UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

PROVISIONAL

T/PV.519
18 March 1954

ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 18 March 1954, at 2 p.m.

President: Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.519 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

54-07571

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 752 (VIII): ATTAINMENT BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE OBJECTIVE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE (T/L.441) [Agenda item 12] (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it, in effect, three draft resolutions. One is a draft resolution introduced by the representative of Belgium, to which an amendment has been submitted by the representative of India, and then there is a draft resolution submitted by the representative of India, which is comprehensive in its character.

I think the best procedure would be for me to call upon the representative of India to present his draft resolution, and then, if necessary, the Council can take a brief recess if representatives wish to consider this draft resolution among themselves. That, however, may not be necessary.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. President, you will recall that when we started making observations on this subject yesterday, my delegation pointed out that it wanted to avoid making the conclusion of this item very formal, if it could be avoided. That was thought to be possible and, thanks to your guidance, I have been able now to bring some order into my very disorderly mind and produce these two sheets of paper; in substance they are the same. I have only introduced them because after yesterday's debate I had to be prepared for any procedural difficulties that might arise.

I would submit that the draft resolution submitted by my delegation procedurally has priority because the proposals were made before the Belgian draft resolution was put down. However, it is arguable, if you take a very strict literal view, that the text was not before you. If that is the view you take, then we will move the ammendment to the Belgian draft resolution, in which case the amendments have priority, in my submission. On the other hand, if it is to be taken in terms of substance rather than that of form, it would be more convenient for the Council to consider the resolution as drafted because, when the amendments are put into the Belgian draft resolution, it will read like that anyway.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want at this stage to make any ruling at all. I just wish the members to clarify their minds as to the documents before them because I want this matter, if it is at all possible, settled by agreement around the table.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I very much appreciate what the President has said, but my difficulty is this. I cannot speak or move both these papers at the same time so the President has to make a ruling, unless we put everything to one side and just speak on the item.

The PRESIDENT: If you wish me to make a ruling I shall do so, subject to what the representative of Belgium may say. There is a draft resolution by the

representative of Belgium and then there are the amendments of the representative of India. I think that the representative of India is entitled to move his amendments and the amendments have to be considered first. If the representative of India wishes to speak on that point, I will be happy to hear him.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My submission was that we had made these proposals even though they were not put in rigid form, that the draft resolution itself only embodied those proposals and that the resolution has priority. If the President rules that they do not have priority, then I am prepared to take up the amendments; these will give considerable trouble to the Council in fitting in the wording into the other draft resolution. When amended it would read like that anyway. Would the President wish me to speak on the amendment?

The PRESIDENT: I am not going to make a ruling at the moment.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should first of all like to ask for some clarification from the representative of India. I should like to know on what basis he is submitting paragraph 6 (c) of his amendment or paragraph 4 (c) of his draft resolution. Is there anything in the General Assembly resolution enabling him to conclude that the General Assembly wishes to have this section of its report drawn up on bases different from all other reports of the Trusteeship Council?

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): All that appears in paragraph 6 (c), in the view of my delegation, is what is covered by the General Assembly resolution. We consider that if a satisfactory answer to the General Assembly's resolution has to be made, then it is necessary to spell out the matter -- as we have done. I would enlist in support of my argument the observations submitted by the Assistant Secretary-General yesterday when he said that the Secretariat would want to know what is to be included, what is to be excluded and what further material could be brought in and so on. There is nothing in paragraph 6 which goes beyond either the purposes, the scope or the limits of the Assembly's resolutions.

All that we have done is to spell out the resolution submitted by the representative of Belgium.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): If I understand correctly, the representative of India would like to have the rule which he wishes to apply to this section of the report to apply to all sections of the report. In other words, from now on the Secretary-General would be empowered to question the Administering Authorities on any chapter of the report. Is that the correct position? By virtue of this would he give the Secretary-General the right to seek, in connexion with this section, supplementary information in regard to the other sections of the report of the Trusteeship Council? Perhaps the representative of India means that on this section of the report of the Trusteeship Council the Council should adopt new rules which would not apply for the rest of the report. If that is the case, then I would ask him what in the General Assembly's resolution would justify the Trusteeship Council's or the Secretary-General's resorting to other sources of information in regard to this section? If the representative of India means that this section should be drawn up in accordance with the same rules that are applied to the rest of the Trusteeship Council reports, then this would mean that our affirmative vote on this amendment would have the result that henceforth the Secretary-General could, over and above the question of the Trusteeship Council, put to the Administering Authorities any question he would deem fit in order to elucidate any point in the report. I do want to call the attention of the Council to the very extensive implication inherent in such a decision.

As regards the question of procedure I would point out to the representative of India that the procedural question has no importance whatsoever. If the President decides to put the draft resolution of the representative of India to the vote first, then I shall ask for a vote separately on paragraph 4; the result would then be exactly the same as if the President were to decide to vote first on my draft

resolution beginning, naturally, by a vote on the Indian amendment to the Belgian resolution. The decision of the President, therefore, on this score would not have any practical significance.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I confess that I do not understand what the point of the objection is. I believe that if you take the text of the draft resolution it refers to paragraph 4 (c) -- that is to say, the Secretary-General, in making up this report, is asked "to take into account and obtain where required and utilize as relevant and necessary". It does not say that it is mandatory. Paragraph 4 (c) of the Indian draft resolution states:

"such relevant elucidation, clarification and additional information or material that may be received hereafter from the Administering Authorities". For example, a considerable amount of information was given this Council which would not appear in the printed report. The Administering Authorities may be willing to send any other information in order to make the report fuller. We have said here as "may be received"; then it goes on to say: "...or that may be possible to obtain by making appropriate requests". If the words "may be possible to obtain" may be open to misinterpretation, that is, that if it is implied that there may be some difficulty or some pressure or something of that character, I am prepared to alter it. It could say: "it may be available by making appropriate requests".

In fact, all those words starting with "or" are unnecessary because it says "such relevant elucidation, clarification" and so forth, and because the Secretariat can presumably always write to the Administering Authorities for anything. There is therefore no rule of law that we have introduced here; there is no new principle that we have introduced.

The General Assembly has asked for a report. It has asked for the report after the usual reports of the Administering Authorities have been received, and we have to discuss a draft at the next session of the Council. In the view of my delegation, it is right and proper that we should give the Secretariat certain guidance as to what the Trusteeship Council's view of the matter is. If one looks at General Assembly resolution 752, it will be seen, as I pointed out repeatedly yesterday, that the resolution is addressed to the Trusteeship Council. It is up to the Trusteeship Council to go into the question of how best this can be answered.

There is nothing in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) that is an encroachment on the position of the Administering Authorities. There are no new powers conferred upon the Secretariat. If the Administering Authorities on the whole feel that there is any principle that is violated, I should like to be shown what it is. I listened very carefully to the representative of Belgium, for whose experience I have great respect, and I did not find that we have introduced any new principle. All we have said is that, in making up these reports, you can look to sources (a), (b) and (c) as set out in our draft resolution or in the amendment. If the last part of (c) gives any offence to anybody, I am quite prepared to alter it. If there is any suggestion that anyone wants to make, I would be only too happy to alter that wording.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): If I understand the representative of India rightly, he does not insist on the retention of the concluding words of sub-paragraph (c): "or that may be possible to obtain by making appropriate requests to the Administering Authorities in this regard." As there is no provision for making requests, beyond the questionnaire, to the Administering Authorities -- especially on the part of the Secretary-General -- if the

representative of India consents to delete the words "or that may be possible to obtain by making appropriate requests to the Administering Authorities in this regard", I am quite ready to accept his amendment.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am prepared to amend the last part of it to read: "or that may be obtained by making appropriate requests...". The word "appropriate" covers everything. It means that the Secretary-General cannot ask anything that is ultra vires as regards his powers or the Trusteeship Agreement or the Charter of the United Nations or ordinary proprieties of behaviour. That is the meaning of the word "appropriate".

However, I see that these words, as they appear in our proposal, are liable to an interpretation of lack of courtesy or consideration. I am therefore quite prepared to say "that may be obtained by making appropriate requests" or "that may be available by making appropriate requests". I have no objection to doing that.

I cannot see how the representative of Belgium construes this as another questionnaire. It simply means that the Secretariat may ask any particular Administering Authority for any clarification. If the Administering Authority does not wish to reply, it does not reply. That is all there is to it.

To make this precise, I should like permission to delete those words and add "or that may become available by making appropriate requests to the Administering Authorities".

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the representative of India, the last part of sub-paragraph (c) should now read: "or that may become available by making appropriate requests to the Administering Authorities in this regard".

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I do not agree to that. According to the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, there are no appropriate requests to be made by the Secretary-General. The Trusteeship Council may make requests to the Administering Authorities, but any request made by the Secretary-General would be inappropriate. Therefore, if this sub-paragraph is maintained, I shall ask for a separate vote on the last part, beginning with the words "or that may be".

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I simply want to advance a suggestion which may lead to a unanimously agreed solution, a solution which does seem to be within our grasp. I suggest that, as to the documents referred to in paragraph 4 (b) of the Indian resolution -- that is, publications of the specialized agencies "or other appropriate United Nations sources" -- it be understood that the Secretariat would informally inform the delegations of members of the Council present in New York as to the documents which the Secretariat intends to use. We would therefore have these documents a little in advance and we would have an opportunity to study them and, if they prove very technical, to turn them over to experts for further study.

This is not to be considered an amendment. It is merely a suggestion and it would be sufficient for my purposes to have the statement I have just made, and the reply by the representative of India, appear in the records. If the representative of India states for the record that he is in agreement with the conception I have just advanced, I would not move any amendment.

