



CONTENTS

	Page
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>)	107
Membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (<i>continued</i>)	109
Revision of the rules of procedure (<i>continued</i>)	111
Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (<i>continued</i>)	
Report of the Committee on Visiting Missions (T/L.126)	114

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.

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.

1. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) thanked the Council for the thorough and comprehensive way in which it had examined the annual report.¹ His government was particularly gratified by the almost unanimous judgment that his country was fulfilling its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. Only the USSR delegation had deliberately misinterpreted the facts in order to present a false picture of the administration of the Trust Territory. The annual report, as also the report of the Visiting Mission (T/789) and the special representative's statements to the Council (325th to 328th meetings), clearly disproved the USSR representative's conclusions and many of his assumptions.

¹ 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).

2. Three points raised by some members of the Council had already been dealt with in statements by the special representative, and in order not to burden the Council unduly, he would not revert to them. They were the application of international agreements, conventions and treaties to the Trust Territory; the present state of organic legislation for the Territory; the seat of government of the Trust Territory.

3. It could not be denied that it would be some time before populations long attached to their traditional customs adopted the democratic way of life of the Western countries. A balance had to be struck between the need for political progress and the reluctance of the people to change their traditional institutions. The United States Government was gratified by the Council's approval of the way in which the Administering Authority had struck that balance. His government believed in promoting democratic forms of government just as rapidly as the people would accept them and in stimulating and providing for increased participation by the indigenous peoples in the government as rapidly as possible. However, political progress for the population of the Trust Territory should be gained by sympathetic leadership, and with the consent and co-operation of the inhabitants, not by methods of compulsion or dictatorship. Notable progress had already been made and it was pointed out that indigenous personnel now participated extensively in the administration of the government. His government was aware of the fact that democracy might take various forms and that representative government developed in indigenous communities might differ from Western forms.

4. He wished to take up several points which had been commented upon by members of the Council during the examination of the annual report. Mention had been made of the development of a Territory-wide legislature. The Administering Authority's long-range programme provided for just such a legislature. The

New Zealand representative's suggestion (328th meeting) that a conference of representatives from the district congresses might usefully be held was interesting and the Administering Authority would consider it.

5. One member of the Council had commented on the system of military administration in the Territory. As the Council had been informed, the Administering Authority was at present transferring the powers hitherto exercised by military personnel to civilian personnel. The transfer was scheduled to be completed on 1 July 1951, and care was being taken to ensure that it was effected in an orderly manner and without impairing the public services.

6. In the economic field, land seemed to be a particularly important problem, and the Administering Authority was aware that the economic development of the population depended, to a large extent, on land being used for the maximum benefit of the inhabitants. It should be explained, in that connexion, that the 450 square miles of land under the Administering Authority's control consisted principally of public land transferred by the former administrations, which was now held for the benefit of the inhabitants. As the special representative had pointed out, in reply to an oral question, the Administering Authority had appointed land title officers to deal with claims to land taken from its owners without just compensation. In regard to the comments on the Administration's right to alienate land in the public interest, it should be recalled that that right was recognized by modern law. Moreover, the Territory under discussion was of strategic importance and article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement expressly authorized the Administering Authority to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the Trust Territory. The Administering Authority obviously required the use of certain lands for the erection of such installations.

7. Several members of the Council had referred to the problem of such Japanese obligations as postal savings accounts, bonds and the redemption of the yen. The United States Government would give careful consideration to the suggestions made on that subject.

8. Copra was the mainstay of the Territory's economy. The Administration would see to it that the indigenous producers received a fair return for their product. Furthermore, it was noted that the copra price paid the producer had been increased four times within the past thirteen months. In regard to the revocation of the tax on copra, the Administering Authority considered that copra, being the principal product of the Territory, should provide a large share of the Territory's revenue and contribute to the economic development of the islands.

9. Several representatives had mentioned the possibility of Japanese participation in the fishing industry. Development of the fishing industry was one of the problems to which the Administering Authority was giving close attention. It believed that the industry should remain as far as possible in the hands of the indigenous inhabitants, and that the people should secure a full return for their labours.

