

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1202
20 July 1962

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 July 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. BINGHAM

(United States of America)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea: report of the Drafting Committee [3d]
2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru [3c]
3. Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 [5]
4. Draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly covering the period 20 July 1961 to 20 July 1962 [12]
5. Closing of the session

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1202 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 3d

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1044 and Add.1, L.1053)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative for New Guinea under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I invite comments from representatives on the report of the Drafting Committee. It is for the Council to say whether it wishes to consider the document as a whole or paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. HCCD (Australia): I agree that a large part, at any rate, of the report can be taken as a whole, as is often done. I would ask, however, that the position of my delegation in respect of certainly the first three paragraphs be noted either -- if a vote is taken -- by our abstention, or by a general reservation which I do not propose to make in detail, other than to say that our position with regard to those proposals of the Visiting Mission and the Council's endorsement, to a large extent, of them should, from the point of view of the Administering Authority, be regarded in the light of the observations which have been made by myself and the Special Representative. These observations related to the existing plans of the Administering Authority for constitutional advancement in the Territory. They referred to the action already taken in the appointment of two committees of a constitutional character to study and indeed prepare for political reforms and the extension of the franchise.

The proposals themselves of the Visiting Mission as now taken up by the Council will, of course, be very thoroughly considered by the Administering Authority. But the Administering Authority, namely, the Australian Government, obviously has not yet had time to adopt a definitive position towards these proposals. It is with that reservation that I would approach the first three paragraphs of the report.

This is by way of a general remark. I shall have one other point which perhaps the President will allow me to put a little later.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already explained its position on the report of the Administering Authority, as well as on the recommendations contained in the report of the Visiting Mission. Those comments that we expressed earlier apply also to the report of the Drafting Committee, in which it is proposed that a number of the conclusions and recommendations of the Visiting Mission be approved.

We indicated earlier, and we wish to reiterate this now, that we consider those recommendations to be inadequate, and that the basic flaw in them is that they make no provision for immediate measures to be taken for the early implementation in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Although in the report of the Drafting Committee reference is made to the creation of a representative parliament, nothing is said of handing over all the authority to this parliament, in accordance with the Declaration of the General Assembly.

In these circumstances, the Soviet delegation cannot support those inadequate recommendations, but, in an attempt at least to improve somewhat the report of the Drafting Committee which is now before this Council, the Soviet delegation intends to introduce some amendments to paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 17. Accordingly, we do not press for an examination of the whole of this report, paragraph by paragraph, but we would wish separate consideration to be given to the four paragraphs I have mentioned, with respect to which we wish to propose amendments.

The PRESIDENT: May I suggest that, if the Soviet representative has his amendments before him, he could present them all at this time so that they will be before the Council.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We will act precisely in accordance with your suggestion, Mr. President.

Our first amendment applies to paragraph 1, and seeks to replace the word "notes" by the word "endorses", so that the paragraph would begin, "The Council endorses the views of the 1962 Visiting Mission".

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Our next amendment applies to paragraph 2. We suggest that the words "notes that the Mission believes" should be replaced by the words "approves the view of the Mission". Thus the beginning of the paragraph would read, "It further approves the view of the Mission that the establishment of the Legislative Council".

Since we are now dealing with paragraph 2, we would wish to make the reservation that the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the target date of not later than the end of 1963. We believe that all measures towards the establishment of a representative parliament and towards the handing over of all the authority to that body must be carried out considerably earlier.

With respect to paragraph 3, we suggest that the words "give serious consideration to" should be replaced by the word "implement". Thus, the paragraph would begin, "The Council recommends that the Administering Authority implement the Mission's proposal".

Thus our amendments to the first three paragraphs lie, at least in the procedural sense, in the direction of improving the report of the Drafting Committee and in strengthening it, because the recommendations themselves are in fact inadequate, not strong enough, and they do not go far enough. If the Council were to approve even these inadequate recommendations in their present form, and not recommend to the Administering Authority that they be implemented, then the effect would be lost even of those, in our view, rather limited provisions.