I want it to be clear that, as regards documents which are not Trusteeship Council documents, the Secretariat would be kind enough to advise us beforehand that, in drawing up its report, it intends to make use of this or that document. Having been warned in that way, we could study the documents and, if necessary, turn them over to our experts. This communication on the part of the Secretariat could be informal; it would not have to be an official communication from the Secretariat.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): The reaction of my delegation to the suggestion made by the representative of France is that it is most helpful. If we had had the experience that he has had, we probably would have included it in the first place. At any rate, I have not the slightest objection to it. I would have thought that that was normal procedure: that the Secretariat would be in touch with all these delegations and tell them what it was including.

May I make it clear that it is not the purpose of this draft resolution to rig up a report behind the backs of the Administering Authorities, because that would not get us anywhere: they are the Administering Authorities; they are in

possession, so to speak; they are on the spot.

We are entirely willing to accept the suggestion that has been made. If it is desired to include it in the resolution, we have no objection, but I think it would only make it cumbrous. It can simply appear in the records and, so far as we are concerned, we stand committed by it.

The PRESIDENT: Then I take it that, if paragraph 4 (b) of the resolution is adopted, it will stand as a matter of record that the Secretariat will communicate to the Administering Authorities the nature of the documents to which it proposes to resort in pursuance of that sub-paragraph.

This is quite an important matter, and I should be quite happy to recess the Council for a quarter of an hour so that delegations may consider their positions in respect to this matter. I simply put that to members of the Council as a suggestion that they may wish to follow.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should be grateful if that could be done. I do feel, however, that we have come pretty close to agreement in the short discussion that we have had in the last quarter of an hour. Yesterday I asked the representative of India to clarify, so far as could be done, the proposal that he had in mind, and I am most grateful to him for setting out, with such precision as he has set it out in this paper, the proposal that he sketched for us yesterday.

I said a moment ago that I thought we had come pretty close to agreement because I heard the representative of Belgium say that, if a certain omission were made in the Indian text, he would be able to agree to the Indian amendment.

The representative of India went a little way towards meeting the suggestion of the representative of Belgium, but not quite the whole way. With regard to the wording of sub-paragraph (c) I have somewhat the same difficulty referred to by the representative of Belgium. I do feel that what the representative of India said in reply goes some way towards meeting that difficulty, but I feel also that he could go somewhat further without losing the force of or undermining the intention of this sub-paragraph (c) of his proposal. It does seem to me that from the point of view of the proposer nothing is lost if the words following the word "Authorities" are omitted. As the representative of France suggested yesterday, it would still be possible for the Secretariat to make informal contacts with the delegations concerned and to obtain the information envisaged in this sub-paragraph.

In the light of the fact -- and I think it is a fact -- that we have almost reached agreement on this matter, I should like, for my part, to appeal to the representative of India to make it easier for us to agree to his proposal by accepting the suggestion of the representative of Belgium relating to the omission of these words, and I would say again that I feel that nothing would be lost of the Indian proposal by this omission. It might very easily be said in reply, "If nothing is lost then there is nothing much at stake, and therefore why should not the words remain?" In answer to that I could even cite some words used by the representative of India during this discussion. I cannot cite them verbatim, but the intention of a certain passage of his remarks yesterday, or it may have been the day before, was to the effect that he realized that the Administering Authorities have an extremely great and difficult responsibility and a great and difficult task, and that, after all, they are the ones who have to carry out the purposes laid down in the Charter and, for that very reason, have to be extremely careful about any proposals concerning machinery in connexion with the Trusteeship System. In other words, the representative of India recognized that, and I do appeal to him to carry that recognition into effect by making a small concession here which will render it possible for some of us, at any rate, on the administering side to accept the proposal he has placed before us. In conclusion, I should like to thank him once again for responding to the appeal I made yesterday for a clarification of his proposals.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I really do not understand the complication of this matter. I think that the question raised by the representative of Belgium -- leaving aside the issue whether or not we agree that the Trusteeship Council can ask for information -- would have some point if these two lines were mandatory. But they are purely permissive. They say, in effect, that the Secretariat can write a letter, and if the Belgian Administering Authority does not want to give the information it does not give it. The proposal merely says, "or may become available by making appropriate requests". It does not make any demands; no further questionnaire is sent out; it is not prescribing a procedure for the Trusteeship Council for good and all and for ever after. And there must be some method, where the information is not available, if some clarification is required. There may be some gap, and it may be in the interest of the Administering Authority that something in the way of further clarification should be put in -- something that is quite satisfactory even from the Administering Authority's point of view. Therefore, it is quite right for them to say, "Can you help us in this matter? Has there been any further advance in this question? Are we right about these figures?"

My submission is this. It would be different if these two lines conveyed the idea that is now conveyed by the questionnaire procedure -- the procedure laid down by the Trusteeship Agreement to the effect that a questionnaire shall be sent and an answer given. These two lines simply say, "or may become available by making appropriate requests". If it would help in any way, we could say:

> "Such relevant elucidation, clarification and additional information or material that may be received or obtained hereafter from the Administering Authorities".

I can find a few objections to that also if you want, but I think that it will meet the case.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I should like to ask the representative of India one question. He told us yesterday that he did not want to be dictated to by the Secretariat. We do not want that either, but we do not think that it is fair to the Secretariat to burden it with tasks which are not part of its functions.

All I want to ask the representative of India is whether he can cite any resolution of the General Assembly which gives the Secretariat authority to address questions or requests to the Administering Authorities on its own. That is all. I find that there is no appropriate request from the Secretary-General to the Administering Authorities. There may be appropriate requests from the Trusteeship Council to the Administering Authorities or from the General Assembly, but not from the Secretariat. That is why I want these words deleted.

If the representative of the Secretary-General were to speak I am certain that he would agree with me that the Secretariat would be placed in an impossible position if it were made responsible for ascertaining something from the Administering Authorities. That is not its work.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I do not agree with the objection, but I am prepared to meet it. I now see that the objection is that the Secretariat has no right to ask the Administering Authorities a question. The Trusteeship Council has. That is the position. All right, I will alter the wording to read:

"or may become available by making appropriate requests to the Administering Authorities in this regard on behalf of the Trusteeship Council".

Now what does he say?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): No objection whatsoever.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): All right.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Council had better take a recess for ten minutes on this subject --

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): If we have a recess there will be more troubles.

The PRESIDENT: -- but if anyone --

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): You ought to take advantage of my weakness.

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of India thinks that a recess or a rest is invariably followed by troubles, I shall not order a recess -- at least as at present advised.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): There may be some possible misunderstanding of the wording "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council". Would it not be better to say "by the Trusteeship Council", since the Secretary-General has nothing to do "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council"? When the Trusteeship Council wants something it instructs the Secretary-General to write to the Administering Authorities, but that action is taken by the Trusteeship Council -- not by the Secretary-General and not on behalf of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Really, I am sure that the twelve of us could not get together and write a letter. We could not have each question brought before this Council and put out a resolution. I think there is some misunderstanding in this matter. The Secretary-General is being used -- if I may be pardoned for using the expression -- as an agency for this purpose. This is not a Secretary-General's report but a Trusteeship Council report, and the whole thing has to come here. This is not conferring any new authority, and it is only to meet the objection of the representative of Belgium that I have agreed to say, "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council". If it is on behalf of the Trusteeship Council the Secretary-General is only an agent, and no agent has a power that exceeds that of his principal.

The PRESIDENT: I think that what the representative of India means is "on behalf of and within the scope of the authority of the Trusteeship Council" --

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): All right, all right.

The PRESIDENT: I am putting that forward as my own view --

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): You can add a little more -- "within the scope of and not further than the scope".

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I am sorry that I have not been listening to the French interpretation, because I am not really an expert on the English language.

What I should like to know is this: Does "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council" mean "by direction of the Trusteeship Council"? If it does, I am in full agreement with the representative of India. If, however, it means that the information will be obtained on the initiative of the Secretary-General, and merely to assist the Trusteeship Council, I am not in agreement, because I believe that the Secretary-General has no authority to make any requests of the Administering Authorities, unless he is ordered to do so by the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: With great respect, I should like to tell the representative of Belgium that I think he really is an authority on the English language.

I should like to ask the representative of Belgium what he would think of the words: "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council and within the scope of the Council's authority". I am suggesting those words in my capacity as President, not as representative of the delegation of New Zealand.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Would it not be good English to say: "by direction of the Trusteeship Council"?

The PRESIDENT: I shall leave that to members of the Council.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I do not, myself, believe that the words "on behalf of the Trusteeship Council and within the scope of the Council's authority" would remove the Belgian representative's difficulty; certainly, they would not remove my difficulty.

I do feel that the discussion we have had during the last few minutes illustrates the great difficulties that we encounter when we try to introduce innovations in the trusteeship machinery. I should like once again to

appeal to the representative of India to relieve us of those difficulties by deleting the words in question. Even if he deletes those words, everything that is needed will remain in sub-paragraph (c). The Secretariat will not be saddled with the responsibility of taking an official and formal initiative, but will be free to obtain -- informally, through the delegations of the Administering Authorities -- the additional information which might be required.

If there is a favourable response to that appeal -- which, in the circumstances, I rather doubt -- I shall be happy to accept the proposal. If there is not, I must reserve my position as regards sub-paragraph (c).

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to make my own views on this matter quite clear.

I have no objection whatever -- quite the contrary -- to the Secretariat's addressing any requests for information that it wishes to address to the head of the French delegation to the Trusteeship Council. On the other hand, I should object if the Secretariat were to address such requests for information to the Government of the French Republic.