10. Some representatives had referred to the possibility of reorganizing the sugar industry, particularly in the Northern Marianas. The Administering Au-

thority had made an extensive study of the industry's economic possibilities and had come to the conclusion that under normal world market conditions the sugar industry could not be profitable in the Northern Marianas. Rehabilitation of the sugar industry would require heavy investment and constant subsidies, and, as some representatives had pointed out, a system of subsidies might retard the country's economic independence. The Administering Authority was nevertheless aware of the need to increase agricultural production, and was studying the various possibilities of coffee and cacao production, which at the moment seemed more promising than that of sugar.

11. Economic development of the Territory was being fostered in other ways, such as increasing copra production through improvement in the quality and size of coconuts and the elimination of destructive insects, developing other agricultural products for export, encouraging and assisting the inhabitants to establish retail and wholesale companies and light industries and, finally, providing small craft for the inhabitants to facilitate transport between the islands.

12. The Administering Authority's attention had also been drawn to the importance of making the phosphate royalty payments to the Angaurese under the new Angaur Mining Agreement as soon as possible. The two annual payments due to date under that Agreement had already been made available to the beneficiaries.

13. His government felt it had been generous in the amounts spent on the Territory, but, as several representatives had pointed out, too great a generosity in the amounts expended by the United States on the Trust Territory might retard its political and economic independence.

14. In regard to the Administering Authority's fiscal and financial policy, the United States Government thought that the head tax should be retained until an adequate substitute was found. Wages paid to the indigenous population in each area varied according to the cost of living in that particular area. The payment of higher wages to non-indigenous employees was due to the differences in skills or the need to attract competent people to the Territory. The disparity which existed between the various wages was not due to racial differences but to economic necessity. Indigenous personnel were employed to the fullest extent practicable.

15. Funds available for social welfare were invested in immediate social needs rather than in insurance plans appropriate to a highly industrialized society.

16. The Administering Authority appreciated the comments of some members of the Council on the work done by the USS *Whidbey*. So that there should be no misunderstanding, however, it should be pointed out that that work was not of a permanent nature; the ship's function was merely to make an initial survey of the population's health. As soon as that had been completed, it would leave.

17. Several members of the Council had been interested in the situation of the inhabitants of the island of Bikini, and had thought that they merited special consideration. The Administering Authority thoroughly agreed with them on that point. The population of Bikini had already received considerable assistance

from the Administering Authority, and should now be encouraged to adapt itself to its new conditions and to contribute to its own social and economic progress.

18. The difference in the figures of the school population between 1948 and 1950, which had been noted and stressed by one of the members of the Council, was due mainly, as the special representative had explained, to a difference in the statistical method used. The progress made in elementary and secondary education could be clearly seen from the fact that fifty students, in addition to those studying medicine, dentistry and nursing, were at present receiving higher education outside the Trust Territory. The excellent results obtained by the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School gave hope for rapid improvement in the number of teachers.

19. In conclusion, the United States Government would always welcome any constructive criticism or suggestions which might help to improve the administration of the Trust Territory. The Administering Authority had been especially happy to welcome the Visiting Mission to the Territory and had found its suggestions particularly valuable.

20. Rear Admiral FISKE (Special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) thanked the President and the members of the Trusteeship Council for the courtesy and forbearance which they had shown him. It was probably the last time that he would be privileged to attend the Council in view of the imminent transfer of power from the Navy to the civil administration, but he would always remember his association with the Council as a happy one.

21. The PRESIDENT said that for the past three years the Council had appreciated the special representative's loyalty and courtesy. Now that Rear Admiral Fiske was about to sever his connexion with the administration of the Trust Territory, he wished to express the Council's best wishes to him.

Rear Admiral Fiske, special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, withdrew.

22. The PRESIDENT proposed that Australia, Belgium, the Dominican Republic and Thailand should be appointed members of the committee to draft the Trusteeship Council's report on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

It was so decided.

23. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no objection to the appointment of Thailand and the Dominican Republic, but that the presence on the Committee of two Administering Authorities, Belgium and Australia, would have caused him to abstain if the membership had been put to the vote.

