



## CONTENTS

	Page
Programme of work: date for the consideration of the Ewe problem . . . .	91
Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the year ending 30 June 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/808, T/820 and T/789) ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	91
Revision of the rules of procedure ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	94

**President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).**

**Present:** The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

**Programme of work: date for the consideration of the Ewe problem**

1. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) observed that it seemed advisable in principle to keep 26 February as the date for the consideration of the Ewe problem. If the Council changed the date, it would have to reallocate the time for consideration of the other questions on its agenda. Moreover, it was to be noted that the petitioners who had asked to be heard by the Council (326th meeting) were not those to whose petitions the General Assembly had given its attention during its last session (General Assembly resolution 441 (V)). If such circumstances as the long journey the petitioners had to make made it impossible to maintain the original date, the Council could then consider what steps should be taken to change it.

2. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he interpreted the French representative's statement to mean that, if the petitioners reported that they were unable to be present on 26 February, the Council would then set another date for consideration of the Ewe question, taking into account the date when the petitioners said they could be present.

3. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) agreed in principle with the USSR representative. Nevertheless, he pointed out that study of the petitions on the Ewe question was not the Council's sole task: it must also consider the steps taken under Trusteeship Council resolution 250 (VII) of 14 July 1950 and the results of the inquiry prescribed by General Assembly resolution 441 (V) of December 1950. Those two questions could be studied without the petitioners, who were to speak only in support of their petition. Subject to that reservation,

the French delegation considered the USSR representative's interpretation entirely acceptable.

4. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Council could begin consideration of the two questions without the petitioners, but that it could not reach a decision on them without hearing the petitioners.

5. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) remarked that the Council could, if really necessary, reach a decision on the inquiry prescribed by the General Assembly without the petitioners in view of the fact that it had not received requests for hearings from the petitioners from the inquiry directly concerned.

6. The PRESIDENT thought that, subject to the reservations just expressed, the Council could decide on the date of 26 February in principle.

7. In reply to a question from Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), the PRESIDENT said that the Council could send the petitioners a telegram informing them that it was prepared to hear them and telling them that the Ewe question would be considered on 26 February.

*It was so decided.*

**Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the year ending 30 June 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/808, T/820 and T/789) (*continued*)**

*At the invitation of the President, Rear Admiral Fiske, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took his place at the Council table.*

8. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) stated that, in accordance with the USSR representative's request (326th meeting), he had prepared a document con-

taining information on the financial status of the Island Trading Company.<sup>1</sup>

9. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) wished to know whether the 565 scholars mentioned on page 51 of the annual report<sup>2</sup> included any women. She further asked whether, in giving the number of inhabitants of school age in future reports, it would be possible to submit tables similar to that on page 54 of the report, but classifying the students by sex. Finally, she wished to know whether there were any girls among the students taking courses as medical assistants, dental assistants and nurses (page 54 of the annual report) or among the nineteen students taking courses in schools and universities outside the Trust Territory.

10. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) replied that scholarships were awarded to worthy students without regard to sex. Students attending the school for medical assistants and dental assistants were men, while girls studied at the school of nursing. He had no precise information as to the numbers of male and female students registered in schools and universities outside the Territory, but he was sure that there were some girls. In future reports the Administering Authority would give a table showing the numbers of students by sex.

11. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) wished to know how many times a week the films mentioned on page 55 of the annual report were shown.

12. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that the films were primarily for the administrative staff. There were about two or three programmes a week which Native administrative employees and students taking courses at the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School could attend. Commercial motion pictures were shown as an indigenous enterprise in Ponape, Rota and Saipan.

13. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) asked whether the post of Supervisor of Libraries, mentioned on page 55 of the annual report, had been filled.

14. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) replied that the post had been filled about four months previously. The supervisor of libraries had organized the libraries of the High Commissioner's Office and the Department of Education, and had then left headquarters for visits to each district, during which he was organizing district and school libraries.

15. In reply to another question from Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that indigenous women had shown keen interest in education. One-fifth of the teaching personnel were women, and a number of women students were registered at the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School.

16. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) drew the special representative's attention to page 79 of the report, on which there was a table showing the number of church schools and the number of students registered in them. He noted that Saipan, which had a mainly Roman Catholic population, had no church schools. That situation seemed rather paradoxical, and he asked for clarification.

17. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) replied that missions on Saipan gave religious, not academic, instruction. The Administering Authority would try to include details on the matter in its next report.

18. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) wished to know whether there was co-education in the Territory, and whether the Administering Authority thought that system appropriate. In some parts of the world the question was highly controversial.

19. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that there was co-education in the schools, and it seemed to work satisfactorily. Nevertheless, while he himself was in favour of co-education, educational experience in the Trust Territory had been too brief to enable him to form a definite opinion as to the desirability of the system there.

20. Mr. HAY (Australia) asked how school teachers were appointed.

21. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) replied that the municipalities paid the teachers' salaries, but the Administration, through the district civil administrator and the district director of education, in collaboration with the indigenous superintendents of schools, appointed them, seeking always to gain the concurrence of the municipality concerned.

22. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) recalled that his written question about the number of teachers in the Northern Marianas (T/L.125, question 23) had not been answered.

23. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) stated that document T/L.127 did not contain a written reply to the question because of a technical error. He explained that the reason why the number of teachers in the Northern Marianas seemed comparatively smaller than in the other islands was that the population was concentrated on five islands, whereas the population of the Marshall Islands, for example, was scattered over very many islands.

24. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wanted to know how the schools were administered, and, specifically, when and how representatives of the Department of Education visited the schools.

25. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) replied that the staff of the Department of Education included the Director of Education, the Assistant Director, a supervisor of publications, a supervisor of agricultural education, a supervisor of libraries and a supervisor of linguistics. At the Truk field headquarters, there was an assistant director of education, and in each district there was a district educational administrator responsible to the civil administrator. Generally, at least one

<sup>1</sup> Document distributed to members of the Council only.

<sup>2</sup> See *Report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the period July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, transmitted by the United States to the United Nations pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations*, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., 1950 (OPNAV P22-100-J).

member of the Department's staff was making an inspection tour, during which he conferred with the district education officers and other officials concerned. The supervisor of linguistics and the supervisor of libraries made inspection tours. In addition, the Assistant Director of Education, who normally had his headquarters in Truk, where there were various educational centres, inspected all districts in rotation. At least once a year the educational staff, the indigenous superintendents of schools and the Advisory Committee on Education held a conference. In addition members of the University of Hawaii conducted special courses and refresher courses for teachers in the Territory every summer.

26. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked how school curricula were worked out, and who was responsible for that task.

27. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that some three years previously an Advisory Committee on Education had been created, composed of some twenty eminent members of the teaching staff of the University of Hawaii and of the Department of Public Instruction in Hawaii, who were specialists in various fields of education. After field trips in 1948 to Guam, Truk and some remote islands and in the summer of 1949 to the Marshall Islands, and after conferences in February 1949 and 1950 in Hawaii, the Advisory Committee on Education had prepared several reports. School curricula had been worked out on the basis of the recommendations the reports contained. The curricula were constantly under revision and were flexible enough to be adjusted both to the needs of the population and to the stage of advancement which they had reached in education.

28. In reply to another question from Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that he would undertake to see whether copies of the recommendations and reports of the Advisory Committee on Education might not be made available to the Council for its information.

29. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that school children stopped learning their dialects when they reached the age of about eleven. He did not understand why that decision had been taken, and requested further details on the matter.

30. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that the Administering Authority tried to maintain the culture of the indigenous inhabitants and not to impose Western culture on them. In the opinion of experts and education specialists, however, it appeared impossible to devote more time to the study of the vernacular, especially as there was no substantial amount of written vernacular literature. In order to ensure the economic, social and political advancement of the indigenous population, therefore, they had to be taught a language in which there were various printed works which would enable them to enlarge their knowledge.

31. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Administering Authority's

policy appeared to be to make English a compulsory language without contributing to the development of the eight indigenous languages spoken by the people of the Territory.

32. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) emphasized that that was not the case. On the contrary, the Administering Authority had exerted every effort to produce written texts to preserve the indigenous languages, and to that end had engaged an eminent linguist. Moreover, dictionaries and grammars of the languages spoken in the Palau Islands and Ponape had been prepared and perfected under the Administering Authority's supervision. They already existed for Chamorro and there were also Marshallese and Trukese dictionaries. Steps had been taken to do the same for the spoken dialects of other districts. From a practical point of view, the teaching of English was essential to ensure the economic, social and political advancement of the people, but the Administering Authority was deeply concerned to preserve as much of the indigenous culture as possible.

33. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the special representative's statement that the Administering Authority was keenly interested in the development of indigenous languages, requested examples of the implementation of that policy. The annual report showed that primary school children stopped studying vernacular languages at the age of eleven. Moreover, the curricula in the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School did not include the study of vernacular languages. In the circumstances, it was difficult to understand how the teachers, who had themselves stopped studying their own languages at the age of eleven, could teach the languages to their pupils.

34. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) pointed out that children spoke only the vernacular until the age of eight or nine, and then continued to study it until they were eleven. Consequently, it was not very likely that they would forget it. Teaching of the vernacular languages was made difficult by the scarcity of school text-books. Nevertheless, the Administration was preparing texts in the indigenous languages, and a number of them had already been published and were being used. School text-books in eight or nine different dialects, and a large teaching staff, would be necessary if vernacular languages were to be taught in the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School, and that was not practically possible. Moreover, there was no danger of the vernacular languages disappearing for many years to come, and by that time, there would be many books in the various indigenous languages to ensure their preservation and development.

35. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in all schools in the world, pupils studied their native language up to the age of seventeen or eighteen and often longer, until their last year at the university. Teachers' training should include study of the language in which they had to teach. Of course, study of vernacular languages at the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School would probably entail considerable expenditure and require a large staff. On the

other hand, the Administering Authority had duties to the peoples of the Trust Territory and could not escape them. It was quite clear both from the special representative's statements and from the annual report that the Administering Authority was neglecting the indigenous culture. He could not but express his disapproval on that score.

36. Turning to another question, he asked the special representative how long class periods were in the primary schools mentioned on pages 49 and 50 of the annual report.

37. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that they lasted about fifty minutes.

38. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that class periods should be the same for eight-year old pupils as for thirteen- or fourteen-year old pupils.

39. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) referred the USSR representative to the report, which indicated that in the first year of primary school, there were four classes per day; in the third year, there were six and beginning with the fourth year, there were seven. In some schools, the schedule was flexible and depended to a great extent on the teacher's judgment.

40. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that six classes a day, lasting fifty minutes each, were too much for children of ten, and wondered whether the Advisory Committee on Education at Guam could study the question and provide the Council with complete information.

41. On page 58 of the annual report for 1948,<sup>3</sup> it was stated that the number of inhabitants in Truk was 14,306 and that there were 43 primary and higher primary schools, 64 teachers and 3,176 pupils. Page 54 of the annual report under discussion gave the figures as 15,617; 39; 51; and 2,128 respectively. At Ponape in 1948 there had been 5,825 indigenous inhabitants, 60 teachers and 1,946 pupils. The figures for 1950 were 10,024; 42; and 1,350 respectively.

42. He asked how the Administering Authority could explain the fact that although the indigenous population had increased, the number of schools, teachers and pupils had diminished.

43. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) said that he had no information which would enable him to give an immediate explanation of the differences in the figures.

44. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be very useful for the Council to have an explanation on that point as soon as possible.

45. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) to some extent agreed with the USSR representative about the teaching of the vernacular languages to school children. However, it must be pointed out that the indigenous inhabitants had known and spoken the indigenous

languages before there were any schools in the Trust Territories.

46. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question was not only the teaching of the indigenous languages, but also and more particularly their development and the maintenance of indigenous culture.

*The meeting was suspended at 3.15 p.m. and was resumed at 4.5 p.m.*

### Revision of the rules of procedure (continued)

47. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to examine the report of the Committee on rules of procedure (T/L.123).

48. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) introduced the Committee's report. He recalled that the Committee's objective had been to revise the rules of procedure so as to enable Italy to take part in the Trusteeship Council's work in respect of the Territory of Somaliland, for the administration of which Italy had been made responsible.

49. The members of the Committee had been uniformly glad to see Italy become an Administering Authority, but had also regretted that Italy was not a Member of the United Nations. It was important for Italy to be able to take part not only in the discussions on the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration, but also in Council debates on general questions relating to the operation of the International Trusteeship System.

50. The supplementary rules A to H of the rules of procedure prepared by the Committee concerned the participation of the Italian Government in the sessions of the Trusteeship Council, while the rest concerned the participation of States members of the Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration which were not members of the Trusteeship Council.