If the Secretariat addresses requests for information to the head of the French delegation to the Trusteeship Council, the latter will do everything possible to answer them on the basis of the documents available to him. He will also assume the responsibility for sending cablegrams or letters to his Government to obtain any clarifications which he needs. Such a procedure is within the legitimate and normal framework of the relations which should exist between the Secretariat and delegations. If, however, it were to be admitted that the Secretariat could officially address requests for additional information to a government -- requests which were not provided for in decisions of the Council -- I should, of course, be obliged to ask my Government for further instructions before I could take a position. I repeat, however, that if it is a question of requests to be addressed to the head of the French delegation to the Council, I fully agree with the present text.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I feel that we are all so near agreement that it would be a great pity if we were to go on discussing this matter.

I should like to ask the representative of India whether he would accept the following amendment to sub-paragraph (c): to insert after the word "received" in the second line the words "or obtained", and to delete all the words after the word "Authorities" in the third line. If thus amended, the sub-paragraph would read as follows:

"(c) such relevant elucidation, clarification and additional information or material that may be received or obtained hereafter from the Administering Authorities".

I should like to say that, if the Secretariat rang up the offices of our delegation, my Government would always be prepared to supply the Secretariat with any information which it was possible to give. I feel certain other delegations would also be prepared to do that.

If the representative of India would accept the amendment which I have suggested, and if it were also acceptable to the representative of Belgium, I should hope that we might be able to come to some agreement and adopt a resolution without any further discussion.

The PRESIDENT: Is that amendment acceptable to the representative of India?

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Let us see what the representative of Belgium has to say. I seem always to be giving in, and perhaps he will want me to do so again.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I do not wish it to appear that I am splitting hairs. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, however, requests the Secretary-General "to take into account and obtain", and so forth. Hence, it is the Secretary-General who must obtain the information, and I do not believe that the Secretary-General has any right, on his own behalf, to request supplementary information of the Administering Authorities.

If the last phrase of the first sentence of paragraph 4 read, "to take into account and utilize as relevant and necessary", without the words "and obtain where required", that would mean that the "relevant elucidation, clarification and additional information or material" that are referred to in sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 4 would be received or obtained at the request of the Trusteeship Council, and not of the Secretary-General, who, in our opinion, has no authority to make such requests.

Hence, if the words "and obtain where required" are deleted from the first sentence of paragraph 4, and the Secretary-General is thus not requested to obtain information that he has no authority to obtain, and if the words "or obtained" are inserted in the second line of sub-paragraph (c) and the last two lines are deleted, in accordance with the United Kingdom amendment, I shall be prepared to agree to the text. If not, I shall not be able to agree.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am prepared to agree to the suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative.

As regards the most recent observation of the representative of Belgium, I would say this: I do not know how the text reads in French, but the entire draft resolution is a request by the Trusteeship Council. I therefore do not see how anyone could think that the Secretary-General would be placed above the Trusteeship Council.

Having said that, I would add that I share the opinion of the United Kingdom representative that we have discussed this matter long enough. I accept the United Kingdom amendment and should like to move that the matter should be put to the vote.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): My understanding is that the representative of India intends the words in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution to mean "to take into account and obtain where required by the Trusteeship Council". That is what I understand him to mean. If the request is made by the Trusteeship Council, then I agree to it, but I still maintain that the Secretary-General has no authority whatever under the rules of procedure to obtain on his own behalf any information from the Administering Authorities, even if he does it to serve the Trusteeship Council, but not under instructions from the Council. If the representative of India will agree to the deletion of the words "and obtain where required" or to add the words after "obtain where required", "by the Trusteeship Council" then no misunderstanding would be possible, and I could agree.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Before I speak again, I should like to submit that, having moved a motion, I am entitled to ask for it to be put to the Council. For information, I should like to ask whether the Secretary-General has authority to prepare a working paper to summarize these reports. He does such work very often for the Trusteeship Council, and the position is just the same with regard to my draft resolution. I do not regard anything in paragraph 4 as an imposition of any additional powers upon the Secretary-General with regard to the Administering Authorities or anyone else. I regard this purely as a problem of mechanics. Someone has to do this work, and that someone is the Administration. That is all it means. I have accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom, and since the delegation of India has moved this draft resolution, I have the right to request that it be put to the meeting now.

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of India is moving the closure of the debate, that motion will have to be put to the Council at once, in accordance with the rules of procedure. However, the representative of the United States asked to be heard before the closure of the debate was moved.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): To keep the record straight, I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the data called for from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be submitted by the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, and not to the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: That will be noted.

What I propose to do, unless there are any objections, is to put now the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of India, document T/L.443. Subject to any objections, we shall first vote on the draft resolution down to the word "sources".

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I accept the amendment suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom, by which sub-paragraph (c) would read:

"such relevant elucidation, clarification and additional information or material that may be received or obtained hereafter from the Administering Authorities."

I accept that, but I ask for a separate vote on the words "and obtain where required" in paragraph 4.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Belgium want these words put to the vote first, or when does he want them put?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I want the Council to decide by its vote whether it wants these four words "and obtain where required" to remain in the resolution. If the Council votes in favour of these four words, they will remain in the resolution. If the Council votes against them, they will be deleted.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate that.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am prepared to delete the words "and obtain where required".

The PRESIDENT: The words "and obtain where required" have been withdrawn by the representative of India. On that basis, I shall put the resolution as a whole to the vote. As the draft resolution now stands, the words "and obtain where required" have been deleted. In paragraph 4(c), the words "or obtained" have been added after the word "received", and the words from "or" to the end of the sub-paragraph have been deleted.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): May I be allowed to express to the representative of India my appreciation of the way in which he met my suggestion?

The PRESIDENT: I should like to express my appreciation to the Council for the expedition with which we have dealt with this matter.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. INGALLS (World Health Organization): I wish to thank the President for allowing the World Health Organization a few minutes to bring to the attention of the Council several matters which we feel will be of interest to it.

In reply to the question of the representative of Belgium on the subject of tuberculosis control services in the Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, it has been impossible to obtain any information from our tuberculosis section at Geneva since the matter was raised last Thursday. Our answer from Geneva states that some information can be obtained shortly. Therefore, we expect this information soon and will transmit it at once to the representative of Belgium.

All I can say at present is that the World Health Organization is conducting a survey in Africa on the incidence of tuberculosis and of the present facilities and methods used for its control. This survey is the groundwork for tuberculosis control programmes to be carried out, it is hoped, with the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or using other extra-budgetary funds.

The programme includes the work of two short-term consultants, one of whom is still in East Africa. The other has returned after spending some two months in West Africa. While on this survey, visits were made to the Belgian Congo, French Equatorial Africa, Senegal, the Gold Coast, Nigeria and several other places. The report of this survey may not yet be in Geneva, and it is probably this fact which is delaying the reply asked for by the representative of Belgium.

Following this survey, various personnel are budgeted for next year. This includes the services of teams of one medical officer and two public health nurses each in various countries in East Africa. So far, they are all in United Kingdom territories. This personnel will aid the Governments in their programmes for tuberculosis control. The supplies will be provided by UNICEF or from extra-budgetary funds.

Certain members have expressed concern about the lack of WHO programmes for the control of specific diseases endemic in certain Trust Territories, diseases such as meningitis, yaws and smallpox. Without going into the question of what exactly is being done in these countries at present, I would like to call the Council's attention to the several campaigns in which WHO and UNICEF have aided countries to cure and control yaws. These campaigns are, so to speak, a focus from which a much wider campaign will spread out. Now that yaws can be controlled by a single penicillin treatment at a low cost per person, the spread of these campaigns is virtually assured to a much wider area.

The World Health Organization is planning for 1955 an international conference in Africa on yaws control, and will provide fellowships for eighteen participants at this conference. Of course, it is hoped that governments will send many others.

Meningitis is, of course, a different matter, and I believe the special representative from Togoland under French administration remarked that there had been no outbreaks in 1951, 1952 or 1953. This, of course, may or may not continue, but since the use of antibiotics has become a very common and routine matter, this disease is not the terror that it used to be and small outbreaks can be stopped before they spread. For this type of control, no special campaign is needed, and the most effective control can be exercised by having a network of medical service posts covering a country or an effective mobile medical and public health set-up. Great progress in the development of such services has been reported, I think, by all of the territories for 1953.

In the matter of smallpox, the third regional meeting of WHO at Kampala last autumn passed a resolution requesting the Regional Director to conduct discussions with governments with a view to seeing how WHO could aid them to step up and intensify the anti-smallpox campaign by vastly increasing vaccinations.

For the remainder of 1954 and 1955, in addition to the programmes now under way, which I have mentioned before, WHO will devote funds and programmes for education and training fellowships will be given in this regard or, alternatively, courses in the training of medical auxiliary personnel. Some such courses are planned in Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika of the Trust Territories and also in the Gold Coast, Nigeria and French Equatorial Africa. Nigeria will also have tuberculosis, venereal disease and treponematosis control programmes. In the long view, these programmes will be of use to the neighbouring Trust Territories.

In inter-country programmes, I have already mentioned yaws control and the WHO malaria conference. Nine fellows are to be sent to attend the Malaria Institute at Amani, Tanganyika, also through WHO assistance.

Another inter-country programme is the study tour and conference on health statistics. Plans and preliminary studies are being made through this programme and the conference will take place in 1955.

The importance of improving and extending the collection of health statistics in Africa is admitted as being fundamental to any real evaluation of the various disease problems and of the success of medical and health programmes.

The Regional Director has also been specifically charged by the Regional Committee to build up a closer collaboration between the Regional Office and the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa, South of the Sahara.

