



**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL**  
 Twenty-ninth Session  
 OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 16 July 1962,  
 at 3 p.m.

INDEX SECTION, LIBRARY

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (continued):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961;</i>	
(ii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962</i>	
<i>General debate (continued) . . . . .</i>	111
<i>Examination of petitions (concluded)</i>	
<i>Petitions concerning the Trust Territory of New Guinea (concluded) . . . . .</i>	112
<i>Petitions concerning the Trust Territory of Nauru (concluded) . . . . .</i>	115
<i>Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council . . . . .</i>	116
<i>Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories (Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV)) and the situation in the Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI)) . . . . .</i>	116
<i>Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI)) . . . . .</i>	117

**President: Mr. Jonathan B. BINGHAM**  
 (United States of America).

**Present:**

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Bolivia, China, France, India, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (continued):**

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961 (T/1591, T/L.1044 and Add.1);
- (ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 (T/1597 and Add.1)

[Agenda items 3 (d) and 5 (b)]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, special representative of the Administering Authority

for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place at the Council table.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. KIDWAI (India) congratulated the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962, on its report (T/1597 and Add.1), an excellent document which gave a very clear picture of the geographical features and economic, political and social conditions of the Trust Territory of New Guinea. With regard to the development of national unity in the Territory, the Indian delegation had been particularly struck by the optimism of the Visiting Mission, which had stressed in its report that the difficulties and divisions militating, in the past, against progress in New Guinea could be overcome. However, it had also been struck by the pressing need for far-reaching changes in the economic, political and social fields. In the economic field, in particular, there were amazing contradictions. Although there was no shortage of land, the indigenous people cultivated mainly for their own needs and did not produce enough for export or domestic sale; while, of the very small proportion of cash crops produced for export, 80 per cent were in the hands of non-indigenous inhabitants of the Territory.

2. In the political sphere, conditions were even worse. The Visiting Mission had reported that political progress had been less rapid and had been confined to the establishment of local government councils having very limited functions. Moreover, the thirty-eight existing councils covered less than one third of the total population. In the social field the problems were no less complex. The fact that many areas were still unexplored and that the inhabitants of those areas continued to live in ignorance of the existence of any peoples outside their own small groups clearly emphasized the magnitude of the task.

3. While giving full credit to the Administering Authority for its work in the Territory since the end of the Second World War—the Visiting Mission had described it as impressive in its range and admirable in its drive—the Indian delegation could not help feeling that the present efforts were still inadequate. The special representative had said that almost a million people would be incorporated in the system of local government councils by 1967; but such progress was too slow and, if not accelerated, might lead to serious difficulties.

4. The Indian delegation fully supported the three recommendations contained in paragraph 129 of the Visiting Mission's report, viz.: first, the undertaking of a full review of the Territory's economy; secondly, the finding, training and guiding of potential leaders, as a matter of maximum urgency; and thirdly, the developing of representative, democratic government at the centre, to overcome the divisions which had so far bedevilled the Territory. It also endorsed the Visiting Mission's view that those three aims could and should be pursued concurrently. Yet they did not

represent the ultimate objective, which was self-government; and unless they were achieved speedily the Indian delegation would not await the time of their achievement before demanding that the Territory be declared self-governing. It had, however, been gratified by the special representative's assurance that the Australian Government was sincere in stating that its efforts were directed towards the establishment of self-government in New Guinea.

5. With regard to the third recommendation—for the development of representative, democratic government at the centre—it was surprising to see that the thirty-eight members of the new Legislative Council established by the Administering Authority included only twelve indigenous members and that, of those, only six were elected, through a complicated system of indirect election of a type unknown in democratic countries. The Administering Authority had stated that political advancement was dependent upon the expression of the wishes of the people, but at present the people had no means of expressing its desires since the existing Council was not a fully representative one. The only means whereby expression could be given to those desires was through the creation of a fully representative parliament; and the Indian delegation fully endorsed the Visiting Mission's proposal for the creation of a house of representatives of 100 members elected from single-member constituencies on the basis of full adult suffrage. It hoped that the Administering Authority would make every effort to implement the Mission's proposal and would complete all the practical preparations to that end within about one year.