24. The PRESIDENT said that the USSR representative's reservation would be noted in the record of the meeting.

25. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that the Soviet Union had previously made similar reservations. He would like to know whether the USSR representative considered that the Administering Authorities in general, and Belgium in particular, although members of the Trusteeship Council, did not have the same

rights and the same duties as the other members of the Council.

26. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that the Soviet Union was sole judge of the position which it had adopted on that point. With regard to the rights and duties of the members of the Trusteeship Council, he advised the Belgian representative to refer to the Charter.

Membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (continued)

27. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions should consist of China, New Zealand, Thailand and the United States of America.

28. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR delegation had already set forth its view on the participation of the Kuomintang representative in the Council's work: in the eyes of the Soviet Union Government, he did not represent the lawful Government of China, which was the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. He would therefore vote against the nomination of the Kuomintang representative, whom he regarded as representing no one, and requested the President to take a separate vote on each nomination.

29. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) said he had already had occasion to state that he would always be glad to sit on committees of the Council as the lawful representative of China. The USSR representative had of course the right to object to the participation of any member of the Council in the committees of the Trusteeship Council and to ask for a vote on the nominations of members of the Council, provided that his objections were admissible. In the case in point they were not. The President should therefore declare the USSR representative's motion inadmissible and thus settle once and for all a point which might be raised by the USSR representative every time the Council took a decision such as it now had to take.

30. The PRESIDENT said that he could only apply the rules of procedure. The USSR representative had asked for a separate vote under rule 60 of the rules of procedure and his request was valid.

31. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the USSR representative's motion in fact raised a question of principle which the Council had already settled when it accepted the Chinese representative's credentials. The President had proposed that the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions should have a particular membership. The Council could not vote separately on each candidature; it must merely approve or reject the membership proposed by the President.

32. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) supported the President's proposal and the Belgian representative's view. If the USSR representative had objections to the participation of China in the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, he could do as he had just done in the case of the Committee appointed to draft the report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: he could have his reservations noted in the record of the meeting. If he asked for a vote, it would be taken

under rule 41, which stated that all elections were to be by secret ballot.

33. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asserted that none of the arguments put forward to counter the USSR's lawful request stood up to a logical interpretation either of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council. It could not be denied that any member of the Council had the right to request that the Council should vote on any proposal in parts. Moreover, there were many precedents. If there were any objections to his argument, he would ask to speak on a point of order in order to explain and justify it.

34. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that in his opinion there were three considerations which must be borne in mind: first, the right of every member of the Council to ask for a separate vote on parts of any proposal submitted to the Council; secondly, the reasons justifying any such request, which must appear in the record of the meeting; and, lastly, the question of principle raised by the representative of China, which the Council ought to settle once and for all.

35. The PRESIDENT thought that the matter had been discussed sufficiently. The problem had two aspects: one, the question of the separate vote, and the other, the question of the USSR representative's reasons for opposing the nomination of China. The first aspect was the more important. The only way out of the impasse was, therefore, to take a vote in parts, unless the Council decided otherwise.

36. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) regretted the President's ruling. The Council had in fact already settled the question of the representation of China (315th meeting) and China had the same right as the other members of the Council to be represented on the Council's committees. The fact that the USSR representative was opposing the appointment of China for reasons which had already been the subject of a Council decision was no reason why the Council should take a vote on the composition of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.

37. The PRESIDENT said that the question was one of procedure and not of principle.

38. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) felt that the question of procedure in itself implied a question of principle and, in the circumstances, he was compelled to challenge the President's ruling.

39. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that the President's point of view was right. The rules of procedure must be obeyed. It was not a question of considering the reasons why the USSR representative had asked for a separate vote. The point was simply that the request, which was in conformity with rule 60 of the rules of procedure, must be considered, and in the circumstances he appealed to the representative of China to show the necessary understanding.

40. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) thought that a matter of principle was unquestionably involved. The problem was to decide whether a duly qualified member of the Trusteeship Council was, by that fact alone, duly qualified to take part in the work of subsidiary organs of the Council. The President's proposal was in fact being put to the vote in parts simply because the

USSR did not recognize the Chinese delegation's credentials.

41. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) agreed that, since the Trusteeship Council had accepted the Chinese delegation's credentials, that delegation was qualified to sit in the Council and in the Council's subsidiary organs. However, the fact that a delegation was eligible for membership of certain subsidiary organs did not necessarily mean that it must be appointed to those organs. The Belgian delegation considered that the Chinese delegation was duly qualified for membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions and would vote in favour of the nomination. On the other hand, it might have been able to vote for some other delegation. He concluded that, without sacrificing its position of principle, the Chinese delegation might be able to agree that the vote should be taken.

42. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) entirely agreed with the President. He recalled that a similar question had arisen when the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions was constituted (316th meeting). In the present case, the question of the representation of China, on which the Council had already made its decision, was not involved.

43. The PRESIDENT confirmed the opinion already expressed by various delegations that the principle of the representation of China was not involved.

44. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) thanked the President and members of the Council for having made matters clear by specifying that the representation of China was not in question. In the circumstances, the Chinese delegation would not press its point.

45. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the nomination of China to the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.

The nomination was approved by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

46. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the President for his strict application of the rules of procedure.

47. He also explained that he had voted against the nomination of the Kuomintang representative because the latter was not qualified to represent China.

48. Mr. GARREAU (France) raised the question whether the USSR representative was within his rights in repeating the same statement of principle concerning the representation of China every time the question of the participation of China in the work of the Council and its subsidiary organs arose in one way or another.

49. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation had voted for the nomination of China because the Dominican Republic considered that the Chinese delegation duly represented the Chinese people. It was the Dominican Republic's policy to oppose the admission to the United Nations of any representative of the communist Chinese government.

50. His delegation had taken that opportunity to show that the small Dominican Republic had the same rights as the other Members of the United Nations, regardless of their power or importance, despite Generalissimo Stalin's protest against the fact that the Dominican

Republic had as much weight in the United Nations as India and China.

51. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not wish to go back to the question of the representation of China but merely to make certain explanations in reply to the representatives of France and the Dominican Republic.

52. First, it was not true to say that the USSR delegation was continually raising the question of the representation of China. That matter should not be confused with the explanations of its votes which the Soviet Union delegation, like any other, was entitled to make whenever it thought it necessary.

53. Secondly, it was to be regretted that the representative of the Dominican Republic had so far departed from the subject under discussion as to refer to a statement by the Head of the State of the USSR. Nevertheless, what Generalissimo Stalin had said of the small Dominican Republic was perfectly true.

54. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the nomination of Thailand to the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.

The nomination was approved by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

55. There being no objection, the PRESIDENT put the nominations of the United States of America and New Zealand to the vote together.

The nominations were approved by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

56. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the membership of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions as a whole.

The membership of the Committee as a whole was approved by 11 votes to 1.

57. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that for the reasons he had given he would have preferred the Council not to take a vote on the membership of the Committee as a whole. As, however, the various nominations had finally been put to the vote as a whole, the USSR delegation had been compelled to vote against them in view of the fact that the Kuomintang representative was one of the candidates instead of the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, the sole legal representative of China.

58. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) felt that misunderstandings of that kind might be avoided if a vote was taken by secret ballot when the nomination of a person or a delegation gave rise to objections. That was the sense of rules 41, 42, and 43 of the rules of procedure.

59. The PRESIDENT, replying to the USSR representative, pointed out that rule 60 of the rules of procedure laid down that when parts of a proposal were voted on separately, the proposal should then be voted on as a whole.

60. He thought that the Council might bear the Argentine representative's suggestion in mind for future reference.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and was resumed at 4.20 p.m.

Revision of the rules of procedure (continued)

61. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had considered the report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure (T/L.123) at its 327th and 328th meetings; it had reached draft rule K, and the vote on the second paragraph of that rule had been equally divided.

62. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that, as a compromise solution, he had suggested (328th meeting) that the words "connected directly or indirectly with the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration" should be added to the second paragraph of rule K after the words "general questions relating to the operation of the International Trusteeship System". It could not be denied that it would be useful to have members of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration taking part in the Trusteeship Council's debates on questions directly or indirectly concerning Somaliland.

63. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) regretted that he was unable to support that conciliatory proposal. If the second paragraph of rule K were adopted as amended by the Argentine representative, the Secretary-General would communicate to the Trusteeship Council any request of a State member of the Advisory Council to take part in its discussions when it studied general questions "directly" connected with Somaliland. The States members of the Advisory Council might, however, reply that the Trusteeship Council did not have to be consulted on the point, as those States had that right under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement. On the other hand, article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement would be infringed if such States were invited to take part in the discussion of general questions "indirectly" connected with Somaliland, since it laid down that there should only be such participation when questions specifically relating to the Territory were under discussion.

64. The Belgian delegation therefore considered that it would be better to delete the second paragraph of rule K or at least to substitute the wording of article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement for it.

65. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) agreed with the Belgian representative's interpretation of the Argentine amendment. The second paragraph of rule K as drafted was not inconsistent with article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement, but it would be if amended as suggested by the Argentine proposal. The proof of that was that article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement gave the right to members of the Advisory Council for Somaliland to participate in the debates on any question specifically relating to the Territory. There was therefore no objection to their now being given the opportunity to take part in debates on general questions regarding the functioning of the International Trusteeship System, especially as the Trusteeship Council had already granted that right to Italy. The presence of members of the Advisory Council might prove necessary, for example, when questions of land tenure were discussed.

66. The second paragraph of rule K as drafted thus supplemented article 11 of the Trusteeship Agreement.

67. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) could not follow the reasoning of the Belgian or Thai representatives. As, however, the Argentine amendment did not seem to meet the objections of certain delegations, he withdrew it and merely requested that the second paragraph of draft rule K, which met with the full approval of the Argentine delegation, should be put to the vote by roll-call.

68. The PRESIDENT asked the members of the Council to vote a second time on the second paragraph of draft rule K.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Argentina, China, Dominican Republic, Iraq, Thailand.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The second paragraph of draft rule K was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

69. The PRESIDENT put draft rule K as amended to the vote.

Rule K as amended was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

70. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that he had voted against rule K because the second paragraph had been deleted. The Government of Iraq felt that the Advisory Council for Somaliland should have the right to take part in the deliberations of the Council, in the conditions set forth, in the interest both of the International Trusteeship System and of Somaliland.

71. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted against rule K for the reasons the representative of Iraq had just given.

72. The PRESIDENT put draft rules I, J and L to the vote.

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mascia, observer of the Italian Government to the United Nations, took his place at the Council table.

73. The PRESIDENT said that, as part of the same question, the Council must now decide on the Argentine draft resolution (T/L.132) concerning the participation of Italy in the Trusteeship Council's work.

74. Mr. GARREAU (France) warmly supported the Argentine draft resolution.

75. Now that Italy had been entrusted with the administration of a Trust Territory, it should have the same rights in the Council as the other Administering Authorities. Of course, it was understood that the question of Italy's admission to the United Nations was not within the competence of the Trusteeship Council, but it was none the less appropriate to draw the General Assembly's attention to the necessity of solving the problem of Italy's participation in the Trusteeship Council's work as soon as possible.

76. Mr. RYCKMAN'S (Belgium) thought that Article 86 of the Charter prevented the General Assembly from making Italy a member of the Trusteeship Council. Therefore, the problem of Italy's participation in the Trusteeship Council's work could be settled either by the admission of Italy to the United Nations, or by an amendment of Article 86 of the Charter to permit Italy to enjoy the same rights as the other Administering Authorities in the Council.

77. In the Belgian delegation's opinion, the Argentine draft resolution was designed solely to draw the General Assembly's attention to the paradoxical situation resulting from the fact that Italy, to which the General Assembly had given a mission of great trust, was not a Member of the United Nations and could not therefore take part in the Trusteeship Council's work on a footing with the other Administering Authorities. More specifically, the Argentine draft resolution sought to have the problem placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, which would thus have to examine every aspect of it. Whatever the General Assembly's conclusions, the important point was that it should consider the problem.

78. In that spirit, the Belgian delegation would vote for the Argentine draft resolution.

79. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) noted that by altering its rules of procedure so as to enable Italy to take part in its work, the Trusteeship Council had for all practical purposes accorded Italy every right save the right to vote. That was a constitutional problem, which was outside the competence of the Trusteeship Council since it involved an interpretation of the Charter.