With regard to paragraph 17, we propose that after the word "urgency" towards the end of the paragraph, the remaining words be replaced by the words "for the immediate implementation in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples".

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Thus, with our amendment, paragraph 17 would read:

"The Council urges the Administering Authority to establish, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the immediate implementation in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples."

We consider this amendment to be absolutely essential since the Trusteeship Council is in duty bound to report what measures it has taken for the implementation of the General Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960 to that body.

In turn, and as a result of that Declaration, the Trusteeship Council must recommend to the Administering Authority that it take the necessary urgent steps in that regard for the implementation of that Declaration. Since we consider this amendment to be absolutely essential, we shall ask the President to be good enough to submit it for discussion and subsequently to put it to a vote.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): In view of the proposed amendments to certain paragraphs in both the main body and annex of the draft, it might perhaps be better if we considered this text paragraph by paragraph. If we do that, I think perhaps we may arrive at a clearer picture.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I wish first merely to comment briefly on the remarkable speech which was just made by our friend from the Soviet Union. On behalf of the members of the Visiting Mission, I should like to say how deeply touched we are by the enthusiasm which he has shown for the recommendations that we have made. I feel that this is a happy day and one, perhaps, on which we may look back as the beginning of the conversion of the representative of the Soviet Union to more reasonable approaches to colonial matters. I wish, on behalf of the Mission, to express our appreciation of his support. This represents a day when he has begun to see the light and may be compared with other famous conversions. Perhaps the Soviet representative has realized how hard it is to kick against bricks.

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

I am sorry that he should have spoiled such a charming intervention by his final proposal, which is obviously in conflict with his earlier enthusiasm for our proposals. We, for our part, are constantly in favour of practical and immediate steps in the direction on which we are all agreed. He, on the other hand, has until now favoured a theoretical attitude which disregards the real difficulties of any particular situation. We have recommended practical and immediate steps in the direction of self-government and independence. He has been bound to support those recommendations; we are glad that he does so. But it is not possible, in the same breath and in the same resolution, to recommend immediate implementation of the full Declaration and at the same time to recommend steps which must involve actual political preparation along the lines which we have proposed.

Much as we are touched by his enthusiasm, I do not consider the amendments that he has proposed for paragraphs 1,2 and 3 necessary. I myself am fully content that the Administering Authority should consider the proposals which we have put forward and which have been duly noted in this Council. While we welcome his support, therefore, I scarcely think that the amendments are required. With regard to the last amendment which the Soviet representative proposes, I think it would be much better if he were to continue to devote his thoughts to practical steps towards the aims which we have set, rather than to revert, at this late stage in the resolution, to his old theoretical approach.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I must say that the beginning of the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom afforded us much joy; but unfortunately, he began enthusiastically and concluded with what is tantamount to a requiem. Perhaps such a format is typical in the British Diplomatic School. I note, in fact, that when Sir Hugh Foot begins to praise somebody or something, one must be prepared, a moment or two later, for a "however" or for a "but", after which there is a complete reversal in his course. The same thing happened this time.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

At the beginning, I thought that the representative of the United Kingdom and Chairman of the Visiting Mission would support our amendments which, as a matter of fact, do not affect the substance but deal with the procedural side of the matter. We are not setting aside the substance of the proposals of the Visiting Mission. We have already had an opportunity to present our point of view and have submitted arguments on that score; of course, our respective positions are different.

At this time, however, we would wish the Council to give more concentrated thought to these insignificant and not very far-reaching proposals of the Visiting Mission. But we see that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission has suddenly become afraid of resolute support on our part. However, when it comes to the voting perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom will, after all, find it possible to vote in favour of these amendments.

With respect to his comments regarding our amendment to paragraph 17, I must say that ours really is a different approach. The representative of the United Kingdom calls it a theoretical approach; we call it a just approach. He is trying to ignore the Declaration of the General Assembly. He is trying to dismiss it as a theory which is inapplicable to New Guinea, whereas we consider that it constitutes a practical approach and that the Declaration should be applied to Nauru, New Guinea, the Pacific Islands and all other colonies. That is the difference between us.