51. The most important question the Committee had had to settle was that of Italy's right to vote. In spite of the feelings of the members of the Committee on that point, the Committee had been unable to settle it as it would no doubt have wished, since it was in fact bound by the provisions of Articles 86 and 89 of the Charter. The only question which had come within the Committee's competence was that of the participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council without the right to vote.

52. The position with regard to the Advisory Council for Somaliland was clear since the provisions of article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement were specific on that point.

53. The conditions in which Italy would be able to take part in the work of the Trusteeship Council were defined in supplementary rule A which was the most important rule in the draft. He read rule A. The other supplementary rules concerned the application of the existing rules of procedure to Italy. The supplementary rules as a whole had been adopted by the Committee by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

54. The PRESIDENT said that he had before him an Argentine amendment proposing that the following

<sup>3</sup> See *Information on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands transmitted by the United States to the Secretary General of the United Nations pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter*, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., July 1948 (OPNAV P22-100-E).

sentence should be added to rule A: "In the examination of annual reports on Somaliland under Italian administration, the Government of Italy shall be entitled to designate and to have present a special representative under rules 74 and 75."

55. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that, as the United States representative had remarked, the members of the Committee had been unanimous in their regret that Italy was not a Member of the United Nations, since it would then *ipso facto* have been a member of the Trusteeship Council, with all the rights and powers of an Administering Authority. However, he himself did not altogether approve of the proposed provisions which were to govern the participation of Italy in the Trusteeship Council's work. His delegation felt that Italy's participation should be wider. That was why the Argentine delegation had abstained from voting on the draft in the Committee. However, the additional rules laid down the conditions under which Italy would be able to take part in the Council's work, and although the Argentine delegation did not wholly approve of those conditions, it would vote in favour of the Committee's report, subject to the adoption of the two amendments to the draft supplementary rules which it was submitting.

56. The first amendment, the idea of which had already been put forward in the Committee, had been read by the President.

57. The second amendment was that the second sentence of rule A should be deleted. The sentence seemed useless, since the Trusteeship Council was master of its own procedure and the President could call upon the representative of Italy to speak whenever he thought it desirable.

58. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) supported the first Argentine amendment, which expressed the Committee's intentions. He pointed out, however, that the English text of the amendment would be more correct if the word "as" were added after the word "representative".

59. With regard to the second amendment, he felt that the sentence in question was pointless because, in virtue of the powers conferred upon him by rule 51 of the rules of procedure, the President had the right to accord any speaker permission to speak. The United States delegation therefore did not oppose the deletion of the second sentence of rule A.

60. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) asked whether the first Argentine amendment was intended to authorize not only the representative of the Italian Government, but also a special representative, to be present at the Council meetings devoted to the examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland. Under article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority undertook to designate an accredited representative to be present at the meetings of the Trusteeship Council at which the reports of the Administering Authority and the petitions relating to that Territory were to be examined. He would like to know whether that article referred to a special representative as understood by the representative of Argentina or a representative of the Government of Italy.

61. He was, however, whole-heartedly in favour of the second Argentine amendment. The sentence was nugatory and even mischievous. The rules of procedure of the regional economic commissions, some members of which were not Members of the United Nations, contained no provision of that kind and there was no reason for including it in the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council.

62. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) intended to vote in favour of the first Argentine amendment. The Committee had certainly intended that the Italian Government should be able to designate a special representative to be present at Council meetings devoted to the examination of the annual reports on the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland, but there was no harm in saying so specifically.

63. With regard to the second Argentine amendment, proposing the deletion of the second sentence of rule A, the delegation of Thailand had voted in the Committee for the retention of that sentence and would do so again in the Council. It was obvious that Italy ought to participate, without vote, in the discussions in the Council relating specifically to the Trust Territory of Somaliland. He felt some doubt, however, not with regard to the principle of Italy's participation in deliberations on general questions relating to the operation of the International Trusteeship System, but with regard to its application in practice. It was true that as an Administering Authority Italy might be concerned in such matters, but to admit Italy without restrictions to the Council's discussions on those questions might raise certain difficulties. For example, when the Council was examining an annual report on some Territory other than Somaliland under Italian administration, the question of education would be a general question, but the number of schools would be a question particularly concerning that Territory, with which Italy would have no concern at all. The delegation of Thailand therefore felt that the second sentence of rule A should be retained. It would be for the President of the Trusteeship Council to decide whether or not the representative of Italy should be asked to speak. In any event there could be no doubt that the representative of the Italian Government would act with tact and discretion.

64. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) agreed with the comments of the representative of Thailand, but not with the remedy he proposed, since the President obviously could not know beforehand what the Italian representative was going to say.

65. Italy, while not empowered to criticize other Administering Authorities, undoubtedly had the right to take part in the discussion of general questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System. For instance, Italy could have spoken in the discussion on the use of indigenous languages in the Trust Territories, without expressing any opinion regarding the attitude of some of the Administering Authorities on that question.

66. Moreover, one of the President's functions was to ensure the orderly conduct of debates; hence, if the Italian representative were to digress from the subject of the discussion and to make direct observations on any Trust Territory other than Somaliland under Italian administration, the President would have the right to call him to order. That was very unlikely to occur,

however, since the Italian delegation would undoubtedly act with discretion.

67. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) observed that Italy was, so to speak, a member *sui generis* of the Trusteeship Council, under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and as the Administering Authority for Somaliland. It was most unfortunate that, because it was not yet a Member of the United Nations, Italy could not take its rightful place in the Council. The delegation of the Dominican Republic hoped, however, that the problem would be settled to the satisfaction of Italy and of all those in favour of its admission to the United Nations.

68. The Committee had unanimously adopted the first part of the first sentence of draft rule A, concerning Italy's right to be represented at all sessions of the Trusteeship Council. He was glad to note that a majority in the Council was in favour of that provision.

69. His delegation was also in favour of the second part of the first sentence of rule A, relating to Italy's participation in deliberations relating specifically to the Trust Territory of Somaliland. It was essential that Italy, as the Administering Authority, should be in direct touch with the Council and thus acquire the experience it needed.

70. The delegation of the Dominican Republic supported the Argentine amendment, which would facilitate the appointment of a special representative. It also supported the proposal that the second sentence of draft rule A should be deleted, as that would make the text clearer.

71. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) thought it might be well to restate the question in the light of the observations of the representative of Thailand. The French delegation did not consider that Italy would be precluded from taking part in the discussion of specific questions by the second sentence of draft rule A. Moreover, whether specific or general questions were being discussed, it would always be for the President of the Council to ensure that the Italian representative did not go beyond his rights. The French delegation was sure, however, that the Italian representative would invariably act with the discretion and restraint characteristic of his country.

72. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) reiterated that in his view Italy would be entitled to take part in the general discussion of reports on Trust Territories other than Somaliland under Italian administration, but not to question the Administering Authorities of those Territories. A clear line must be drawn between general questions and questions directly relating to a specific Territory.

73. For the reasons already stated, the delegation of Thailand would vote for the retention of the second sentence of draft rule A.

74. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) had no comment to make on the first Argentine amendment, which merely made the text clearer.

75. With regard to the second Argentine amendment, however, he recalled that the Committee's text had been adopted by that body as a compromise, other and stricter provisions having been proposed.

76. It should not be overlooked that Italy was not yet a Member of the United Nations. The problem was a

delicate one, but it should be approached objectively and independently of political considerations. Iraq, like the majority of Members of the Organization, would gladly welcome Italy into the United Nations, but the express provisions of the Charter must be respected. The Trusteeship Council should endeavour to ensure that Italy had its lawful rights under the Charter, but it could not go beyond the Charter. It did not rest with the Council to settle a problem which was the result of a conflict of opinion between East and West.

77. He did not agree with the United States representative's interpretation of the words "Upon the invitation of the President..." The original text had read "Upon the invitation of the President and with the consent of the Council..." The point at issue had never been merely the procedure to be followed by the President when calling upon members of the Council to speak.

78. The effect of retaining the second sentence of draft rule A would be that the Italian representative would not be automatically entitled to take part in all discussions on general questions, but that the President would invite him to take part in the discussion on general questions which, in the President's opinion, concerned Italy. The speaker fully agreed with the representative of Thailand on that point.