80. The United States delegation was consequently quite ready to have the problem placed before the General Assembly and to that end would vote for the Argentine draft resolution.

81. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) also regretted that, although Italy was responsible for the administration of a Trust Territory, it was unable to take part in the Trusteeship Council's work with the right to vote simply because it had not yet been able to secure admission to the United Nations.

82. It was therefore important to draw the General Assembly's attention to the anomaly. That was the purpose of the Argentine draft resolution and the reason why the Chinese delegation fully supported it.

83. Mr. HAY (Australia) said that his delegation would vote for the Argentine draft resolution. In fact, in spite of the amendments which the Council had just made in its rules of procedure, Italy would not enjoy all the rights in the Council which it should normally have as an Administering Authority.

84. The General Assembly's attention should therefore be drawn to that contradiction. The terms of the Argentine draft resolution were, moreover, well chosen since they simply requested the General Assembly to examine the question of the participation of Italy in the Trusteeship Council's work. For its part, however, the Australian delegation hoped that the General Assembly would accord Italy rights commensurate with the heavy obligations laid upon it.

85. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) stated that his country had always favoured Italy's

admission to the United Nations, which would allow it to take its rightful place in the Trusteeship Council on the same footing as the other Administering Authorities. It was regrettable that, as matters stood, the Council had been obliged merely to authorize Italy to participate in its work without the right to vote.

86. The delegation of Thailand supported the various paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution, in particular the one which recalled the General Assembly's statement that Italy was a peace-loving State, able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter.

87. His delegation would, however, have liked the last paragraph of the preamble to be drafted in more specific terms. As it stood, it might imply that the General Assembly was empowered to settle the question of Italy's right to vote in the Trusteeship Council. He therefore proposed that the words "the examination of" should be added to that paragraph after the words "Considering that".

88. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) supported the Argentine draft resolution, even though it implied a revision of the Charter. It would be well, he thought, to state in the operative part that it was a matter of Italy's "full" participation in the work of the Council. The preamble of the draft resolution made that point clear.

89. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) accepted the Thai delegation's amendment. The substance of it was already contained in the draft resolution, under the terms of which the Trusteeship Council invited the General Assembly to examine the question of Italy's participation in the Council's work without in any way prejudging the Assembly's decision.

90. He also accepted the Iraqi delegation's amendment. The word "full" had been omitted from the operative part of the draft resolution solely in order to avoid repetition.

91. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) recalled that his delegation had favoured Italy's admission to the United Nations and had voted for General Assembly resolution 289 A (IV) which gave Italy the trusteeship of Somaliland. It was both necessary and just, in view of Italy's responsibilities, that it should be granted the right to participate in the Council's debates.

92. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, under Article 86 of the Charter, only Members of the United Nations could be members of the Trusteeship Council. Therefore the Trusteeship Council could not submit to the General Assembly a proposal which would result in a breach of the Charter. The USSR delegation would accordingly vote against the Argentine draft resolution.

93. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) stressed that his draft resolution in no way constituted an infringement of the Charter. The most that the General Assembly could do to implement the resolution would be to amend the Charter in accordance with Article 108 and the procedure it laid down, in other words, by a two-thirds majority, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

94. The PRESIDENT put the Argentine draft resolution (T/L.132) as amended to the vote.

95. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, Thailand, United States of America.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Argentine draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

96. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation regretted that Italy had not been admitted to the United Nations. Each time Italy's individual application had been under consideration, the United Kingdom had supported it and had deplored the fact that the USSR veto had prevented Italy from being admitted. The United Kingdom delegation had, however, abstained from voting on the Argentine draft resolution because, notwithstanding the Argentine representative's explanations, it was still doubtful whether full participation of a non-member State in the work of the Trusteeship Council was in order. Article 86 of the Charter provided that the Trusteeship Council should consist of Members of the United Nations. Hence, the first question to be decided was the admission of Italy to the United Nations. He did not see the use of the study the General Assembly was being asked to undertake.

97. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United Kingdom representative was incorrect in attributing the fact that Italy had not been admitted to the United Nations to the USSR veto. Both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, the Soviet Union had shown itself anxious to ensure that the United Nations was all-embracing: despite the objections it might have had to some States that were candidates, it had submitted a proposal² to the effect that all thirteen of the States which had applied should be admitted. That proposal had been rejected as a result of the negative attitude of the representatives of the Anglo-American bloc. Thus, the fact that Italy had not yet been admitted into the United Nations was in no way to be attributed to the USSR, but rather to the Anglo-American bloc, which, despite its protestations in favour of the principle of universality, was reluctant to put the principle into practice. The Anglo-American bloc's real motive was the desire of the ruling circles in those countries to interfere in the domestic concerns of other States, although the Charter forbade such interference. The representatives of the Anglo-American bloc debarred Albania, Hungary, the People's Republic of Mongolia, Romania and other countries from admission because they were hostile to the people's democracies in power there, and by so doing they were impeding Italy's admission. That should be made plain so that the United Kingdom's representative's statements should not sow

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Nos. 40 and 42*; and *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, Annex, document A/1079*.

confusion in the minds of members of the Trusteeship Council and in world public opinion.

98. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) thought it quite unlikely that the members of the Trusteeship Council would be misled by statements, of whatever kind.

99. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) noted that, according to the USSR delegation, the only reason why the Soviet Union had opposed the admission of Italy was that it desired the admission of all the States which had requested it. If as a result of the study the Trusteeship Council had asked the General Assembly to make, the Assembly decided that Italy's participation in the work of the Council should be obtained by some other means — according to the USSR representative, Italy could not be admitted to the United Nations because of the Anglo-American bloc's opposition — then it would be able to amend the Charter in accordance with Article 108 so as to allow participation in the Trusteeship Council's work by a State which was not a member of the United Nations, but which administered a Trust Territory. If the Charter were so altered, Italy would be the only Power to profit by the new provision, and Italy being the only candidate, the "Anglo-American bloc" would not oppose its admission to the Trusteeship Council. As the USSR, according to its representative, had no objection against Italy in itself, it too could logically be expected to support Italy's request. It could then confidently be expected that Italy would be admitted into the Trusteeship Council.

100. The PRESIDENT noted that under rule A of the supplementary rules of procedure recently adopted by the Council, he himself, acting through the Secretary-General, must invite the Government of Italy to designate a representative to be present at the sessions of the Trusteeship Council.

101. The Council had invited the observer of the Italian Government to the United Nations to take his place at the table; he was present and was fully accredited to the United Nations. He therefore proposed that a communication should now be sent to the Government of Italy inviting it to designate a representative for the specific purpose of taking his seat at the Trusteeship Council's meetings.

It was so decided.

102. Mr. MASCIA (Observer of the Italian Government to the United Nations) said that the President's invitation would be transmitted to his government as soon as it was received; that government would then designate its representative. He took that opportunity to thank the members of the Council for the sentiments of friendship towards his country which they had been kind enough to express. He would transmit them to his government.

Organization and methods of functioning of visiting missions (General Assembly resolution 434 (V)) (continued)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON VISITING MISSIONS (T/L.126)

103. Mr. LAURENTIE (France), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Visiting Missions, said that

the Committee had been instructed to take up the points raised in the General Assembly resolution 434 (V) of 2 December 1950, examine them and make recommendations. The Committee's report (T/L.126) embodied the results of that work.

104. With regard to point (a) of the operative part of the General Assembly resolution, on the time to be spent by visiting missions in each Trust Territory, the Committee had agreed that in some instances the time spent by missions might have been too short and had therefore recommended that they should remain in Trust Territories long enough to be able adequately to fulfil their task.

105. In connexion with point (b) of the operative part of the General Assembly resolution, on the reduction in the number of Territories to be visited by a single visiting mission, the Committee had thought that such a recommendation was unnecessary and even inadvisable with regard to the Trust Territories in West Africa and those in East Africa. The Committee had felt, however, that in view of the tedious travel involved and the distances to be covered, two visiting missions should be sent to the Trust Territories in the Pacific.

106. The Committee had noted that the recommendation with regard to point (c), concerning flexibility in the itinerary of the visiting missions, had been carried out in the past. That was also true with regard to point (e) of the General Assembly resolution. Point (d) had already been covered by the recommendation regarding point (a).

