.

It is further stated that "indigenous councils at various levels provide a means of consultation on local matters". That is not so. These councils can express their views on all matters, not only on local matters.

In paragraph 3 of Part A, it is stated that "The Council noted that... many branches of the Administration of the Territory are in fact those of the Belgian Congo". That is a flagrant inaccuracy. The services of the Territory are altogether separate from those of the Belgian Congo. The only union that exists between the two Territories as regards the structures of these services is that the corps of officials who administer Ruanda-Urundi are part of a corps of officials that is common to both Territories. But all the administrative services are strictly indigenous to the Territory and distinct from those of the Belgian Congo.

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

A little further, we read that "the newly-formed indigenous councils possess powers which may be considered to be of an executive nature in local matters". They are not only of an executive nature in local matters; they are also of a legislative nature in local matters.

In paragraph 4, it is stated that "The Council noted that the indigenous councils are indirectly elected by voters designated... by the chiefs...". That might substantiate the opinion that the voters are designated by the chiefs in an arbitrary manner and merely on the basis of the opinion of the chiefs about them. This is inaccurate. The councils were merely invited to send in a list of notables who could express their views on all matters bearing on the political institutions and the operation of these institutions within their purview. This list of notables is publicized; it can be controlled and looked into. Anybody can ask to be added to that list. If an individual asks to be put on that list, asks to participate in the elections to the various councils, his name will be included.

This is characteristic of the structure of Ruanda-Urundi, but it is also found elsewhere: there are territories which do exactly the same thing. Not with a view to criticizing, but merely by way of example, I might say that, according to a report of the ILO, the electoral law of Syria, for instance, gives to the Bedouin tribes a number of seats in Parliament, and that these Bedouin tribes, with fourteen seats in the Parliament, have their representatives elected by indirect suffrage by voters who are named by the Government by decree.

It is also stated that no special measures have been taken to increase the number of Africans in the Administration. All the measures in the field of education have as an effect -- perhaps not as a purpose -- to increase the number of Africans in the Administration. There is a school group in Astrida, for instance, which is training specialized Africans who are then being merged with the administrative personnel, and they are being trained as administrative officers, health officers, veterinary officers and agricultural officers.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): My delegation has considerable difficulty with Part A of Proposal B, which is on page 4 and the first half of page 5 of document T/L.653. We have difficulty, first of all, with the form. This material, practically in the same words, was placed before the Drafting Committee on Tanganyika, whose report we dealt with just before the recess. And my delegation felt very strongly that sub-sections (a) to (e), which refer to General Assembly resolution 752, should, if brought into the text at all, be placed within the section on conditions, in the proper places. If one turns to page 12 of this report, it will be seen that there is a section on suffrage, which we adopted a few minutes ago. But sub-section (c), on page 4, also deals with the subject of suffrage, and it seems to my delegation that that material ought to be placed under its proper heading in the document. It is the same with the other sub-sections -- (a), (b), (d) and (e). For example, we feel that sub-section (e), "Development of adequate public revenue", should be placed in its proper place in the economic section, under "Public revenue". Therefore, on the question of form, we find very great difficulty with this.

Moreover, on the question of substance, as the representative of Belgium has already pointed out, we have here certain statements beginning "The Council noted that", and so on. But there are no recommendations here.

It was our understanding that in the document on conditions it was the Secretariat which had the responsibility and duty of laying out the conditions. That is what they do regularly. In all our reports in past years, the Secretariat has prepared a paper outlining these conditions. It is equipped to do that. It is the impartial third party, so to speak. It has all the documents at its disposal and it draws up the conditions. We adopt whatever recommendations we think fit.

There are no recommendations here at all, and I am not sure that the material that was placed here represents the actual conditions which prevail. I would be unable, therefore, to vote for Part A either as a matter of form or as a matter of substance, and I think that other delegations may have the same difficulty.

I believe that in the future it would make for clarity if we adopted a more uniform method of handling the material with respect to the matter of form. The matter of substance will vary in every case from Territory to Territory. However, I would make an appeal to the Council to see whether we could not agree at least on the form of treatment. That is all I have to say on this particular point. When we come to Part B on page 5, I should perhaps like to comment. However, that is not immediately before the Council.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): It was not the intention of my delegation to participate in any debate on this problem. Although no verbatim records were kept in the Drafting Committee, this matter was nevertheless discussed there at great length. However, my delegation is ready to participate in a debate on this subject as long as other delegations wish to carry on such a debate.