The United Kingdom abstained from voting on the Declaration at the fifteenth session, whereas the Soviet delegation supported it. That is quite natural; the United Kingdom is a colonial Power, whereas the Soviet Union represents an anti-colonial Power. Of course, at the next session the United Kingdom, I think, voted for the resolution or at least said that it favoured the implementation of the Declaration but when the time comes for a practical decision, the United Kingdom asserts that the Declaration is a theoretical kind of approach which is inapplicable in the present instance of New Guinea. The United Kingdom says that the Declaration cannot be applied in New Guinea and that we ought not to approach it in a theoretical fashion. They say that we ought to take a practical approach and we saw what that practical approach amounts to when we discussed Nauru a few days ago. The practical approach occurs when phosphates are being removed from the country; when the Declaration is not to their liking, they try to sidestep it.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, believes that the Trusteeship Council is obliged to implement the Declaration because this Council functions under the guidance of the General Assembly. For that reason we consider this amendment to be justified and believe that it reflects a practical approach to the solution of the colonial problem, which solution was approved by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. The Declaration has become a rather significant weapon and a moral means of supporting the struggle of colonial peoples.

(Mr. Cberemko, USSR)

Of course, for that reason, that Declaration is not to your liking, you representatives of the colonial Powers. That is, of course, why you will object to the Soviet amendment.

I felt it necessary to make these explanations in order to show once again that the introduction of amendments to paragraphs 1 to 3 is something which affects the procedural side of the matter. Our views on the substance of the proposals of the Visiting Mission remain the same. We consider these proposals to be inadequate, nor far-reaching enough, although the representative of the United Kingdom does believe that this is virtually the latest practical word to this, and that nothing can be added to it. We consider that something should be added, and, indeed, something should be changed in it. That is the sense and purport of our amendments.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I listened very attentively to the changes proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union. He, himself, in putting forward his changes, was telling us that they really are not so important; and I shall employ more or less the same language as he did when he submitted an amendment in connexion with the problem of Nauru. He said that that amendment of mine was -- and I quote in English: "a meek kind of amendment". In this case, I must say that the proposals put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union in no way altered the substance of the draft we have before us.

Now, obviously, there is a difference between "to note" and "to endorse". It does make some difference if we spell out concretely that the Council has accepted the Visiting Mission's recommendations; and in the various statements that have occurred when we discussed the problem of New Guinea on this point, I believe there was unanimity in the Council.

I should not like to offer any opinion immediately on the importance of the proposals that have been advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union, but as he has raised some issues of substance -- particularly, in his last amendment to paragraph 17 -- in a purely technical spirit, a spirit of logic, I should like to point out a few questions which the representative of the Soviet Union may answer or not, as he likes.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

During the debate, I have ventured to ask: If there were immediately a transfer of powers to the Territory, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) and other provisions of the Charter, to whom would this power be transferred, and in whose hands would it be put? It would have to have some government or authority that would represent the people of New Guinea. Fortunately, the Soviet Union stated quite clearly that, of course, it would have to be that parliament of the people that should receive this political power. This stands in the records; there is no need for me to reopen the dialogue we have had on this point.

Having said this, I think the problem is very simple. We are living in the year 1962. How much time is required to set up, organize, form and instruct and carry out a mass-indoctrination of the Territory for the organization of a hundred representatives? Can this be done in one week? Can it be done in two days? Can it be done in five months, even? Does it not seem to the Soviet Union that even one year, from the technical view-point, which is involved in this problem, is actually the very minimum that we can ask as the period within which to carry out this political evolution?

This is, of course, a preliminary question; this is a real issue, an actual problem. We are not acting in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) and the Charter, with any idea of advancing immediately and forthwith as quickly as possible. However, we must be realistic; we want to fix the most realistic possible time-limit so that this parliamentary government can be set up in the Territory and so we can act in accordance with the trends in the United Nations.

