the end, entirely satisfactory, it did have the effect of putting a very heavy strain indeed upon the New Zealand delegation by reason of the fact that the draft agreement for Western Samoa, as the first draft agreement to be considered, was, speaking generally, made the focal point for the discussion and criticism of all agreements, as is sufficiently indicated by the following analysis of the twenty-nine meetings of this particular sub-committee. Five and a half meetings were occupied with procedural questions; ten and a half with the draft agreement for Western Samoa; ten and a half on all the other seven agreements; and two and a half on the problem of "States directly concerned." There were thirty-four proposals for amendment of the draft agreement for Western Samoa which, when similar amendments were combined, were reduced to twenty-one separate proposals. In respect of the other seven agreements the corresponding figures were exceedingly large, and in a number of proposals for modifications of the other draft agreements the Western Samoan agreement was quoted as a model.

Throughout the whole course of the very lengthy and detailed examination of the draft agreement for Western Samoa, even those who were most critical agreed at once and repeatedly—that New Zealand's record in Western Samoa had been good, that nobody doubted New Zealand's intentions or integrity of purpose, and that the draft agreement for Western Samoa was unquestionably, in the opinion of the subcommittee, the best that was laid before it.

It would be quite impossible here to endeavour to summarize in any detail the course of the discussions, even on this draft agreement, and the net effect can be sufficiently illustrated by a comparison of the text of the draft agreement as presented (contained in Assembly Document A/160), with the text of the agreement as finally approved (contained in Assembly Document A/258¹). In short, the agreement was approved by the Assembly substantially as it had been submitted to the Secretary-General by New Zealand.

## "States directly concerned"

The sub-committee, having disposed of the draft agreements, then turned its attention to the vitally important, and, indeed, primary and fundamental question of the "States directly concerned." By tacit consent the question had been deferred until the eight draft trusteeship agreements had first been examined in all other respects. The New Zealand delegation took an early opportunity to emphasize that, whatever the formal importance of this matter, it was, in actual fact and in principle, the least important aspect in the conclusion of trusteeship agreements, and particularly so if, as the Charter stipulated, the interests of the inhabitants were regarded as the paramount concern.

The representative of the Soviet Union insisted that a definition first be found and then applied in practice to each territory; it was stated,

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  The final text of the agreement, with an explanatory note, is published separately.