The representative of Belgium was kind enough to point out certain facts which, in the opinion of his delegation, are not exact, but which nevertheless appear in Part A of Proposal B, to which we are now referring. I should like to say that I speak only because my delegation was one of those which proposed Proposal B with its Parts A, B and C in the Drafting Committee. We did this because we understood that only in this way could we satisfy the resolutions which this Council and the General Assembly have passed with regard to this matter.

(Mr. Arenales Catalan,
Guatemala)

My delegation presented Proposal B in the Drafting Committee not in the belief that it was infallible and perfect in each and every aspect. We thought that it could be further improved, especially with regard to Part A entitled "Measures taken or contemplated", setting forth the description of facts in the Territory. We felt it opportune in the Drafting Committee to ask the representative of Belgium whether there were any points which were objectionable. He felt that it would be better for the Belgian delegation to reply in Council rather than in Committee, and now is the time to make any necessary rectifications with respect to Part A of Proposal B.

Although in the opinion of the representative of Belgium in all of Part A there is a distortion of facts, my delegation should like at least to refer to certain of the observations presented by him. The first of these, I believe, was with respect to sub-head (a), "Consultations with the inhabitants". The representative of Belgium pointed out that in paragraph 2 it is stated

"that the present constitutional and political situation of the Territory, and in particular its administrative unity with the Belgian Congo and the distribution of executive and legislative powers, are not based on any form of popular consultation."

He added that this was an historic fact. He indicated why this was so and that Belgium was no exception in this matter. My delegation would simply like to point out that that was exactly the object in submitting this fact here. This is not a criticism of the Administering Authority. We are simply noting a fact, the same fact which the representative of Belgium was kind enough to point out to us.

Without having the text of his remarks before me, I find it difficult to recall all the points brought up by the representative of Belgium. However, I have jotted down a few notes, and I will attempt to deal with all of them.

The representative of Belgium referred to the second sentence of paragraph 2 of Part A with respect to consultations with the inhabitants. It reads as follows:

(continued in English)

"It noted that the existing territorial advisory body (Council of the Vice-Government-General) and indigenous councils at various levels provide a means of consultation on local matters, including questions relating to their own constitutions."

(Mr. Arenales Catalan,
Guatemala)

(continued in Spanish)

The intention of this was precisely to recognize that some sort of consultation has taken place, although not with regard to the fundamental political and constitutional situation of the Territory.

With regard to sub-head (b), paragraph 3, the representative of Belgium stated that this was completely inexact, especially with respect to the first sentence, which reads as follows:

(continued in English)

"The Council noted that the principal executive and legislative powers are vested in the metropolitan institutions of the Administering Authority and that many branches" -- and this is the part to which the representative of Belgium objects -- "of the Administration of the Territory are in fact those of the Belgian Congo, of which the Governor-General has certain executive and legislative authority in respect of the Trust Territory."

(continued in Spanish)

My delegation would simply like to bring up two points. In the first place, the very language used in this paragraph is not my native language, and Spanish is not a working language of the Council, although it is an official language. On the other hand, the concept stated here was expressed by the special representative in the Committee on Administrative Unions. There, he was even kind enough to go further and say that in case independence was achieved by Ruanda-Urundi before the Belgian Congo achieved its independence the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi would find itself in a very difficult position because there were certain administrative services which were centralized in the Congo because of the Administrative Union.

If my delegation has not succeeded in repeating the thought of the special representative, I would apologize to him. I simply regret that this matter has not been clarified as yet.

The second point referred to by the special representative concerns suffrage. The proposers of this matter stated in paragraph 4 of sub-head (c):

(continued in English)

"The Council noted that the indigenous councils are indirectly elected by voters designated as such by the chiefs and sub-chiefs..."

(continued in Spanish)

Once again I should like to apologize to the special representative if I did not correctly understand the very detailed explanations which he and the representative of Belgium were kind enough to furnish. The impression which my delegation received was that the election was held by notables who were designated by the chiefs and sub-chiefs, so that it was not a direct election.

This was not a question of criticism; it was a statement of fact. We were attempting to state facts without putting any interpretation upon them.