The World Health Organization feels that these inter-country or regional programmes give the greatest value for the relatively small amount of money the organization is able to spend, for they tend to bring the health conditions of the various neighbouring countries to a more uniform level by letting each country benefit from the experience of the other and all benefit from the knowledge of specialists from other parts of the world.

Finally, I would say that the failure of WHO in the past to produce a paper such as is called for by resolution 47 (IV) on collaboration with the specialized agencies, which asked the specialized agencies to make observations on the annual reports of the Administering Authorities, was largely due to our feeling that it was impossible to do this intelligently unless we had people working in that area with a first-hand knowledge of conditions.

Now that our regional office in Africa has been established for a year, we have such people there. Furthermore, in order to facilitate the preparation of such a document and to be able, generally, to assist the Trusteeship Council in studying the annual reports on the administration of the Trust Territories, special arrangements have to be made, for this information is received by the United Nations and has to be studied jointly with them and in the light of the health needs of the Territory and the health policies developed by the World Health Assembly.

I have pleasure in announcing that arrangements for more active collaboration with the United Nations on the health sections of the annual reports from Trust Territories, has been agreed to between the Director-General of WHO and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I can assure the Council that in subsequent meetings of the Trusteeship Council, WHO will be in a position to present information on the health reports of the Trust Territories.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the World Health Organization.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS: SIXTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/L.432)/Agenda item 4/

Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions (interpretation from Spanish): I am very grateful to you, Mr. President, for having recognized me with regard to this report because it may make it easier for members of the Council to take cognizance of the report if I introduce it briefly. This document contains only one suggestion on the part of the Standing Committee on Petitions: that a certain number of the petitions on the agenda of the present session should be deferred to the next session of the

Council which will take place this summer. You will find that two annexes are appended to the document: Annex I and Annex II. In Annex I, the majority of petitions enumerated were received by the Administering Authority less than two months prior to the regular deadline. That is why the Standing Committee on Petitions was not in a position to examine them and the Committee suggests the deferment of these petitions to the next session. There are two exceptions, which petitions are set forth in paragraph 3 of the report. The first applies to another item of the agenda, item 16; and the second which, although it seems to emanate from a Trust Territory -- that is, the Trust Territory of Somaliland -- did not in point of fact emanate from this Territory but actually came from Ethiopia, an independent territory. Therefore, the Committee was not in a position to take up this petition.

With regard to Annex II, we find that there are 15 or 16 petitions, of which 5 were not received in the proper time as set forth in the rules of procedure. Ten of the petitions listed in this Annex could not be taken up due to lack of sufficient time.

The Committee met daily for more than two months. At the beginning, it met twice a day. Despite this, there was so much work on hand that it was not possible for the Committee to take up these ten petitions at this session. Since there are but a few meetings scheduled for the Trusteeship Council, it will not be possible for the Standing Committee on Petitions to dispose of these last petitions.

This, therefore, is an explanation with regard to the petitions listed in Annex I and Annex II. We suggest the postponement of the consideration of these petitions until the next session. We also suggest that the Council postpone the consideration of the procedural matter until the next session. The Committeee very much regrets that it was not in a position to discuss this question. This was due to the extremely intensive work before the Committee and the lack of time. For these reasons, the Committee did not find it possible to consider the procedural question and it suggests that the considerition of this matter be postponed until the next session.

At this point, I might advance a personal suggestion. I believe that the next Standing Committee on Petitions, as one of the first items on its agenda, should consider the procedural question. They should do so in the meetings which will be held before the opening of the next session of the Council. Otherwise,

this situation may recur where, due to the number of petitions, it will be impossible for the next Standing Committee on Petitions to consider the procedural matter.

There is a circumstance which will militate in favour of the next Standing Committee on Petitions. It is that the petitions which will be taken up at the next session will be petitions emanating from the Pacific Territories, and there are relatively few petitions which come from these Territories. Consequently, it seems to me that the next Standing Committee on Petitions will have more time on hand to take up these procedural questions.

A suggestion is also embodied at the end of paragraph 5 of the report. As is known, the special representative of French Togoland is at present in New York and he will remain here for some time. It would be convenient for the petitions on French Togoland to be considered while this representative is present here. I believe he will be here for fifteen days more. That is why we suggest that the next Standing Committee on Petitions should begin to consider these petitions from French Togoland, next week if possible, in order to take advantage of the presence in New York of the special representative from Togoland under French administration. Otherwise, it may be that when these petitions are taken up at the next session of the Standing Committee on Petitions, the special representative will not be here. This would hamper the work of that Committee.

This is a suggestion which we hope will prove acceptable, since the next Standing Committee on Petitions could perhaps be convened almost immediately and then it could dispose of these ten or eleven petitions from French Togoland, taking advantage, as I have said, of the presence of the special representative from French Togoland in New York.

That is all I have to say. I hope that the report which was unanimously adopted by the Committee will be accepted by the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Committee and I am sure that every member of the Trusteeship Council realizes the amount of work which has been performed by this Committee.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I quite agree with the suggestions made by the Standing Committee on Petitions. I wonder, however, whether it would not be advisable -- and I think the Council is quite empowered to do this -- to ask the former Committee to take up the question of procedure. If the new Standing Committee on Petitions is called upon to take up the procedural question, it would embark upon this work but it would not enjoy the considerable experience in this field which is held by the present Standing Committee on Petitions. If we could prolong the life of the Standing Committee on Petitions so that it could just take up the procedural issues, then this would be a very advisable procedure.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I asked to speak on another matter, but connected with this report. I think I should comment immediately on the rather surprising suggestion just made by the representative of Belgium, at least surprising to me personally. We discussed this possibility, of course, in the Standing Committee on Petitions, which I represent on behalf of my delegation, and we felt that there was little really to be gained by our attempting to carry ourselves forward to examine this particular question of procedure, since nothing very special in the way of experience fell to our lot which was not the common experience of members of the Council in dealing with this question.

Furthermore, as far as my own delegation is concerned, in view of the fact of impending changes in personnel, there would in fact be no continuity in representation were the old Committee to be continued to deal with this particular question. Therefore, my delegation is not, certainly at the present time, in any way enthusiastic to support the proposition put forward by the representative of Belgium.

I would like now to turn to one comparatively minor point which relates to Annex I of document T/L.432. At the top of Annex I there is mention made of a petition and two addenda from Tanganyika, and a footnote at the bottom says:

> "The petitioner raises complex issues which, it was considered, the Council would have insufficient time to examine at its thirteenth session."

I think that for the record that should be spelled out somewhat. This petition was examined by the Standing Committee on Petitions, which considered that the matters raised by the petitioners did not relate specifically to Tanganyika but with rather general issues regarding the interpretation of certain provisions in the International Trusteeship System, which should be examined as general issues and not simply as relating to the specific instance which gave rise to the feeling in the mind of the petitioners that a whole series of hypothetical questions should be examined.

In the circumstances, my delegation would like it to appear in the record that the Standing Committee on Petitions decided to defer examination of this petition because it was deemed to raise questions of a general nature affecting the operations of the Trusteeship System and did not relate to any particular Territory. In these circumstances the Committee felt that the petition could well be examined without the assistance of a special representative from the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that the members of the Council have taken into account that suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I wanted to refer to the suggestion made by the representative of Belgium. However, I believe that the representative of the United Kingdom has already set forth the reasons why I would not agree with the proposals made by the representative of Belgium. I therefore do not need to proceed any further

The PRESIDENT: In any case the members will be through by the end of this session because they will retire from office and the new members will be elected.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): As usual, the logic of the representative of Belgium is flawless. We think the present Committee knows and has been studying the problems of French Togoland and that it would be inefficient to appoint a new Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that some members of the Committee are not anxious to bear that honour.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I confess that I do not understand fully the explanation made by the representative of the United Kingdom. If the petitioner raises a general problem and that general problem, by definition, applies to a special item, then in the context of that special item it becomes a special problem, does it not? In this particular matter the petitioner has raised certain characteristics of the Trusteeship Agreement. Obviously those characteristics apply to Tanganyika. I do not know what those characteristics are, but obviously they apply to Tanganyika. If he has anything to say with regard to the application of these special attributes of the Tanganyika Territory, then irrespective of the fact that it may apply to other Territories, it would still be relevant, would it not?

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I am afraid that I have been left behind by the metaphysical introduction which the representative of India gave to his question. But I think that I can answer the point. The Committee examined this question. In the petition, the petitioner found from a particular incident in Tanganyika that one question came to his mind relating to the general operations of the International Trusteeship System. From that question a number of questions appear to him to flow. He therefore posed to the Trusteeship Council in this petition -- I think it was recollection 4 or 5 -- general issues affecting the possibility of action by administering authorities under the International Trusteeship System in various fields. I concede immediately that these questions would apply to Tanganyika, but they would equally apply to any Territory since they were posed in general terms.

The Committee considered that this was the crux of the petition, that the general questions is what the petitioner wanted us to consider, and that after they recieved an explanation from the special representative of the immediate incident which gave rise to this question in the petitioner's mind, the Committee decided that it would regard this petition as one raising general questions and not one relating solely to the Trsut Territory of Tanganyika. In these circumstances, it agreed that as these questions would obviously be of extensive scope and would require a great degree of concentration and examination by the Committee, that it would serve its purpose best to defer examination of these general questions until a time when it was less occupied with specific petitions relating to Territories for which special representatives were available to assist it.

I hope that has answered the question in the mind of the representative of India.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): It almost raises other questions. It looks as though this petitioner from Tanganyika is politically advanced and he ought to have been self-governing by now. How does the application of a general principle to a special Territory exclude the problem of that special Territory?