If we accept the idea that this is what we are trying to achieve, I must revert to the amendment submitted by him; and now I would cut my second question to the Soviet representative:

In the draft resolution, or the draft prepared by the Drafting Committee, I must say that in the Drafting Committee we were in agreement on the inclusion of this paragraph which, as a matter of fact, already existed in previous resolutions prepared by this Council; and I should like to read out the sense of this paragraph. It says:

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

(continued in English)

"The Council urges the Administering Authority to establish, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life." (T/L.1053, page 5)

(continued in Spanish)

Now he goes on to add -- and my attention is drawn to the fact that the United Kingdom representative, in commenting on this Soviet amendment, stated that he thought this amendment was a text containing an ideological posture, a doctrinal approach which, in reality, already does appear in the text as we have submitted, because all that it says is this:

(continued in English)

"... implementation of the provision on the granting of independence to colonial countries ...".

(continued in Spanish)

If we have established a realistic goal, which is 1963, to allow for the setting up of a parliament; and if at the same time we talk about the sense of urgency -- just take those words -- what in the world is the difference between "sense of urgency" and the words "the immediate implementation"?

Now, I know that around this table we have representatives -- experts -- who have been discussing this problem for some time; but from the strictly legal standpoint, the word "immediate", without any concrete date, has no meaning whatsoever; and the date of 1963, in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, does establish the only possible realistic goal.

Having said all this, in the light of this logical approach to the problem, I should like to ask the Soviet Union representative -- in the utmost good faith: If this is the fact, then, what in the world does this text add? I am referring now to his amendment to paragraph 17.

There is a further point: If the Soviet Union representative really can convince me that by adding this text to paragraph 17 we are speeding up -- by the word "immediate" -- the date fixed as 1963, which is a minimum limit, fine.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

The Administering Authority, however, has expressed reservations regarding the Soviet amendments. If the Administering Authority were to accept the date of 1963, taking into account the inherent difficulties in the Territory, and the problems that arise there, and the question of distance, need to organize and expand the Councils and to create a really solid campaign from which this parliament should emerge, I think, in all due logic and reason, this is a time-limit within which the Administering Authority would have to work to its utmost if it is to comply with the request of the Council. With these words I have concluded my statement. I am raising this point once again because I do feel that in the light of the ability and intelligence which we know Mr. Oberemko has, he must agree with the logical approach to this problem. I hope you will agree.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The questions raised by the representative of Bolivia are deserving of our attention and we shall endeavour to give what explanations we can in order to establish mutual understanding between at least the two delegations of the Soviet Union and Bolivia.

First of all, I should like to read out our amendment. Even in listening to the Spanish of the representative of Bolivia I hear certain words used; I heard him, for instance, use the word "immediate", which was translated into English as "without delay". This must be very carefully interpreted. We shall try to state exactly what our amendment contains. In paragraph 17 they say that the "Council urges the Administering Authority to establish ... realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency...". But a sense of urgency for what? We are specifying the exact purpose for which all of these measures should be carried out, all the measures provided for in the Declaration of the General Assembly, and we are speaking of the sense of urgency for the immediate implementation, without delay, of the Declaration. We wish the Trusteeship Council clearly to indicate to the Administering Authority that the Council will brook no procrastination, no delay, that we insist that steps be taken.

The representative of Bolivia raises the question: Does the representative of the Soviet Union really believe it possible to create a parliament in five days? We are not saying a parliament can be created in five days. What we insist upon is that measures for such a parliament be taken without delay. Of course, it is necessary to prepare electoral rolls, polling-places have to be set up, an electoral campaign must take place -- and that all takes time. But that all must be done and it must be done without any delay, without any postponements. That is the point of our amendment, and I think that in this respect our position does not differ from that of the representative of Bolivia. He also wishes there to be no delay, no procrastination. But I repeat, we do not say that a parliament can be created in two days or five days or that this should be done. In regard to this, the representative of Bolivia and certain

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

other members of the Visiting Mission have concluded that all of these measures could be carried out no earlier than by the end of 1963. We hold another point of view on this subject. Perhaps here there is a difference of opinion concerning the exact date. But let us leave that matter aside; they hold one point of view as to the date and we hold another. I think, however, that all of us must agree that measures have to be taken, at least, towards the attainment of these goals and that these measures must be put into practice without postponement or delay. That is precisely the point of our amendment, that is what we are advocating.