There was one final point of fact which the representative of Belgium was kind enough to correct. This is to found in sub-head (d), paragraph 5, which states in part:

(continued in English)

"The Council noted that no such appointments are in prospect at an early date and that no special measures to bring about the Africanization of the Administration are contemplated."

(continued in Spanish)

Once again, this is a statement of fact, as my delegation understood it. I would even say that at this very meeting this afternoon the Council approved what in the opinion of my delegation was a similar point of view. In paragraph 19 on page 12 of document T/L.653, the following recommendation, which was approved this afternoon by twelve votes to none, with two abstentions, is found:

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

"The Council notes that the principal means by which the Administering Authority is endeavouring to give to the indigenous inhabitants an increasingly important share in the management of their affairs is through the evolution of their own institutions, to which responsibilities at present exercised by the central administration will progressively be transferred..."

Then the Council goes on to note the statement of the Administering Authority concerning certain developments with the Bami. Finally, the last part of the recommendation reads:

"The Council considers that complementary efforts" -- I repeat the words "complementary efforts" -- "should be made to prepare Africans for responsible posts..."

In the opinion of my delegation, in including this terminology in paragraph 5 of proposal B, we were attempting to establish a situation of fact; that it is the policy of the Administering Authority -- and at the present moment my delegation is not criticizing or approving -- that the Africanization, shall we say, of the Administration will be brought about as a result -- and I think I am quoting the representative of Belgium -- of a whole group of measures, but that no special measures to bring about the Africanization of the Administration are contemplated. There are no specific or special measures. We discussed this in the Drafting Committee, and this then was my attempt at the clarification of the points raised by the representative of Belgium.

As I have said, I do not wish to provoke a debate, but if my delegation has misunderstood the facts or has drafted the statement poorly in English, I would apologize. It was never my intention to distort facts and I believe that I have now proven that my intentions were simply to cite facts which appear in the reports and in the statements of the Administering Authority.

With regard to the intervention of the representative of the United States, I shall not enter upon all the details of his statement. I respect the point of view of his delegation, but unfortunately I cannot share it. Paragraph 2 (b) of resolution 1369 (XVII) reads as follows:

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

"(b) instructs its drafting committees to incorporate, in a readily identifiable form, in the individual chapters of Part II of the Council's annual report to the General Assembly which review progress made by each Territory towards attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System, such conclusions and recommendations as may be appropriate, as well as factual information related directly to developments under the heads mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) above;"

Points (a) to (e), which are mentioned in paragraph 2 (a) of resolution 1369 (XVII), are precisely the headings which my delegation and other delegations felt ought to be included in part A of proposal B.

With regard to the fact that the representative of the United States feels that the Secretariat ought to prepare the factual report, I will not deny the fact that according to paragraph 3 of resolution 1369 (XVII), the Secretariat ought to undertake such a task. However, I would insist that the Drafting Committees should also have terms of reference allowing them to do this. This is the interpretation which my delegation puts on Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII), as well as other resolutions which I could quote. However, in order to save time, I shall not do so.

Mr. CLAEYS LOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I wish to reply very briefly to some of the remarks of the representative of Guatemala. He very aptly stressed the fact that most of the points raised in proposal B were already the subject of recommendations in the report and in the general recommendations of the Council, and that is precisely to what I was drawing the attention of the Council. It is a dangerous method. The whole of this part A of proposal B consists of selecting, out of a total of situations and proposals, certain elements which are represented in a negative fashion and often in an inaccurate matter, as I pointed out. It is this method which I think is extremely dangerous and I had occasion to draw the attention of the Council to it on other occasions.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I am most reluctant to say what I feel obliged to say about this draft proposal, as I hoped that we would not be called upon to vote on it. My trouble with it does not arise from inaccuracies in the facts to which it purports to relate, but with the whole tone of this draft. I say without hesitation that this is a slanted draft, and I would say, if I did not know better the authors of it, that it was a malicious draft. I do not believe that malice is present, but I do believe that this draft springs from a preconception to which I have referred before, namely that it is the duty of the Council, at all costs, to show up in their true colours -- which are inevitably black -- the Administering Authority. This particular draft is an outstanding example of this particular philosophy. It purports to set out facts; it selects the facts; it presents them in such a way as to lead inevitably to the conclusion that the Administering Authority is in the wrong. Such facts as tend to the favour of the Administering Authority are left out. If they are included, they are included in such a fashion as to play down their importance. The whole effect is to slant the draft.