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I should explain that this petitioner is not in Tanganyika. He is a fully self-governing citizen of London, as I understand it, and it is from there that he submits his petition. He is not so interested, as far as we could gather, in the specific circumstances in Tanganyika as in broader speculation regarding certain hypothetical interpretations of provisions in Trusteeship Agreements and the International Trusteeship System.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India)(speaker's microphone not connected, remarks inaudible).

The PRESIDENT: I rather thought it might.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India)(speaker's microphone not connected, remarks inaudible).

The PRESIDENT: I will now put this matter to the Council. With the emendation moved by the representative of the United Kingdom, I shall put the recommendations and proposals in the sixty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions to the Council.

The recommendations were adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States for an explanation of vote.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I abstained because I thought there was going to be a vote on the Belgian representative's proposal. I was therefore quite in agreement with you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: The matter is actually covered by the vote. If I may respectfully say to the representative of the United States, there are real difficulties because, for example, the representative of the United Kingdom, who has been attending to this matter, is leaving us and we really have no control over his movements.

The next item on the agenda concerns the examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration. However, the representative of Syria, who is interested in this matter, is absent at the present time. I therefore propose that we should consider item 5 of the agenda.

It was so decided.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION: FIFTY-SIXTH, FIFTY-SEVENTH, FIFTY-EIGHTH, FIFTY-NINTH, SIXTY-FIRST, SIXTY-SECOND AND SIXTY-THIRD REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/L.411 to L.414, L.416, L.417, L.423([Agenda item 4]

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it seven reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions dealing with petitions concerning the Cameroons under French Administration, documents T/L.411 to L.414, L.416, L.417 and L.423. The Council will consider the reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions in their numerical order, as follows: first, the fifty-sixth report, document T/L.411. This report deals with fourteen petitions and contains, in its annex, thirteen draft resolutions proposed by the Committee.

Concerning one petition, the petition from Mr. Issah Njoya, set forth in document T/PET.5/174, referred to in section V of the report, the Committee states that it was unable to agree on a draft resolution, and therefore had no proposal to submit to the Council.

The Council will vote first on the draft resolutions contained in the annex to the report. A vote will be taken on each of these draft resolutions, and, as far as petition V is concerned, for which no draft resolution has been proposed, I propose to put to the vote the alternative proposal set forth on pages 7 and 8 of the report.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): With the President's permission, I should like to make a few brief comments on all the draft resolutions

submitted to the Council by the Standing Committee on Petitions which touch upon the French Cameroons. I shall take this opportunity also to state the position of my delegation concerning its vote on the various draft resolutions.

First, I should like to make a general comment. I do not intend to insist upon this, but I do believe that it is useful to raise it. It seems to me that for a very substantial number of petitions, the Committee calls for additional information from the Administering Authority. I shall not discuss these requests seriatum and express my views on how well taken they are, but I would like to point out that this may entail work which might prove to be useless, thereby delaying consideration of new petitions.

In like manner, certain draft resolutions explicitly request the Administering Authority to submit information to the fourteenth session of the Council. I cannot commit my delegation to submitting this information in proper time.

Also, I would like to say that the Standing Committee on Petitions seems to have ignored the terms of rule 81. In any event, I notice that the term "inadmissible" was never considered when petitions were submitted dealing with decisions taken by competent tribunals, and so on.

I note also that the draft resolutions relating to petitions T/PET.5/163, document 412, T/PET.5/155, document 413, T/PET.5/144, document 417, T/PET.5/213, would engage the petitioners in litigation the results of which are certainly open to doubt at the present time. In fact, there might not be any results, since these procedures would exceed legal time-limits. It seems to me that the Council should not deliberately in this way induce the petitioners to take steps which might only result in disappointment and embitter them towards the Administering Authority and the tribunals, and cause them to doubt the wisdom of the Council. For these reasons, I shall vote against the draft resolutions that I have mentioned.

There are also a certain number of draft resolutions whose meaning does not seem to be clear. This relates to the draft resolution concerning petition T/PET.5/L.1, document 411, which invites the Secretary-General to continue to send to the Voix du Cameroun pertinent information about the activities of the United Nations. I should like to know what is meant by the term "pertinent" or "relevant". It seems that the word "pertinent" in the French language as used in the United Nations has a connotation different from its use in France. However, that does not clear up the matter very much.

In the draft resolution relating to petition T/PET.5/166, document 414, the Administering Authority is asked to determine whether the petitioner has access to sufficient land. Now how can one judge whether a petitioner has sufficient land?

The draft resolution relating to petition T/PET.5/209, document 414, speaks of steps to ensure to the petitioner the possibility of using his land in a reasonable fashion. Again, I must ask the Council and the Standing Committee on Petitions for the exact meaning of this term. For these reasons, I shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolutions I have just mentioned.

The objections which I have concerning the draft resolution related to petitions T/PET.5/205, T/PET.5/207 and T/PET.5/210, which figure in document 423, are much more serious. I cannot admit that because a juge de paix has been guilty of a procedural error, a vote of censure should be directed against all magistrates in the Territory. Therefore, I request a vote in parts on paragraph 3 of the operative section of the draft resolution that I have just mentioned, beginning with the words "and expresses the hope that all judicial officials in the Territory will familiarize themselves with the established procedures." I intend to vote against this part of paragraph 3.

As regards the draft resolution related to petition T/PET.5/210, I would request a vote by parts on paragraph 2 of its operative part. I shall vote against the first part of the paragraph, which, "Recommends to the Administering Authority that it take all possible steps to separate the judicial from the executive power." The principle of the separation of power is in force in the Territory and has been in force for many years.

The PRESIDENT: I should be obliged to the representative of France if, when he come to the draft resolutions and I call the appropriate draft resolution, he will raise the point concerning the procedure which he wishes to be followed.

We shall now proceed to the vote, and I would request representatives to have before them the annex to the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 6 votes to none, with six abstentions.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Before proceeding to the vote on draft resolution III, I should like to explain the position and the vote of the Soviet Union delegation on this draft resolution. Perhaps some other representatives will understand and support our view.

This draft resolution, which was approved by the Standing Committee on Petitions deals with two petitions, namely, T/PET.5/140 and T/PET.5/146. In both these cases the petitioners complain that they were subjected to intolerable abuse by the Administration; they were beaten, they were forced to work without pay, their property was taken from them, and their wages were unsatisfactory. They say that they were forced to labour on heavy construction work without adequate compensation. The draft resolution before us does not touch upon these matters at all; it ignores the questions raised in these two petitions. Therefore, the terms of this draft resolution are not at all adequate and my delegation will vote against it.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 5 votes to one, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 8 votes to one, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution V concerning the petition from Mr. Issah Njoya. Representatives will note from the report that the Committee considered two proposals before it and that neither proposal was adopted. It seems to me that it is my duty to put these alternative proposals to the Council. A vote will therefore be taken on the first proposal, which was as follows:

"1. Requests the next Visiting Mission to the Territory to carry out on the spot an investigation of the complaints of the petitioner and to report its findings to the Council."

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: It is now my duty, pursuant to the rules, to put this proposal to the vote again.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the second proposal, which reads as follows:

"1. Notes the statement of the Administering Authority that Chief Njiasse was properly elected by a majority of the village chiefs and notables of the group;

"2. Notes the statement of the Administering Authority that the petitioner was convicted by the Tribunal correctionnel for making false and slanderous statements."

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: It is now my duty, pursuant to the rules, to put this proposal to the vote again.

There 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Since the Council has adopted no resolution on this particular petition, I am advised that the proper procedure is to refer the matter back to the Standing Committee on Petitions. If there is no objection, we shall follow that procedure.

It was so decided.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Draft resolution VI does not meet the questions and the problems set forth in the petition with which it is concerned. The petitioner considers

that Paramount Chiefs should be elected, but the draft resolution makes no mention of this point. Further, he expresses his opinion that "the Cameroons must be reunited...". The draft resolution makes no mention of that. The petitioner also complains of the low prices paid for local products. Neither is that point mentioned in the draft resolution. Finally, he states that "the United Nations should see that the UPC continues with its full programme without the interference of the Administration". None of these points has been reflected in the draft resolution. My delegation feels that such an attitude towards the petitioner is unjust and, therefore, we shall vote against this draft resolution.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 9 votes to 3.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution X was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Before passing to the vote on draft resolution XIII, I should like to say that important questions involved both in this resolution and in the petition are completely avoided. The petitioner points out that he was arrested without grounds; he describes the very difficult conditions of work of the medical personnel in the Hygiene and Prophylaxis Service. In speaking of the working conditions of the Cameroonian Civilian Orderlies it is stated that they "are treated like slaves, to the point of being dismissed without just cause". Those are the words of the petitioner himself. This has not been reflected in the draft resolution. The draft resolution simply points out the observations of the Administering Authority and really does nothing to satisfy the requests of the petitioner. My delegation, therefore, will not be able to support this draft resolution and shall vote against it.

Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution XIV was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I refer the members of the Council to the recommendation contained on page 2, paragraph 3; that is the recommendation to the effect that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I, II, IV, XII and XIV.

The recommendation was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: After the recess we shall take up the fifty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions set forth in document T/L.412 which deals with sixteen petitions; the annex contains the sixteen draft resolutions proposed by the Committee. We shall in the usual way proceed to vote separately on each one of these draft resolutions. We will recess now and resume at 4.20 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 4.25 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to deal with the draft resolutions in the annex to the fifty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions, document T/L.412.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to draft resolution II.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation proposes that to the draft resolution there be added the following:

"Draws the attention of the Administering Authority to the necessity of investigating the complaints contained in the petition, complaints against the arbitrary actions and the force used by the police in Sangmélima against the population, and of investigating the lengthy judicial procedure involved in the case, which began two years ago."