6. In the economic field, the Indian delegation had been glad to note that the Australian delegation was already in touch with the International Bank for the Reconstruction and Development regarding an economic survey of New Guinea. Such a survey would lead to the preparation of a concerted development plan, which was needed in order to meet the intense and growing desire of the New Guineans to increase their material prosperity and raise their standards of living. It would also help to elucidate the many problems mentioned in the Visiting Mission's report, including those connected with land tenure. It was important that the survey should give adequate attention to the question of finance and the development of a balanced economy.

7. In the educational field, the main problem was that the present programme was inadequate and paid little or no attention to the need for higher education. It was true that the Administering Authority had made efforts in that direction and that enrolment in post-primary and secondary schools would rise to 10,000 in the next five years, but there was still no indication as to how many students would complete their secondary education and how many would take and complete university courses. Hundreds of university students were now required, and the Indian delegation therefore urged the Administering Authority to establish a university in Papua and New Guinea, at Port Moresby, at the earliest possible date. In the meantime, the Australian universities should give yet further assistance in the matter of educating students from New Guinea.

8. In the sphere of administration, it was the view of the Indian delegation that a far greater share in the Public Service should be given to the indigenous people. The existing machinery of government, with its staff of over 4,000 Australians and only some 600 New

Guineans, was not adequate for the tasks which it now had to handle. It was also a matter for regret that the highest posts so far given to New Guineans had been those of cadet patrol officer and, in one or two cases, of medical officer. The Indian delegation therefore whole-heartedly supported the Visiting Mission's proposal for the appointment of a five-member public service commission to undertake the main duties now carried out by the Public Service Commissioner; that proposal should be implemented without delay.

9. Finally, the Indian delegation considered that the target date for the implementation of the Visiting Mission's three recommendations should be set not later than 31 December 1963.

#### Examination of petitions (concluded)

[Agenda item 4]

#### PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA (T/PET.8/16-19; T/PET.8/L.7; T/OBS.8/8) (concluded)

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should deal first with the petitions in documents T/PET.8/16 and T/PET.8/17, relating to ten tribesmen who had been sentenced to death for murder, and with document T/OBS.8/8, which contained the observations of the Administering Authority on those petitions.

11. He recalled that at the previous meeting the French representative had suggested that, in the light of the observations of the Administering Authority and the debate which had taken place, the Council should merely draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the Administering Authority.

12. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already protested against the arbitrary actions of the Administering Authority and against the discrimination practised against the indigenous population.

13. The Administering Authority, in its observations on the two petitions before the Council, represented the prisons in the Territory as effective re-education and rehabilitation centres. Indeed, it went so far as to claim that the detainees would benefit greatly by their terms of imprisonment upon their eventual release. That was a revealing admission by the Administering Authority of what living conditions in the Territory were. Moreover the Bolivian representative, who had been in the Territory with the Visiting Mission, had observed that the living conditions of the indigenous population were worse than those in the prisons.

14. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) pointed out that the living conditions to which the USSR representative referred were those in the virtually untouched areas of the Territory; they had not changed for a thousand or more years, and could hardly be ascribed to the fault of the Administering Authority.

15. The PRESIDENT said that if there were no further comments he would regard the French representative's proposal as adopted, subject to the reservations made by the USSR representative.

*It was so decided.*

16. The PRESIDENT invited members of the Council to turn their attention to documents T/PET.8/18 and T/PET.8/L.7, both of which related to riots which had occurred on the island of Buka in protest against the payment of taxes.

17. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) recalled that at the 1196th meeting he had given the Council a full account of the events at Buka.
18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that members of the Council were familiar with the official version of the events in question. His delegation would like to know, however, what the Administering Authority had done to avoid the recurrence of such repressive measures by the police and Administration officials in the future, to lessen the heavy burden of taxation on the indigenous inhabitants, and to meet the wishes of the petitioners.
19. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) replied that, as members of the Council were aware, very few of the indigenous inhabitants paid income tax at all, and where tax was paid—in areas where economic activity was highly developed—the maximum figure was £2 per head. When a local government council was formed, that council taxed the people and in that case there was a remission of the personal tax imposed by the Administration.
20. With regard to the second part of the USSR representative's question, educational tours were being arranged for the leaders of the dissident group in order to increase their awareness of social, political and economic development elsewhere in the Territory. A rural health centre was to be established in charge of a Papuan leader trained in health work, and of his wife, who was a trained infant and maternal worker. When necessary, a further survey would be undertaken by officers of the Department of National Welfare to determine what welfare activities should be encouraged. The district commissioner and the district officer were keeping in close touch with the Hahalis people to offer all possible help and guidance.
21. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not consider those explanations to be satisfactory. The incidents in question were examples of arbitrary action by the Administering Authority and of the forcible repression of manifestations of dissatisfaction on the part of the indigenous inhabitants when they protested against the unjust laws and unbearably heavy tax burdens. In the light of the wages paid to the indigenous population, £2 a year represented a large sum to them. A representative in the Legislative Council of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea had stated that the new tax would increase the heavy burdens already borne by the population, and that it was because of their hard living conditions that the indigenous inhabitants exposed themselves to the bullets of the police. He was glad to note that, according to document T/PET.8/18, the majority of Australian people dissociated themselves from such instances of colonialism.
22. Document T/PET.8/L.7, a petition from the Clayton Branch of the Communist Party of Australia, requested the Secretary-General to influence the Australian Government to change its policy and to implement the decision of the United Nations on the abolition of colonialism. It also pointed out that the people of Buka had no say in the Government and asked the United Nations to defend them. The Soviet delegation supported the just claims of those people. He proposed that the drafting committee which would presumably be set up to formulate recommendations on the subject of New Guinea should take the petitions in question into account and should draft the necessary recommendations with regard to the fulfilment of the demands of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory.
23. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) repeated that the £2 tax was applied only in areas where economic development had reached a stage at which the Administering Authority considered the tax to be justified. He had explained that £2 was the maximum, and that it was paid by comparatively few people, even in the economically developed areas. He had also explained, at great length, that the police had not fired upon the Hahalis people. He quoted statements made in the Legislative Council by two indigenous members—Mr. Jubilee, who was known to the members of the Trusteeship Council, and Mr. Tobainig, the elected indigenous member for New Britain—expressing approval of the action of the Administering Authority in connexion with the Buka riots. The Buka Native Local Government Council had also commended the way in which the incidents had been dealt with.
24. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council might draw the attention of the petitioners to the debate which had taken place on the subject.
25. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) proposed that the petitions should be dealt with in that way.
26. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that he had made a different proposal.
27. The PRESIDENT observed that if the USSR proposal were adopted the Council would still have to dispose of the petitions in some way.
28. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the President considered it necessary, the Council could first appoint a drafting committee and then adopt the USSR proposal. His delegation could not agree to the Council's merely drawing the petitioners' attention to the debate. The Council should reach a decision and adopt recommendations to the Administering Authority with regard to the petitions.
29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should first take up the matter of the procedure to be followed in drafting its conclusions and recommendations concerning New Guinea. He asked whether the Australian delegation would have any objection to that question being taken up before the final statement of the Administering Authority.
30. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that he had no objection, although it was unusual to deal with petitions in the Council's report to the General Assembly.
31. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) supported the President's suggestion. He emphasized that the drafting committee should not be called upon to decide what was to be done about any of the petitions. If the petitions were to be dealt with in the report, which he did not consider necessary, the Council must give the drafting committee specific directions. He thought that, if the USSR representative had any proposals to make regarding the petitions, he should make them in the form of a draft resolution rather than propose that the matter should be left to the drafting committee, which would not know the Council's wishes in the matter.
32. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would regard the proposal that a drafting committee be appointed to prepare draft conclusions and recommendations concerning New Guinea as adopted.

*It was so decided.*

33. The PRESIDENT invited members of the Council to consider the USSR proposal.

34. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) recalled that, when the Standing Committee on Petitions had been abolished, the Council had reserved the right to appoint ad hoc committees when it wished to do so. He felt that the best course in the present instance might be to appoint such a committee to consider the petitions concerning New Guinea.

35. Mr. KIDWAI (India) said that his delegation would have no objection to the appointment of a committee on petitions.

36. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) did not agree with the United Kingdom representative's proposal. In his view the petitions should be dealt with by the Trusteeship Council itself. He pointed out that the Visiting Mission had set forth certain goals for the political development of the Trust Territory and that the Administering Authority had said that it was unable to give its views on the subject immediately. The petitioners might perhaps be informed that the Administering Authority was considering the matter.

37. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) agreed with the representative of Bolivia that the petitions should be dealt with by the Council itself. He had already proposed that the petitioners should be referred to the record of the debate. He felt that that procedure would be perfectly adequate, especially in view of the fact that the petitions did not come from the Territory but from a branch of the Communist Party of Australia, which presumably knew nothing about the situation in New Guinea.

38. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against the last statement by the New Zealand representative, whose obvious purpose was that the petition from the Clayton Branch of the Communist Party of Australia should be dismissed without proper consideration. It was natural that the delegation of New Zealand, like those of the other colonialist Powers, should be opposed to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples in New Guinea (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)), which was called for by the petition. Any failure by the Trusteeship Council to adopt appropriate decisions regarding the petitions would be one more demonstration of the fact that it had become a completely colonialist body. There were, however, higher organs of the United Nations which would take up the question of the granting of independence to Trust Territories, including New Guinea.

39. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) explained that his point was that whereas any petition coming from a Trust Territory should be given serious consideration by the Council, petitions from other sources should be treated on their merits. In his view the petition in question had already received as much consideration as it deserved.

40. Mr. HOOD (Australia) pointed out that, according to the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a request to the Secretary-General to influence a Government to change its policy was not a petition but a communication.

41. The PRESIDENT asked the United Kingdom representative whether he would withdraw his proposal that an ad hoc committee on petitions be appointed, in

view of the fact that it had not been supported by any other member of the Council.

42. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposal.

43. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the New Zealand representative's proposal that the attention of the petitioners should be drawn to the debate which had taken place in the Council with regard to conditions in New Guinea.

*The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 2.*

44. Mr. KIDWAI (India) said that his delegation had voted against the New Zealand proposal because it considered that the petitioners would be unable to understand, from the records, what the Council's views in the matter were. Much discussion had taken place, but no conclusions had been reached.

45. The PRESIDENT expressed the view that the proposal just adopted was inconsistent with the USSR proposal. He therefore assumed that no vote should be taken on the latter.

46. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he did not consider that the decision just taken excluded his delegation's proposal. The petitioners' attention should also be drawn to the conclusions and recommendations which would be adopted by the Trusteeship Council with regard to the matters raised in the petitions.

47. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) agreed with the USSR

48. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) said that if, as he understood it, the USSR proposal was that the petitioners should be given firstly the record of the discussion in the Council and secondly the conclusions of the Council, he would support it.

49. Mr. NOYES (United States of America) felt that the drafting committee and the Council could be left to decide whether they wished to formulate conclusions on the subject.

50. Mr. HOOD (Australia) emphasized that not only the records of the debate but also the observations of the Administering Authority should be forwarded to the petitioners.

51. The PRESIDENT said that, as he understood it, that point was covered by the New Zealand proposal which had just been adopted.

52. He invited the members of the Council to consider the USSR proposal that, "apart from the record of the debate on the two petitions in question (T/PET.8/18, T/PET.8/L.7), the petitioners should also receive the conclusions and recommendations which would be adopted by the Trusteeship Council on the matters raised in the petitions."

53. Mr. NOYES (United States of America) said that he would vote against that proposal, because he did not agree that the question should be dealt with in that manner.

54. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) submitted an amendment to the USSR proposal. He would like the phrase "the conclusions and recommendations which will be adopted" to be amended to read "any conclusions and recommendations which may be adopted".

55. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the New Zealand amendment, which was obviously designed to prevent the Trusteeship

Council from adopting any decisions concerning the petitions.

56. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) said that the reason why he had submitted his amendment was that it was not yet certain whether any conclusions and recommendations would be adopted.

57. The PRESIDENT put the New Zealand amendment to the USSR proposal to the vote.

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

58. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR proposal as amended.

*The proposal as amended was adopted by 3 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

59. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) withdrew his own proposal, since it was not in conformity with the decision that had just been reached.

60. The PRESIDENT drew attention to document T/PET.8/19 and asked whether the Administering Authority was ready to comment on that petition, which had not been received within the time-limit prescribed by the rules of procedure.

61. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority had no observations to offer beyond those he had already made earlier, when he had stressed the importance of markets.