I frankly do not believe there is any purpose to be served by my going into detail through the draft proposal to bring out examples of this kind of slanting. The representative of Belgium has already given some examples; there are others. It is not a matter of saying that one part of it is objectionable and that the rest is acceptable. I do not believe there is a paragraph or a sentence in the draft as it stands which is entirely free from the criticism I have made.

I say quite sincerely that it is with a sense of shock that my delegation finds itself confronted in this Council, at this stage, with a draft of this character. Of course, it follows that I propose to vote against every and all parts of it. Should it happily be defeated, root and branch, my delegation would be prepared to support the draft set out in proposal A on page 2 of the report.

Mr. MAX (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation is quite in agreement with the remarks made by the representatives of Belgium and Australia. I will confine myself to saying, as has already been pointed out in the Committee, that the tone employed is fairly malevolent and one can find that negative spirit throughout the whole of the proposal. This is in contradiction

(Mr. Max, France)

with the tone of the recommendations of the report which we have just approved. Some of the contentions seem to be in contradiction with the report which the Council has just adopted. By adopting proposal B, we would have two texts which, if not in absolute contradiction, would nevertheless have great disparity, and therefore we would have considerable difficulty in explaining it.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I feel that I must join issue with the representative of Australia. In our opinion, there is no particular slant in proposal B which has been put forward by the representatives of Guatemala and Haiti; certainly there is no malice or distortion. Obviously, certain members of the Council felt obliged, in response to the relevant General Assembly resolutions, to state the plain unvarnished facts as they saw them. If the representative of Australia has different views on the subject -- and he certainly has -- we think that he is certainly free to introduce counter-proposals.

Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) (interpretation from French): It was not the intention of my delegation to extend the debate of this Council by speaking in order to explain the reasons for which we associated ourselves with the delegation of Guatemala in introducing the draft resolution submitted for the consideration of the Council. However, in view of certain allegations which are not very flattering for the delegations participating in the submission of this draft resolution, my delegation would say that it was not our intention to show either maliciousness or malevolence in introducing this draft resolution. My delegation is well known to this Council for its attitude of moderation and for its spirit of conciliation. Therefore, the use of such expressions as the representative of Australia used in characterizing the motives behind this draft resolution causes me to deny very emphatically that there was either malevolence or maliciousness. We attempted to the best of our ability to introduce a draft resolution which would respond to the greatest extent to the wishes expressed in resolutions adopted earlier by the Trusteeship Council and in resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

Therefore, since our draft resolution was based on the wishes of the General Assembly and of the Trusteeship Council, it can hardly be termed malicious or malevolent. If certain provisions are found in that draft resolution which seem to be caused by ill-will, then that ill-will must be attributed to the source of the draft resolution, namely, the wishes of the General Assembly and of the Council itself. Certainly, we ourselves cannot be accused of that since our attitude is in full accord with resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the request of the representative of India, I will put separately to the votes parts A, B and C of proposal B.

We shall first vote on part A.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

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

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. Part A was not adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on part B.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): With regard to part B of proposal B, with certain changes which might be suggested, my delegation would be prepared to vote for it in the same spirit and in the same sense that we voted for a very similar section in connexion with the report on Tanganyika. My delegation might also be able to vote for proposal A, if it comes to the vote. Proposal A does not go quite as far as my delegation would be prepared to go but, as far as it does go, my delegation might have voted for it.

If part B of proposal B is to be voted on, I would suggest that the heading "Establishment of final and intermediate time-limits" be amended to read "Establishment of intermediate target-dates and final time-limits for the attainment of self-government of independence." Logically and in every other way, "intermediate" should precede "final".

With regard to the material contained in paragraphs 7, 8 and 9, I assume that this is factual. I assume that paragraphs 8 and 9 give faithfully and correctly the views of the Administering Authority, views which must have been copied from some statements it made in the past with respect to the question of setting time-limits or target-dates. If this is the correct position as stated by the Administering Authority, naturally we could vote for the paragraphs.