The Soviet Union delegation moves that as an amendment to draft resolution II.

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to draft resolution VI.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In place of draft resolution VI, the Soviet Union delegation proposes the following draft resolution:

"The Trusteeship Council recommends to the Administering Authority that it investigate this situation and call to account those individuals responsible for persecuting indigenous inhabitants for their political

activities, and that it investigate the facts concerning the illegal action of Mr. Neutot and bring about a fair and unprejudiced decision on this question."

The Soviet Union delegation proposes this draft resolution in place of the draft resolution submitted by the Standing Committee on Petitions because the draft resolution of the Committee does not deal with the questions raised in the petition, whereas the draft I have just proposed does deal with them.

The draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union was rejected by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution X was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I should like briefly to explain my vote on draft resolution X. The petition in question is one of those referred to earlier by the representative of France as dealing with actions before courts. We note from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution that it is possible for the petitioner to take his case before the Conseil du contentieux administratif. I voted in favour of this draft resolution because the paragraph in question had been adopted precisely on the basis of a statement made by the special representative, in reply to a question, to the effect that the petitioner could adopt that course. Naturally, our favourable vote does not mean that we are taking any stand with regard to the final decision which, of course, rests with the Conseil du contentieux administratif. When adopting this draft resolution the Committee on Petitions was well aware of this aspect of the situation. Thus it adopted the draft resolution advisedly. The same consideration was also in my mind here today.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I quite agree with the representative of Syria and with the special representative in recognizing that the person concerned can submit his case to the Conseil du contentieux administratif, but I submit that, in view of existing legislation and jurisproducence, the petitioner has perhpas one chance in a thousand of obtaining satisfaction in this case. In my humble opinion, therefore, it is not reasonable to encourage him to take steps which will prove fruitless, and that is why I voted against the draft resolution.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution XIV was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution XV was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution XVI was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 on page 3 of document T/L.412; namely, that the Council should decide that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I, III-V, VII-X and XII-XVI.

The recommendation was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the draft resolutions contained in the 58th report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.413).

Draft resolution I was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before the Council proceeds to the vote on draft resolution II, I should like to say this:

In the petition to which draft resolution II refers, the petitioner raises the question of the unification of the Cameroons and the granting of independence to the Territory. The draft resolution ignores these complaints and treats the whole problem as if it were a matter of opening a bar-restaurant. I must note that the draft resolution is somewhat frivolous, and I am afraid my delegation will have to vote against it.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution X was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution XI was adopted unanimously.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make a statement as regards draft resolution XII, before that draft resolution is put to the vote.

In the petition from the railway workers of the French Cameroons, very serious complaints are made concerning the situation which exists on the railroads. Those complaints have not been dealt with in the draft resolution. We think that the draft resolution would be substantially improved if the following paragraph were added:

"Recommends to the Administering Authority that it should establish a commission to investigate the complaints of the railway workers and that it should take the necessary steps to eliminate the existing irregularities."

The railway workers request in their petition that such a commission should be established, and I think it would be unfair if the Trusteeship Council were simply to ignore their request.

I therefore move that the text which I have read out should be added to the draft resolution, as paragraph 4.

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution XII was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now deal with draft resolution XIII.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union proposes the following draft resolution as a replacement for draft resolution XIII:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Notes that the prohibition of the circulation in the Trust Territory of publications of the World Federation of Trade Unions is a violation of trade union rights and is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations,

"Recommends that, in view of the importance of these publications for the development of the trade union movement in the Territory, the Administering Authority authorize the circulation of all material dealing with the actions of trade unions and that it revoke Decision No. 2270 dated 6 May 1953."

The draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria)(interpretation from French): I request that the draft resolution be voted on paragraph by paragraph for the first two paragraphs.

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution XIII was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution XIII as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution XIV was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution XV was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution XVI was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now pass to draft resolution XVII.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation proposes that the words "Expresses the hope" in operative paragraph 3 be deleted and the words "Recommends" be inserted in their stead.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: It is now my duty, pursuant to the rules of procedure, to put this amendment to the vote again.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The amendment was not adopted.

Draft resolution XVII was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution XIX was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention

The PRESIDENT: We shall now pass to draft resolution XX.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation proposes that the draft resolution submitted by the Standing Committee on Petitions be replaced by the following draft resolution:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Draws the attention of the Administering Authority to the impermissibility of persecuting students from the Trust Territory for political activities which have as their purpose the unification of the Cameroons on a democratic basis;

"Recommends to the Administering Authority that it investigate the complaint of Mr. Norbert Yamgwet de Bana regarding his arrest and the ill-treatment to which he was subjected in prison and, upon confirmation of these facts, that action be taken against those guilty."

In submitting this amendment, the Soviet Union delegation bases itself on the fact that the petitioner describes a number of incidents dealing not only with an abnormal attitude towards students, but with action by the authorities which are contrary to the spirit of the Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreement. It is the duty of the Trusteeship Council to draw the attention of the Administering Authority to such facts so that steps can be taken to ensure respect for the legal rights of the indigenous inhabitants, not only in the field of education but in the field of their civil rights also. That is the purpose of the draft resolution which I have submitted.

The draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union was rejected by 6 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution XX was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now draw the attention of the Council to the recommendation contained in paragraph 4 on page 3 of the report to the effect that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I to IV, VII to XI, XIII, XVI, XVII, XIX and XX.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): There should be some correction made to the French text. There, it is only resolutions I,IV and not I to IV inclusive.

The PRESIDENT: Resolutions I to IV is correct.

The recommendation was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the fifty-ninth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions which is set forth in document T/L.414. This report deals with thirteen petitions and in the annex members of the Council will find eleven draft resolutions proposed by the Committee.

As to the petition from Mr. Abraham Ewo, which is set forth in document T/PET.5/161 and referred to in section VI of the report, the Committee states that it was unable to agree on a draft resolution and, therefore, there is no proposal submitted to the Council.

I shall put each of these draft resolutions as they appear in the annex of this report to the Council. However, when I come to the petition contained in section VI for which no draft resolution has been proposed, I shall put to the vote the alternative proposals set forth on page 13 of the report. Draft resolution I on page 1 of the annex is before the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I should like a separate vote on paragraph 2.

The first part of draft resolution I to the end of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution I was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution VI. I ask the members of the Council to turn to page 13 of the report. On that page, two proposals are set before the Council. The first is entitled A, and I shall read it:

"1. Requests the Administering Authority to carry out further investigations as to the right of the petitioner to speak on behalf of the community concerned and to investigate the substantive questions raised in the petition and to report the results of the investigations to the Council at its fourteenth session."

Mr. McKAY (United States of America): Is my understanding correct that, in the case of this petition, all of the complaints have been investigated on one occasion?

The PRESIDENT: I shall have to ask the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions to answer that question.

Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) (Chairman, Standing Committee on Petitions) (interpretation from Spanish): It is rather difficult for me to reply to the question put by the representative of the United States because I cannot recall all the circumstances of this particular case. We did discuss the

matter in detail and all this appears in the records of the Committee. However, it is rather difficult for me offhand to recall exactly what the situation was. Perhaps the special representative or the representative of France could help in this regard.

I believe that what transpired was that some of the cases had been investigated but a few had not. That is why it seemed to us that resolution A might be adequate since it does not involve any vote of censure with respect to the Administering Authority. It simply suggests that a further investigation be carried out and a report sent to the Council. Now, this might be taken up at the fourteenth session of the Council, but we could perhaps make it easier by saying, "at its fourteenth session, if possible". Of course, if there is no result with respect to the further investigation, there will be no need for a report at the fourteenth session.

I cannot reply exactly to the representative of the United States as regards all the circumstances of the case. Reference would have to be made to the records of the Committee in order to secure this information.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I think it is absolutely pointless to ask the Administering Authority to report to the fourteenth, fifteenth, eighteenth or twentieth session of the Council. The Administering Authority has stated that the matter has been entirely settled. The Standing Committee on Petitions can continue to draw up these draft resolutions but we will always reply that the matter has been definitely settled and that there is no need for any new legal appeal before an administrative or judicial tribunal. Therefore, we will always reply in this vein.

Mr. McKAY (United States of America): I just wish to thank the representative of France for this clarification. In the light of what he has said, my delegation will vote against proposal A and for proposal B.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that in paragraph 1 of section VI of the document we are discussing, the following is stated:

"The petitioner, writing on behalf of the community of Pola Banéka-N'Kongsamba, states that a piece of their land was expropriated without their consent. It is now occupied by the Compagnie pastorale...". This is a French land company and not an indigenous land company.

I should like to draw your attention to article 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration. It is as follows:

"In framing laws relating to the holding or transfer of land, the Administering Authority shall, in order to promote the economic and social progress of the native population, take into consideration local laws and customs.

"No land belonging to a native or a group of natives may be transferred, except between natives, save with the previous consent of the competent public authority. No real rights over native land in favour of non-natives may be created except with the same consent."