79. The comparison made by the Belgian representative between the Trusteeship Council and the Economic Commission for Europe was not a valid one. The latter's activities extended to Europe alone, so it was quite natural that Italy should take part in all its work, but the Trusteeship Council's competence extended to Territories and questions many of which did not concern Italy. The Trusteeship Council's work might as well be compared with that of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, in which, for obvious reasons, States non-members of the United Nations took part on an equal footing with States Members. Italy exercised its functions as an Administering Authority only by virtue of General Assembly resolution 289 A (IV); nothing in the Charter conferred upon it the right to take part in the discussion of questions which did not concern the Territory under its administration.

80. True, as the Belgian representative had pointed out, the President could not know beforehand what the Italian representative was going to say, and for that very reason it was essential that the President should have the responsibility of inviting the Italian representative to take part in discussions when he thought Italy's participation was required.

81. He stressed once more that his delegation was by no means opposed to Italy's taking part in the Council's work; it was, however, anxious that due respect should be paid to the Charter.

82. Mr. Y. W. LIU (China) also expressed regret that Italy was not yet a Member of the United Nations. It would give the Chinese delegation the greatest pleasure to see Italy taking part in the Trusteeship Council's work.

83. Although not opposed to the first Argentine amendment, he could not see that it was necessary. Draft rule A already provided that Italy might attend all the sessions of the Council and take part in debates



relating specifically to the Trust Territory of Somaliland. The Argentine amendment was superfluous in view of the latter provision. With regard to the second sentence of rule A, he agreed with the Iraqi representative that the words "Upon the invitation of the President..." did not refer merely to the usual power exercised by the President of according the right to speak to members of the Council. The Chinese delegation thought that the second sentence, as at present worded, was in conformity with the rules of procedure, but if a majority in the Council wished the text to be amended, it would have no objection.

84. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) felt that Italy would be in a difficult position in administering the Trust Territory of Somaliland unless it took part in the discussion of general questions concerning all the Trust Territories.

85. The only course of action left open would be to state that since it was not a Member of the United Nations, Italy could not take part in the discussion of general questions concerning all the Trust Territories. The responsibility could not be placed upon the President. That being so, there would be no point in authorizing him to invite Italy to participate in the discussions, in certain circumstances.

86. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) replied to the statement of the representative of Iraq that there was no provision in the Charter giving Italy the right to take part in the discussion of questions not connected with the Trust Territory under its administration by asking whether there was any provision in the Charter permitting a non-member State to be entrusted with the administration of a Trust Territory. That had however been done in the case of Italy because that country had been judged worthy of the task; moreover, it was universally known that Italy, though not yet a Member of the United Nations, was nevertheless qualified for membership. Although the Trusteeship Council, to the deep regret of most of its members, could not grant Italy the right to vote, it could permit it to participate as fully as possible in its work.

87. He again drew a parallel between the Trusteeship Council and the Economic Commission for Europe, to which States not Members of the United Nations were admitted as associates; it was therefore only reasonable that a State which had been judged by the General Assembly to be worthy of administering a Trust Territory should be considered by the Trusteeship Council as an associate State and hence authorized to take part in its work without the right to vote.

88. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) deeply regretted that Italy had not yet been able to join the United Nations and was consequently not a member of the Trusteeship Council.

89. His delegation considered that the form of words for draft rule A was in conformity with the Charter and would therefore vote for it, although it also supported the first Argentine amendment.

90. With regard to the Argentine proposal to delete the second sentence of rule A, he observed that in any case it was for the President to direct the debates; and that moreover Italy's position was clearly defined, as the rule provided that its representative might partici-

pate in the deliberations of the Council on general questions relating to the operation of the International Trusteeship System. His delegation would, however, vote for that amendment should the delegation of Argentina be unable to withdraw it.

91. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), in reply to the Belgian representative, admitted that there was no provision in the Charter permitting a non-member State to assume the administration of a Trust Territory. Italy had however been entrusted with that task by a decision of the General Assembly; the General Assembly resolution entrusting Italy with the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland did not entitle Italy to participate in the discussion of questions not directly concerning that Territory.

92. On another occasion the Belgian representative had objected to the participation of a non-member of the Trusteeship Council—namely, the Philippines—in the work of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (319th and 320th meetings). The delegation of Iraq and the delegation of Argentina had favoured the participation of the Philippines in the Committee's work although that country was no longer a member of the Trusteeship Council. The Philippines was however a Member of the United Nations.

93. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) stressed that his delegation's attitude was consistent; it had been anxious that the Philippines should continue to take part in the work of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions and it was equally anxious that Italy should participate as far as possible in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

94. As the Belgian representative had said, the Charter could not have foreseen that a non-member State would be entrusted with the administration of a Trust Territory. Article 90 of the Charter, however, permitted the Trusteeship Council to adopt its own rules of procedure. The Council should therefore amend those rules to cover the new situation.

95. Italy had been entrusted with the administration of Somaliland by a resolution of the General Assembly, where the unanimity rule did not apply; the Trusteeship Council should therefore bear in mind the implications of the General Assembly decision.

96. If it were true that Italy's participation in the discussion of general questions not directly affecting the Trust Territory of Somaliland was a violation of the Charter, the fact of Italy's having in some cases been invited to take part in the debates in question would not in itself regularize the matter.

97. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Argentine amendment to the effect that the following sentence should be added to draft rule A:

"In the examination of annual reports on Somaliland under Italian administration, the Government of Italy shall be entitled to designate and to have present a special representative as under rules 74 and 75."

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

98. Mr. Y. W. LIU (China) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Argentine amendment because, as he had already indicated, it

thought that draft rule A already embodied all the necessary provisions.

99. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that, in accordance with the wishes of the United Kingdom representative, he would withdraw his proposal that the second sentence of rule A should be deleted and would merely ask that the phrase "Upon the invitation of the President" should be put to the vote separately; that was the only part of the sentence which gave rise to serious differences of opinion.

100. The PRESIDENT put that phrase to the vote.

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

101. The PRESIDENT put draft rule A as amended to the vote.

*That rule as amended was adopted by 11 votes to none with 1 abstention.*

102. Mr. HAY (Australia) said that, although his delegation was anxious to see Italy admitted to the United Nations, it had voted for the retention of the first phrase of the second sentence of rule A as it felt that those words would have saved the Trusteeship Council useless discussion in the future. The meaning of the expression "general questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System" had not been defined and differences of interpretation might arise. It would therefore have been better to leave the matter to the discretion of the President.

103. Nevertheless his delegation had voted for rule A as amended, as a whole, since it believed that the provisions of that rule would meet the situation.

104. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) suggested that the Council should vote on rules B to H, inclusive.

*It was so decided.*

105. The PRESIDENT thought that rule B should refer to a "regular" session of the Council. It might not be possible to give thirty days' notice of a special session.

106. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) remarked that that point had already been raised in the Committee and that it had been agreed that the words "as a rule" covered the eventuality of special sessions.

107. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that rule B had been drafted in conformity with rule 4 of the Council's rules of procedure; he also believed that the words "as a rule" covered special sessions.

108. The PRESIDENT put to the vote rules B to H, inclusive.

*Those rules were adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

109. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested that the Council should consider the remaining rules together.

*It was so decided.*

110. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that in the Committee his delegation had voted for rules I, J and K. Some delegations, however, appeared to have some objections to the present provisions of rule K. Those delegations should make known their views, as a compromise text could certainly be found.

111. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) would like the wording of the second paragraph of draft rule K to be changed. As the Trusteeship Agreement already contained definite provisions on the subject, the Trusteeship Council should either merely refer to the Trusteeship Agreement or should reproduce the relevant provisions of the Agreement in rule K.

112. His delegation would prefer that the second paragraph of rule K should be identical with the first paragraph of article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement, and proposed that it should be so amended.

113. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that, as the Trusteeship Council had granted the Administering Authority the right to participate in the discussion of general questions, it should grant the same right to the Advisory Council for Somaliland. The members of the Advisory Council were Members of the United Nations and therefore enjoyed certain rights which Italy did not possess. He did not quite see how the French delegation could justify, in the eyes of the General Assembly, the granting of certain privileges to Italy and their refusal to the members of the Advisory Council.

114. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) asked how the members of the Committee could justify the substitution of new provisions for those of the Trusteeship Agreement.

115. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) drew the Iraqi representative's attention to the fact that there was a clearly marked difference between the Administering Authority and the members of the Advisory Council; Italy, which was responsible for the administration of a Trust Territory, was naturally concerned with any questions related to the operation of the International Trusteeship System, whereas the jurisdiction of the Advisory Council was restricted to Somaliland. Moreover, the General Assembly had not associated the members of the Advisory Council with the administration of Somaliland; otherwise it would have set up a joint administration.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.