While we are on that, since the conclusions and recommendations contained in part C would naturally follow from what goes before, if there are any conclusions and recommendations at all, and in that respect I believe this text differs from proposal A, there would need to be quite a number of changes suggested to that part to enable my delegation to vote for it. I understand that some attention has been given, I believe by the delegation of India, to the introduction of certain changes of that nature, and if the delegation of India can present these, it would be very interesting for my delegation to be able to look at them.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): If proposal B is defeated, it is the intention of my delegation to introduce a new proposal, based largely on the Tanganyika report which was adopted earlier at this meeting. If the representatives of

Haiti and Guatemala do not object, then we need not proceed with putting the rest of proposal B to the vote. But, if they do insist, we do not mind, but we should like to inform the Council that we intend to put forward certain other proposals if proposal B is defeated. As the hour is already late, may I suggest that my delegation be permitted to submit this proposal at our next meeting.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): In order to clarify a point of procedure and before the President gives his ruling on the suggestion made by the representative of India, I should like to know the status of the document on which we are voting. I understood that we are voting on this as a result of the proposal made by the representative of India that we do vote on it. That being so, it seems to me quite irrelevant to hear what the representatives of Haiti and Guatemala have to say about certain amendments which might be proposed. Proposal B is before us now on the proposal of the representative of India, and the representatives of Haiti and Guatemala have no responsibility for it before the Council at the moment.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should like to make it clear that proposal B is not an Indian proposal. We were faced with a situation in which there were two proposals before the Council, proposal A and proposal B, and I think the President suggested we might take note of them. My delegation could not understand how one could take note of two different proposals. That is why we suggested that proposal B should be put to the vote, but certainly not as an Indian proposal. I think it is incumbent on my delegation to consult the views of the sponsors of proposal B before we introduce our new proposal, and that is why I made the suggestion I did just now. I do not know whether the representatives of Guatemala and Haiti would like to comment on my statement.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to sum up the parliamentary situation as regards what the representatives of India and the United States have proposed. The United States representative has proposed a simple change in the sentence describing Part B. I believe that the Indian representative has said that if the delegation of Guatemala has no objection, the Indian representative would have a proposal to make which would change -- I do not know in what respect -- the drafting of the Guatemalan proposal on Part B into a proposal which would closely identify itself with the Tanganyikan draft which has just been adopted.

Mr. ARRENALES CATALAN (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): As I understood the question addressed by the representative of India to my delegation, the Indian representative wanted to know whether my delegation would be interested in having a vote taken upon Parts B and C of Proposal B which is now before the Council or whether my delegation would agree that a new proposal be made by the Indian delegation, a proposal bringing this text more into conformity with the previous text which was adopted this afternoon with regard to Tanganyika.

This is my position. Although we voted in favour of the text of the Drafting Committee; my delegation stated for the record that we voted in favour because we had no objection to any part of that text but that we did not feel that it fully satisfied the resolutions of the Trusteeship Council and of the General Assembly in this field. In the present case my delegation feels that the text of Proposal B except for certain corrections as to facts in Part A, which would have been agreed to if they have been presented, including paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), corresponds to a kind of minimum application of the resolutions of this Council and of the General Assembly. My delegation does not require that other delegations should feel the same way as we do. However, my delegation cannot accept a proposal which would present less than is presented by the proposal now before us. Therefore, my delegation is ready to have this submitted to the vote and to have it rejected. I think it would be very useful if the representative of India could make a separate proposal which would somewhat amend parts of Proposal B to C if it would meet with more widespread approval here in the Council. I think I have now replied to the question addressed to me by the representative of India.

The PRESIDENT: According to the proposal of the representative of India, we were going to put Parts A, B and C to separate votes. We have put Part A to the vote and it was rejected. We will now put Part B to the vote to which there is a United States amendment. If there are amendments to Part B, which the Indian representative has just explained to us, then they can be put to the vote as Part C.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): May I suggest that we might proceed to the vote on Part B and then to Part C. If the whole thing is defeated, I shall then introduce my own proposals.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to say to the representative of India that my understanding is that if Parts A, B and C are all rejected, then we have no alternative but to turn back to Proposal A. However, if the representative of India wishes to amend Part C before we take a vote on it, then we are in the clear if it is adopted. Therefore, the President will hold a separate vote on Part B. The amendment of the United States will be voted on first which would change the descriptive heading from "Establishment of final and intermediate time-limits" to "Establishment of intermediate target dates and final time-limits for the attainment of self-government".