It becomes obvious from the petition that not only have the rights of the petitioners been violated but article 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement has also been violated. Consequently, we see that nothing has been said about it in the resolution. With regard to the statement of the representative of the United States that the question has already been investigated and that there is nothing more for us to do, I would suggest to the representative of the United States that he look into the substance of the complaint in the petition and look at article 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement again. We therefore hope that proposal A will be adopted, because it calls for further investigation as to the rights of the petitioner.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I think it is necessary for the representative of the Soviet Union to read the text of article 7 again, and to read it very closely. When he has read article 7, he will come to the conclusion that his interpretation does not have any foundation.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I do not know about that. I did not read it incorrectly or accidentally. I have the United Nations text before me and I can read article 7 once more. I did not make any mistake in reading the official text of the agreement.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put proposal A to the vote.
There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put this proposal to the vote again.
There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on proposal B.
There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put this proposal to the vote again.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Since proposal B was not adopted, the petition will be remitted to the Standing Committee on Petitions.

The Council will now vote on draft resolutions VII, VIII, IX and X of document T/L.414.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 7 votes to 5.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution X was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider draft resolution XI.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): With regard to the petition which concerns draft resolution XI, this petition contains some very serious complaints regarding the abuses which the indigenous inhabitants have been suffering at the hands of the Pastorale Company. The draft resolution submitted by the Standing Committee on Petitions does not at all reflect the complaints of the indigenous inhabitants against the Pastorale Company. Consequently, we feel that the petition is completely unsatisfactory. We propose that a paragraph 5 be added which would read as follows:

"Recommends to the Administering Authority that it carefully investigate the complaints of the petitioners regarding the arbitrary acts of the Pastorale Company, and that it advise the Trusteeship Council of the results of such an enquiry at its fourteenth session."

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has submitted his draft amendment to the Chairman. The members of the Council have heard the proposed amendment, which is by way of an additional paragraph 5 to the draft resolution. I shall now put the amendment to the vote.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put the amendment to the vote again.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The amendment was not adopted.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 4, page 3 of the report, that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I, III-VI, VIII and XII.

The recommendation was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask the President and the other members of the Council whether it would be possible to postpone further voting on the petitions. We did have before us the very important report on the Cameroons, which has been put aside. We have, one might say, strayed from our original agenda. I must state in all frankness that we are not prepared to vote on the draft resolutions beyond the point we have now reached. We did not anticipate getting this far. We can return to the original item which was before us and which the President by-passed, or take some other course. The matter is in the hands of the President. I do believe that we have made considerable progress today.

The PRESIDENT: I would be happy to return now to the report of the Drafting Committee on the Cameroons under French Administration. However, I did not exactly by-pass this item, if I may refer to that expression. I did this to meet the convenience of the representative of Syria.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/L.406 AND ADD.1, L.429, L.433 [Agenda items 3d, 4, 5]

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, the representative of Syria, to present the report of the Committee.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I wish to thank the President for the courtesy he has extended to me today in postponing the discussion of this item for a few hours.

As members of the Council will note, the report of the Drafting Committee is contained in document T/L.429. The Committee held several meetings, and the representative of Syria on that Committee reserved his right to submit certain

amendments and additions to the draft report. I have nothing more to add as Chairman of the Drafting Committee. However, with the permission of the President, I would like to make a brief statement on these amendments as the representative of Syria.

First, there are two amendments under the general section which are designed to make a little more precise the wording of the recommendations.

With respect to the amendments on integration with the French Union, which relate to page 4 of the report, my delegation finds itself completely unable to accept the contention in the last part of this recommendation that the Council has "confidence that this relationship will continue to remain in accordance with the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and the provisions of the Charter". We shall vote against it in that form. Even if we were to assume, and we do not, that such a statement is true from the legal and constitutional points of view, the fact remains that we have reason to believe, on the contrary, that the present relationship of the Cameroons to the French Union is delaying, if not actually preventing its political advancement towards self-government or independence. We have testimony to that effect from the Administering Authority itself. Year after year it has told this Council and the General Assembly that it is ready to make certain further political advances, small though they may be, but year after year it has told us that it has been unable to get the French National Assembly to act on these reforms.

Even today the best assurance we can get is merely a statement from the representative of France that he personally hopes that the French National Assembly will do something about it this year.

If such a delay is taking place in the case of relatively minor reforms, what are we to imagine would be the situation if the Administering Authority were ready to go before the French Parliament with really substantial reforms designed to bring the Trust Territories - and this applies to other territories - up to the same level as other territories in West Africa. We shall not go into this in detail, but we are convinced that there would not only be these abnormal parliamentary delays, but there would be political obstruction as well.

We simply do not believe that the French Parliament would at the present time be prepared to pass legislation, for example, setting up genuine executive and legislative organs in the Trust Territory, no matter how much the Council might want it, and no matter how much the people or the French Government itself might want it. I shall not say anything further on this point.

I now put forward our amendment, which I consider to be nothing more than facing the situation realistically. With respect of the exercise of political rights, this amendment is both necessary and self-explanatory.

The amendment related to the Territorial Assembly needs no explanation. The two amendments related to Regional Administration are obvious to the Council, and my delegation hopes that they will receive the support of all members.

As regards our amendments related to economic advancement, we have proposed the first of these amendments because we do not like some of the obvious implications of the phrasing "to reserve to them" - that is, to the indigenous inhabitants - "the part which is theirs in the economic development of the Territory". Some members of this Council might claim that they are already playing the part which is theirs, in other words, the minor part, and they might be pleased to reserve it for them, in other words, to freeze them in that minor role. We have therefore proposed a more precise wording.

In our second amendment under this heading we felt that it was important to have an additional paragraph, which will, I hope, receive the support of all representatives. It concerns mainly the question of technical assistance.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I should like, in a very few words, to set forth the position of the French delegation on the amendments submitted by the representative of Syria.

As regards the first amendment, which relates to frontier problems, the question of unification, I have no objection whatever and am quite willing to accept it.

The second amendment relates to political advancement, particularly integration of the Cameroons within the French Union. Hitherto, I had no hard and fast views on this matter, but now that I have heard the comments of the representative of Syria, I shall unquestionably vote against this amendment. This is not an objective consideration which is being introduced into the text, but is actually the introduction of some element of suspicion, which I consider to be unfair, unwarranted, and to which I must take exception. Since hearing the comments of the representative of Syria, I am determined to vote against the amendment.

The second point under this heading touches upon the exercise of political rights. Personally, I would have no objection to adding to the text submitted by the Drafting Committee the words "and universal adult suffrage" if the words "if possible", appearing in the original text, were retained. If this is agreeable to the representative of Syria, I would accept the rest of that particular amendment.

On the third amendment under the same heading of political advancement, dealing with the powers of the Territorial Assembly, I am bound to conclude from the statement made by the representative of Syria that the text is transparently clear, but the words "without further delay" are mandatory, and this is not the sort of language which should be used to a sovereign power. Therefore, I shall vote against this amendment, and I might add that the tenor of the recommendation has been made more than clear by the representative of Syria.

As regards the amendment concerning regional administration and rural mixed communes, I have no objection, although I feel that in the French text there might be some improvement in the style -- the verb should be "se developper".

I have no objection to the amendment concerning economic advancement and am quite willing to accept it, although, again, with little enthusiasm, since this is the sort of thing which is constantly being brought up. However, I would agree to this amendment in a spirit of good will.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I wish to assure the representative of France that there was no element of suspicion in the statement which I made. I was only stating facts; it was not a question of putting the proposal in a mandatory form, which was not my intention at all. I can assure him that what we are trying to do is to decide on our duty vis-à-vis the people of the Territory. I am grateful to the representative of France for accepting a number of my amendments.

I heard Mr. Pignon say that he would accept the first amendment under the heading, "General", but his main objection was to the amendment on the integration of the Cameroons within the French Union. He stated that he would accept the amendment on political rights if the words "if possible" were retained. I am sorry that I cannot agree to that, but I am grateful to the representative of France for having accepted the rest of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France, as I understood him, did not accept the words "without further delay".

Mr. SINGH (India): What difference would that make? We are all going to vote on it. This is a report of the Drafting Committee, not a draft resolution proposed by the French delegation.

The PRESIDENT: These are amendments put forward by the representative of Syria and the representative of France has a perfect right to comment on them. However, I think we shall now proceed to the vote. The first paragraph to deal with is paragraph 1 on frontier problems: question of unification.

We shall vote first on the amendments proposed by the representative of Syria concerning this paragraph.

The amendments were adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 1 as amended was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the section dealing with political advancement: integration of the Cameroons within the French Union. We shall vote first on the first amendment to this section proposed by the representative of Syria.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: A second vote will be taken on this amendment.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The amendment was not adopted.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before voting on paragraph 2, I should like to ask the authors of this report the meaning of the following words: "as well as the observations of the Administering Authority, in particular its statement that the peoples of the Trust Territories would, upon the termination of the Trusteeship System, be free to achieve their aspirations, etc." What does that mean -- "upon the termination of the Trusteeship System"? If the populations can express themselves only upon the termination of the Trusteeship System, how are they going to determine their fate? That would be in contradiction to the Charter. We cannot, in a United Nations document, use any kind of wording which would be contradictory to the Charter.

The PRESIDENT: I would imagine that the Chairman of the Drafting Committee will have to take the responsibility in this matter. Would he care to interpret the phrase?

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I can assure you that it was not my suggestion. We had a lengthy discussion on this particular item. I am not responsible for it myself; that is why I put some amendments through for this paragraph.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I think the legitimate difficulty felt by the representative of the Soviet Union as regards this paragraph could be met if the wording were changed to read "upon the termination of the trusteeship status of the Territory". What I understand by this phrase here is that the Drafting Committee meant to suggest that when this Territory ceased to be a Trust Territory on achieving self-government or independence, then it would be free to achieve any further aspirations the people might feel outside the structure of the French Union -- if they so desired. I am sure that the Committee did not mean that they would have to wait until the last of the Trust Territories became independent before they could realize these aspirations, which is what a literal interpretation of the words existing would mean. Therefore, if it would help the Council, I would formally move an amendment here to change the words "upon the termination of the Trusteeship System" to read "upon the termination of the trusteeship status of the Territory".