107. Points (f) and (g) had not called for any special remarks, whereas the Committee had devoted considerable attention to point (h), directing visiting missions to inform the indigenous inhabitants of the workings and operations of the International Trusteeship System. The Committee had noted that the arrival of a visiting mission was likely to puzzle the indigenous inhabitants and had thought that it would be regrettable if further confusion resulted from different interpretations by the inhabitants and by the local administration. Hence, it had recommended that the missions should explain the purpose of their visit to the inhabitants and the administration in a standard general statement. It had also agreed that it was important to discover what were the local requirements in United Nations information material. Finally, the report embodied the text of a draft resolution under which the Trusteeship Council decided to be guided by the principles set forth in the General Assembly resolution, to take into account the observations made by the Committee and to report to the General Assembly on the measures taken to that effect.

108. Mr. HAY (Australia) thanked the Committee for its outstanding work. The Assembly had requested the Council to study the subject; the best way to do so would seem to be to consider each paragraph of the report separately and to make any relevant observations and comments. The Committee's recommendations would thus become those of the Trusteeship Council itself.

109. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider the Committee's report (T/L.126) point by point, beginning with point (a) of paragraph 4.

110. Mr. HAY (Australia) felt that the first sentence of the paragraph should be amended as follows: "...the time spent by missions in certain Trust Territories had been too short..." It was generally agreed that the total time spent by visiting missions was adequate.

111. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) supported that suggestion.

112. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) thought that it would be better to say: "...the time spent by certain missions in the Trust Territories had, in some instances, been too short..."

113. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) wished to place on record his disagreement in principle with the Committee's views. The basic issue was not the length of a mission's visit, but the way it fulfilled its task and studied the local problems and the working of the administration in the Territory visited. The value of a mission's work did not depend upon the length of its visit. An unduly prolonged visit was unnecessary and even likely to stultify the aims of the International Trusteeship System. With that reservation, he would vote for the paragraph.

114. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) entirely agreed with the Iraqi representative. A visiting mission's task was not to scrutinize everything in detail, but to assess the situation as a whole and to consider the specific problems which the Council had drawn to its attention. With that reservation, the Belgian delegation would not oppose the paragraph.

115. In reply to a question from Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) explained that he in no way under-estimated the importance of the duration of a mission's visit. The mission must remain in the Territory long enough to be able to perform its work adequately. But the value of its work would not be judged by the length of its visit; its report would show what problems, if any, had not been given sufficient attention. That was a very important criterion of the value of a mission's work. Its duty was to study the special problems of the Territory and how it was being administered. It must devote all the time required to such a study, but an unduly long visit was unnecessary.

116. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a mission ought to try to make the

greatest possible use of the limited time at its disposal and devote all of it to studying the problems it had been instructed to consider.

117. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) supported the Iraqi representative. Missions had in the past remained in the Territories for whatever period was required for investigation of the problems submitted to them. The flexible, general wording in the report of the Committee on Visiting Missions was quite satisfactory and fully covered all aspects of the matter.

118. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council could either adopt the Committee's draft resolution, in which case the report would be a body of general instructions reflecting the views of the Committee itself, or it could examine the report in detail and amend it if necessary, in which case the report would subsequently be adopted as an annex to the draft resolution and thus become an expression of the views of the Council as a whole.

119. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the Committee's analysis was very good and was sufficiently flexible for it to be used as an instruction to any visiting mission, whatever the Territory visited. He was prepared to accept the President's suggestion that the report should form an annex to the resolution the Council adopted.

120. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) agreed that that would be good procedure, as it would make it possible to adopt a document expressing the views of the Council as a whole. He agreed with the Iraqi representative that the General Assembly had perhaps attached excessive importance to the length of the missions' visits. Other factors should be taken into consideration. He therefore proposed that it should be stated at the beginning of paragraph 4 of the report that, in the Committee's opinion, the time spent by certain missions in the Trust Territories "might, in some instances, have been too short", and that a second paragraph should be added to the effect that the Committee believed, however, that the success of a visiting mission did not depend exclusively on the length of time it spent in each Territory.

121. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) whole-heartedly supported the Argentine representative's conclusions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.