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I shall be very brief since most of the objections raised by this part B have already been stated very ably by the representative of the United Kingdom. I shall merely speak of the assimilation that is made between the objectives in the economic and social fields and the objectives in the political field. The assimilation of these objectives verges on the absurd and is particularly vulnerable to criticism in the light of the opinion which one may have of the inhabitants of a Territory. One cannot compare psychological phenomena and the interplay of moral forces with the carrying out of an investment programme which can be handed out in instalments. May I recall the situation -- and, in this connexion, may I recall also the criticism levelled by the representative of the United Kingdom -- in the case of Ruanda-Urundi? I have no other comments to make on this section of the proposal.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): With regard to the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States, I should like to state that my delegation has no objection whatsoever to changing the heading of part B. I understand that the representative of Haiti, who was a co-sponsor, has no objection either.

In reply to another observation made by the United States representative, namely his remark to the effect that his delegation would have no objection to part B if it were to reflect facts, I would simply point out that we attempted to reproduce, as far as humanly possible, the statements of the Administering Authority, from official sources, and the statements made by the special representative, who submitted one final correction a day or so ago at the last meeting of the Drafting Committee. Thus, in this part B we have reflected a great deal of proposal A, and we have also relied a great deal on the efficiency of our Secretariat. I think that this is a faithful reflection of what the Administering Authority has said.

With regard to the observation made by the representative of Belgium, I would simply like to point out as far as my delegation is concerned -- and I understand that the representative of Haiti joins me in this -- that we did not attempt to make any assimilation of the objectives of economic and social

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

developments and the ten-year plan with political objectives, but we would not exclude such an assimilation. The position is simply this. On the one hand, we draw the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the Administering Authority had not included this in the annual report for 1954, but, on the other hand, in order to be just, we state that in the ten-year plan there was a statement of the principal economic and social objectives. We have not attempted to draw a parallel, but merely to be objective.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I should like to suggest one textual change which conforms with the change made in the Tanganyika Committee, and which concerns my delegation. In paragraph 9 I think it would be necessary in the second sentence, in order to keep this text in line, to say that "three members of the Visiting Mission" believed, etc, since this is a different belief from that where mention is made of one member dissenting in the previous sentence. I hope that there will be no discussion of this, since it is a factual change.

The PRESIDENT: I would agree that it is factual, but how does the representative of New Zealand propose that we should deal with it?

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I would suggest merely inserting the words "Three members of", so that the sentence would begin, "Three members of the Visiting Mission, taking into account the remarkable adjustments", and so on.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): The Visiting Mission's report was a majority report and a Visiting Mission's report as such. I think, therefore, that it would be wrong to say that three members of the Visiting Mission said this, that or the other. We have no objection to repeating what has been said earlier in paragraph 9, which would involve the insertion of the four words "with one member dissenting". I think that that was the form of words used in the Tanganyika report. In other words, the second sentence of paragraph 9 might read, "The Visiting Mission, with one member dissenting, taking into account", etc. As I say, however, I think it would be quite wrong to say that three members of the Visiting Mission said this or that or expressed this or that view.

The PRESIDENT: Has the representative of New Zealand any objection to the representative of India's refinement of his suggestion?

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): My main concern was to ensure that this was recorded in both cases. I think that my proposal, from the drafting point of view, was rather better than the suggestion to repeat "with one member dissenting". The Tanganyika draft takes a rather different form, which is why it was possible to use "with one member dissenting". I do not see the difference which the representative of India is endeavouring to establish between "Three members of the Visiting Mission" and "The Visiting Mission, with one member dissenting".

The PRESIDENT: The President cannot interfere in a difference of opinion between two representatives about a phrase, so I will ask the representative of New Zealand whether he would be satisfied with the proposal made by the representative of India.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): Yes, Mr. President, I would be satisfied with that.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to the insertion of the words "with one member dissenting" after the word "Mission" in the second sentence of paragraph 9 on page 6 of the report.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the amendment proposed to part B by the representative of the United States. This amendment has already been presented to the Council.

The amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Part B of proposal B, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: That brings us to part C of proposal B, which begins on page 6 of the report.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I think that the representative of Guatemala intended that part C should be put to the vote as it is. If it should be defeated I shall introduce my own proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I am advised that if the proposal is defeated that does not preclude the introduction at that point of a new part C, so that we should not in that case have to go back and vote again on A.