Mr. SINGH (India): That would still bind the Territory to the French Union up to the end of the trusteeship status. We feel that they should have the full right to separate from the French Union perhaps even before the trusteeship status is over. That might sometime be acceptable to the French Union. I therefore feel that the choice should be left open. For that reason I propose that the words "upon the termination of the Trusteeship System" should be deleted. That will facilitate the keeping open of the status of the Territory in this Union. It can stay in the French Union or get out, either before or during or after the end of the trusteeship status.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to point out that this is not a draft of the Committee; it is a statement made by the French representative who therefore has the right of ownership over this

statement. If there is any doubt, I suggest that the Secretariat be asked to look up the relevant document which should be in the files of the Committee on Administrative Unions, and therein will be found the exact statement of the representative of France. I have no objection to this statement being put in quotation marks. In this way the situation will be quite clear and we can all agree on it.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia): I was about to say the same thing and to remind the representative of India that he is not altering a conclusion of the Drafting Committee by proposing an amendment here, but altering a statement of the representative of France. At the same time I think that the representative of France would be quite happy to see his statement clarified somewhat by the adoption of an amendment as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom -- an amendment with which we agree.

The PRESIDENT: It is clear, of course, that this is a statement by the Administering Authority.

Before I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, it might help to clarify matters if I asked the representative of France whether he is prepared to accept this alteration as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): Yes, I quite agree.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In spite of whether this is a quotation of the representative of France or anyone else, I want to say that the Trusteeship Council cannot approve a report which would include a statement of this sort. The representative of France can of course say what he wishes, but for the Council to take note of a statement that the people in the Trust Territory can achieve its political status only when the trusteeship status has finished, I want to say that that is contradictory to the Charter. My point is that the Council cannot approve a report in which a statement of this kind is contained because

that would be approving a statement which is contradictory to the Charter. This is a private and personal statement of the representative of France to which he is entitled, but it does not belong in a report of the Council.

Mr. SINGH (India): Since this was a quotation from the French representative I, for one, withdraw my proposal. I was in error in submitting it. I am surprised that the French representative has now accepted an amendment to this statement. If it was a statement of the Administering Authority I suggest that it be put in quotation marks as it was first done. If he wants to alter it later, then the Council would have to take note of it later on. We do not approve of this status and will vote against it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I do not see why this discussion is prolonged in this way. Those who do not agree that the Trusteeship Council should take into consideration the statement of the French representative can simply vote against the paragraph.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to speak in reply. I wish to stay out of the debate as to the replies which should be given to this statement. I would agree to the solution mentioned by the representative of India. I would agree to the voting suggestion of the representative of Belgium. I want to address myself to the representative of the Soviet Union. I am afraid that he did not understand the meaning of these terms. It is quite patent that the fact that the populations of the Trust Territory accede to a new political status may very well bring the Trusteeship System to an automatic end; this is a matter of logic and common sense. I must say that I fail to see what is this big obstacle in the path of the Soviet Union representative.

The PRESIDENT: I have one proposal before me which I treat as an amendment. That is that the words "upon the termination of the Trusteeship System" should read "upon the termination of the trusteeship status of the Territory". We shall now vote on this amendment.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 2 as amended.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 3, and I shall now put the amendment of the representative of Syria, as set forth in document T/L.433, to the vote.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I am sorry to interrupt the vote, but does it not have some significance whether we vote on this amendment as a whole or in parts? For example, if the first part of the amendment, namely, to delete the words "if possible" were not adopted by the Council, then I think that many of us would be prepared to accept the addition "and universal adult suffrage". I therefore propose that this amendment be voted on in two parts; first, / down to the words "if possible" and then the rest.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I wanted to say the same thing except that I want to vote on the words "if possible" alone -- not the whole three lines.

The PRESIDENT: I think that is a very proper suggestion. I shall put to the vote first the deletion of the words "if possible".

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 votes against.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put it to the vote again.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 votes against; the proposal was rejected.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I will speak in English because I believe it will be easier to understand.

I think we have been taking a vote that is absurd. From what have we been deleting something? We have been deleting something from a text which does not exist. The Committee proposes to the Trusteeship Council that it adopt a text -- but we do not have before us an existing text from which we can delete something. The question is whether we want the words "if possible" to be in the text or whether we do not want to have those words in the text.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid that my brain cannot really conceive this position. All I know is that these are the words I am putting to the Council, and these are the words I intend to put. Now, the amendment to delete the words "if possible" has not been adopted. The proposal to delete the words "if possible" not having been adopted, I do not see how I can put to the Council the proposal to substitute for those words the words "and universal adult suffrage". That seems to fall to the ground. I do not know what the representative of Syria has to say about that.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): That is what the representative of France has suggested. We can retain the words, and now that "if possible" --

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Council to vote on whether it is in favour of the inclusion of the words "and universal adult suffrage".

The proposal to include the words "and universal adult suffrage" was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 3 as amended.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 5, on page 4 of document T/L.429, and we have a Syrian amendment to that paragraph. The amendment proposes that the last five words of the paragraph, "with the least possible delay", be deleted, and that there be substituted therefor the words "without further delay and considers

that it should provide in particular for the granting of legislative powers to the Territorial Assembly."

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 6, and I shall put to the vote first the amendment proposed by the representative of Syria, which is set forth on page 2 of document T/L.433.

The amendment was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 7.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would ask that two separate votes be taken on this paragraph, the first covering the paragraph down to and including the words "traditional chiefs", and the second covering the remainder of the paragraph, beginning with the words "recommends that the Administering Authority".

Paragraph 7, down to and including the words "traditional chiefs", was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The remainder of paragraph 7 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 7 as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 8, on page 6.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with paragraph 8, I have a question to ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee or whoever wrote this. Paragraph 8 reads:

"The Council, noting the satisfactory progress achieved... considers that the success of the plan will, in large measure, depend upon the participation and the co-operation of the indigenous population with the Administering Authority...".

What is meant by the words "co-operation of the indigenous population with the Administering Authority"? I should like to know just what is meant by this "co-operation", specifically in this context.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked a question. It is for those who think they can answer it to do so.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): This is not of my own doing. I cannot claim responsibility for it. There are other members of the Committee. I never suggested this.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I could at least convey to the Council the interpretation of the Administering Authority which will have to carry out this resolution, and give our own views on the meaning of the term "co-operation" as we use it. If I were High Commissioner for the French Republic in the French Cameroons I would understand "co-operation" in this context to mean that the Trusteeship Council advises the population to follow the directives given to it by the Administering Authority -- for example, in the matter of coffee and cocoa trading in organized markets, so that they, the indigenous inhabitants, may take advantage of the official rate and avoid being defrauded by those who try to buy their cocoa from them individually at a lower price. I should interpret it to mean also that the indigenous inhabitants should follow the guidance of the Administering Authority with regard to the sale of higher or lower grade cocoa. That is my interpretation of what the word "co-operation" conveys, and that is how I should apply it if I were entrusted with the task of doing so.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): It seems to me rather dangerous to have in a Trusteeship Council report a phrase such as this calling upon the indigenous inhabitants to co-operate with the Administering Authority. I would ask the Council please not to misunderstand me here, but an Administering Authority might consider this as a recommendation which was entirely in its own interests.

If, for example, the indigenous inhabitants were to demand an improvement in their general welfare, health, political and other conditions, if they were to raise the question of the unification of the Cameroons, and if they were to ask for an improvement in their economic situation through an increase in wages and lower prices, then, I am quite certain, the Governor-General or the High Commissioner could use this recommendation which is now under discussion to accuse the indigenous inhabitants of not co-operating with the Administration. He would tell them, "You want more money: that is not co-operation; that is not in the interests of the Territory."

I might even say that if we were to use this kind of wording the recommendation would militate against the indigenous population, and in this respect the Council should be very careful concerning the kind of terminology

which is used. And indeed, the explanation just given by Mr. Pignon should itself make us a little wary. I do not think that we should say to the indigenous inhabitants, "Please carry out all the directives of the Administering Authority". Not all such directives are in the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. In fact I would go so far as to say that more than half of them run counter to those interests. Consequently I would, as I say, be very wary indeed about adopting a text which would be so favourable to the Administering Authority.

Mr. SINGH (India): Since it is already six o'clock, and since at the speed we are going it may take a long time to dispose of this, I should just like to enquire when the President intends to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT: I did have it in mind to finish this report, but if members of the Council would like to adjourn I am, of course, in their hands. I would, however, draw attention to the fact that there is a great deal of work still to be done.

Mr. S.S.LIU (China): I do not think that it would be possible to dispose of this entire report this evening. Is there any special hurry in view of the fact that we have already done so much this afternoon?

The PRESIDENT: It is a moot point whether we really have done so much, but I am as tired as the other members of the Council and I am quite prepared to adjourn unless representatives in fact desire to continue. I do not think they do, so I shall be happy to adjourn. Before doing so, however, I would draw attention to the fact that the Drafting Committee on Tanganyika will meet tomorrow morning at 10.30 in conference room 8, the Committee on Administrative Unions at 11 o'clock in conference room 11 and the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon in conference room 7.

The Council will proceed tomorrow in a split fashion, if I may use the expression. It will resume its discussion of the present report and, having concluded that, will proceed to deal with the remaining petitions connected therewith. We shall also have other petitions before us. Then we shall continue with the remainder of the agenda as set forth in today's Journal.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.