62. After a short discussion, in which the PRESIDENT, Mr. HOOD (Australia) and Mr. DOISE (France) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that, in accordance with the proposal made by the French delegation at the 1198th meeting, which was endorsed by the Australian delegation, the matter should be referred by the Council to the United Nations Coffee Conference.

*It was so decided.*

63. The PRESIDENT drew attention to documents T/PET.8/L.8 and T/PET.8/L.9, which had been transmitted less than two months before the opening of the session, and asked whether the Administering Authority had any comment.

64. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority was not yet in a position to submit formal observations, and asked that the petitions should not be included in the agenda at present.

65. The PRESIDENT agreed that the two petitions should be held over until the following session.

PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/PET.9/22, 23, 25) (concluded\*)

66. The PRESIDENT observed, in connexion with petitions concerning Nauru, that Mr. McCarthy, the special representative of the Administering Authority for New Guinea, was also the Administering Authority's special representative for Nauru.

67. He inquired whether the Administering Authority was prepared to comment on any of the petitions concerning Nauru which were contained in documents T/PET.9/21 to 28 but which had not been received within the time-limit prescribed by the rules of procedure.

68. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) expressed the Administering Authority's readiness to consider the petitions in documents T/PET.9/22, 23 and 25.

69. The PRESIDENT said that the other petitions (T/PET.9/21, 24, 26, 27, 28) would be held over for the next session. The petition from the Sacred Heart Mission School Committee (T/PET.9/22) would be considered first.

70. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) explained that the matter raised in that petition, which requested the Administration to provide salaries for the teachers of the Sacred Heart Mission School, was not new and had been considered as a question of policy by the Australian Government at the request of the Sacred Heart Mission. The position was that the Administration provided facilities for the education of all children on Nauru and considered that in contributing £1,200 per annum for school requisites and equipment it was discharging its obligation towards those who wished for private rather than government education.

71. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) hoped that the Council would support the recommendation of the Visiting Mission (T/1595, para. 129) that the Australian Government should grant additional financial assistance to the Sacred Heart Mission.

72. He proposed that the petitioners should be invited to refer to whatever conclusions were reached following the work of the Drafting Committee on Nauru.

*It was so decided.*

73. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) explained in relation to the next petition (T/PET.9/23) that the petitioner, Mr. Paul Ribanu, had been granted a cadetship to study in Australia in 1959 and again in 1961, but his studies had not been successful and in view of his academic record the Administration could not support his request for renewal of the original cadetship.

74. The PRESIDENT assumed that the Council would take no action on the petition.

*It was so decided.*

75. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that the Administration had taken no action regarding the use of intoxicating drink on Nauru, the subject of the petition submitted by Mr. G. Star (T/PET.9/25), since it was being considered by the Nauru Local Government Council.

76. Mr. KIDWAI (India) asked that the Head Chief of Nauru be heard on the matter.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. De Roburt, Head Chief of Nauru and adviser to the special representative for Nauru, took a place at the Council table.*

77. Mr. De Roburt (Adviser to the Special Representative) said he had nothing to add to what the special representative had said. The Nauru Local Government Council had already received several such petitions but had not yet agreed to lift the existing prohibition. The matter was still being studied.

78. The PRESIDENT assumed that the Council wished to take no action upon the petition.

*It was so decided.*

*Mr. McCarthy, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, and Mr. De Roburt, Head Chief of Nauru and adviser to the special representative for Nauru, withdrew.*

\*Resumed from the 1192nd meeting.

**Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council (T/L.1046, T/L.1049)**

[Agenda item 11]

79. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 1192nd meeting the Council had adopted the outline of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as set out in document T/L.1040 and Add.1 and 2, as well as the recommendations and conclusions submitted by the Drafting Committee (T/L.1043, annex). It remained for the Council to approve the summary of the observations of individual members of the Council prepared by the Secretariat (T/L.1049), which would complete part II of its report to the Security Council.

*The summary of the observations of individual members of the Council (T/L.1049) was approved for inclusion in the report.*

80. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft of the introduction and part I of its report to the Security Council (T/L.1046).

81. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that during the discussion of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1043) his delegation had explained why it could not agree to the recommendations approved by the Trusteeship Council. It would likewise abstain during the vote on the report to the Security Council.

82. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft of the introduction and part I of the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council (T/L.1046).