I shall now put part C of proposal B to the Council.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

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

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. Part C of proposal B was not adopted.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should like to introduce, as part C, paragraph 156 of the report of the Drafting Committee on Conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika contained in document T/L.657.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): It will be recalled that, when the delegation of India asked that Proposal B be put to the vote, I then asked that Proposal A be put to the vote. In view of the fact that the Council has now adopted Part B of Proposal B, I now propose that there be put to the vote paragraphs 4 to 7 of Proposal A, since Proposal B includes that part of Proposal A which is now no longer in point. In view of the fact that I requested that a vote on Proposal A be taken after a vote on Proposal B, and since Proposal B has now been voted on in its entirety, I think that my proposal has priority.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Before we completed the voting on Proposal B, I had indicated that my delegation would introduce an alternative proposal to Part C, and I think the President had agreed. No one had raised any objection at that time, and I am therefore a little surprised that objection should now be raised.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to explain how the situation stands in his opinion. Part B has been adopted. Part C has been defeated. Prior to the defeat of Part C, the Chair indicated that the procedure to be followed would be that, if Part C were defeated, the way would be open for the representative of India to present an amendment, which he has in fact presented. Therefore, it was well known to the Council what was going to happen. However, following that, the representative of the United Kingdom presented a further amendment, which he has outlined to the Council. The Chair is constrained to rule that, according to rule 63, the amendment presented by the representative of the United Kingdom is more remote and hence has to be voted on first.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I had asked for the floor in order to attempt to give further facts in the light of which to judge the matter before the President could give a ruling. But, in view of the fact that the President has given his ruling, I do not believe it necessary for me to present my comments or observations, and I shall limit myself to casting the vote which I will be obliged to cast.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I merely wish to say that in my opinion the proposal which is being introduced now is not an amendment to Part C, which has just been rejected, but is an altogether new proposal. On the other hand, this new proposal, since it consists merely of reproducing a blanket text that has been adopted in regard to other Territories, shows clearly how very theoretical is the whole approach we have used here. No account is taken of the particular circumstances of any Territory. It is the future of the populations of the Territories which is at stake, and their evolution in each particular case.

I also wanted to say that if the proposal moved by the representative of India, which merely reproduces paragraph 157 of the Tanganyika report, is considered an amendment, it would seem much more logical to accept the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom and vote first on Proposal A. At the beginning of the debate, he said that, if B were rejected, he in his turn would move the text that figures in Proposal A. The President seems to have just ruled along those lines, and therefore my remarks are actually superfluous.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I know that the President has already issued a ruling on this point, and I shall not contest it. But I should like to point out that, in the submission of my delegation, the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom is not an amendment but an alternative proposal. Furthermore, Proposal B has not yet been rejected; part of it has been adopted, and the whole has not yet been put to the vote. Before the whole of Proposal B was put to the vote, I moved my amendment. However, I shall abide by the ruling of the President.

The PRESIDENT: As I tried to make clear before, when Part B of Proposal B was adopted, we then came to Part C, and that was rejected. The representative of India made a proposal. Another proposal was made by the representative of the United Kingdom. It was the opinion of the Chair, on reading rule 63, that the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom was more remote and that, when it came time for voting, that proposal would have to be put to the vote first.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not wish to challenge the President's ruling. I merely wish to draw attention to the following: Paragraph 9 of Proposal B is a textual duplication of paragraph 3 of Proposal A. Would it not be too much to adopt two texts which are identical for the same proposal? Would it not overburden our report? It seems rather superfluous to vote paragraph 9 and paragraph 3.

The PRESIDENT: I would say to the representative of the Soviet Union that I understood the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom to apply only to paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 and not to paragraph 3. Otherwise, the representative of the Soviet Union would have been correct.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I do not wish to say any more. I think I have already said that in my delegation's point of view Proposal B should have been put to the vote as a whole before taking up the United Kingdom proposal or any part of Proposal A.

The PRESIDENT: The reason why the Chair could not put it to the vote was because the proposal as a whole was incomplete.

We will now vote on the amendment of the representative of the United Kingdom, which is to add paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Proposal A to Proposal B.

The amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 5.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to the amendment proposed by the representative of India, which is to add paragraph 156 on page 51 of document T/L.657 to Part C. That paragraph is in the document on Tanganyika.

The amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Proposal B as a whole will now be voted upon. It includes Part B and Part C as amended.

Proposal B, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.