*The draft (T/L.1046) was approved by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

83. The PRESIDENT said he would consider the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council approved as a whole.

**Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories (Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV)) and the situation in the Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI))**

[Agenda item 6]

84. The PRESIDENT thought that, in its report to the General Assembly on agenda item 6, the Council would wish to refer to the Trusteeship Agreements which had been terminated since its previous session, namely, those for the Cameroons under British administration, Tanganyika, Western Samoa and Ruanda-Urundi.

85. Mr. KIDWAI (India) added that the report should further specify how many Territories had attained independence before the adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, how many had done so subsequently and how many had still to do so.

86. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the suggestion of the Indian representative. Moreover, attention should be focussed on the question whether the aims of the Declaration were being fulfilled in the remaining Territories.

87. With regard to the Territories which had already attained independence, the report should avoid magni-

fying the role of the Trusteeship Council, since the liberation of those Territories had been obtained, not thanks to the Trusteeship Council, which had played no active part but had on the contrary acted as a brake, but through the efforts of the peoples concerned, with the support of other freedom-loving peoples. The Trusteeship Council at best had acted as a mere chronicler of events. Moreover, as from 1 January 1963, it would be weakened further, since its membership would be reduced by the exclusion not of a colonial Power but of a non-administering member. No good could come from an organ on which the colonial Powers had an overwhelming majority, which represented an outmoded system and in fact was merely a variation of the colonial system.

88. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) pointed out that the opinions of the Soviet representative were in flat contradiction with the manifold statements made by the people of the former Trust Territories, expressing their appreciation for the efforts made on their behalf by the Trusteeship Council and by the United Nations in general. The Prime Minister of Tanganyika himself, speaking in the Trusteeship Council at the twenty-seventh session (1171st meeting) had specifically attributed his country's happy attainment of independence largely to the fact that it had been a Trust Territory under British administration. The Soviet representative had shown that he was out of touch and out of sympathy with the peoples of Africa and Asia.

89. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the real facts regarding the role of the Trusteeship Council, as evaluated by leaders of some of the African Territories, who concurred with the Soviet evaluation in private conversations, were very different.

90. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) pointed out that the Council was currently considering only Territories in the Pacific area, in which the Territories of three countries that had put their war-time acquisitions under the International Trusteeship System had either become independent or were on the way to independence. One other country had failed to put its territory under trusteeship, and there appeared to be no evidence of progress towards self-government or independence in that territory.

91. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the United States representative might wish to reply to the New Zealand representative, in the light of certain provisions of the 1951 Peace Treaty with Japan, regarding trusteeship and other matters affecting certain Japanese territories held by the United States.

92. The PRESIDENT said that the conclusions and recommendations of the Council, as well as the individual observations of members on the subject, could be included in the report on the item under consideration.

93. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) supported the President's suggestion that the report should include the Council's recommendations and conclusions regarding those Territories which had obtained independence and those which had so far failed to do so.

94. The PRESIDENT suggested that if there were no objection, the Secretary of the Council should be asked to prepare a draft report on agenda item 6 along the lines suggested.

*It was so decided.*

**Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI))**

[Agenda item 8]

95. The PRESIDENT read out the draft of a letter which he proposed sending to the Chairman of the Special Committee informing him that the conclusions and recommendations of the Trusteeship Council, together with observations of members of the Council representing their individual opinions only, would be contained in the Council's report to the Security Council, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and in its report to the General Assembly in the case of Nauru and New Guinea. He felt that such a letter would represent appropriate action with regard to paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI).

96. Mr. HOOD (Australia) expressed agreement with the President's views and proposed that the letter should be approved by the Council.

97. Mr. KIDWAI (India) pointed out that paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) requested the Trusteeship Council, among other bodies, to assist the Special Committee in its work. He therefore felt that the Council should inform the Special Committee that it was ready to assist the Committee at the latter's request.

98. Mr. NOYES (United States of America) agreed with the representative of India and suggested the addition to the President's letter of a paragraph indicating his willingness to explore with the Chairman of the Special Committee ways and means of co-operating with or assisting the Committee and indicating a willingness to receive any suggestions or requests from the Committee.

*It was so decided.*<sup>1/</sup>

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

---

<sup>1/</sup> For the final text of the letter, see A/AC.109/19.