The representative of Bolivia has quite rightly pointed out that the Soviet Amendment raises concretely the question of the transfer of all authority in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Declaration, and he asks to whom this authority is to be handed over. In reply to this question we point out that it is necessary to read paragraph 1 of the Report of the Drafting Committee, the Annex thereto, where reference is made to the creation of a parliament. Our amendment constitutes a supplement to this. Paragraph 1 of the Annex proposes the establishment of a parliament, and our amendment is intended to indicate quite clearly that once this parliament is created, all authority should be transferred to it in accordance with the Declaration. Thus two necessary elements are laid down: first there is the organ to which authority is to be handed over, and then our amendment provides for the implementation of the Declaration in regard to the handing-over of authority to that organ. We have a difference of opinion as to dates, but that is not what we are discussing now. The Visiting Mission has its views on target date and we have ours, but that question we are leaving aside for the moment. We simply made a proposal with regard to target dates and now we say that we must indicate that it is necessary without delay to implement the Declaration. That was also mentioned by the representative of Bolivia; he also, as I understand him, is in favour of having no postponement or delay so that the measures to be carried out may be carried out right now. I hope this explanation satisfies the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The explanation, I must say, does outline the position of the Soviet Union delegation with complete clarity. I would have no objection, nor do I think any member of the Council would, to replacing the word "notes" with the word "endorses". I think this is quite a simple matter and that a change of this type does not really alter the meaning of the draft resolution. But there is one point which is not so simple, which is a legal and not a political point on which our views diverge, and so I have taken the floor to point out something that has already been stated by the Special Representative and by the Australian delegation. Of course, in connexion with this matter of political goals and target dates for the Territory, what we needed was to have the statement of Australia in this Council. Now, of course, here we come to a point where my views differ from those of Mr. Oberemko, and it is a legal point. In the deliberations both of this Council and of the Fourth Committee, any resolution of the Council carries great weight, particular vis-à-vis Assembly resolutions, for when we have the consent of the Administering Authority to a text, our resolutions acquire almost a legislative character. In this case, of course, we do not really know what the attitude of the Administering Authority is in this matter, but in any case, if we decide upon the words "without delay" or "immediately", these words might alter that attitude, might alter the Australian position. This is the crux of the matter. If the consent of the Administering Authority has not been given on this specific point and if we use the terms "without delay", "immediately" or "as soon as possible", and if at the same time the Administering Authority tells us that on this particular point the delegation has no instructions and does not know what will be its Government's final decision, in that event how can we say we have the consent of the Administering Authority? If we use the terms "without delay" or "immediately", can we tell the Administering Authority they have to comply with them? With Mr. Oberemko's knowledge of how such things work at the international level, he must agree with me that, after all, agreements in this Organization are voluntary in nature, that the United Nations is not a super-state. We all know, of course, that there are certain Administering Authorities which do take a negative attitude indeed, but we of course hope that Australia will understand and see the validity of our recommendations.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

So along these lines I would point out that my difference with the representative of the Soviet Union is purely legal in nature. The words "immediately" or "without delay" can produce no effect if the Administering Authority does not give its consent to such a decision of the Council.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

Now we are asking the Administering Authority to be good enough to accept the views of the Visiting Mission. Of course, this item will be considered again in the Fourth Committee. Perhaps on that occasion the Australian Government will be able to tell us frankly what its final position is on this problem, which is of great importance and which has been examined with the utmost clarity in the Council.

I do not wish to delay the work of the Council. I have merely offered these few words of explanation to analyze the sense of the amendment advanced by the Soviet representative.

I would avail myself of this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Soviet representative -- and I would emphasize that I am not in any sense being ironic -- for having supported even partially the recommendations of the Visiting Mission.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I should like to have read out the amendment which is proposed to paragraph 17.

The PRESIDENT: As I understood it -- and I am of course subject to correction by the Soviet representative -- the amendment was to replace the phrase which appears after the words "sense of urgency" by the phrase "for the immediate implementation in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples".

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to read out my amendment in Russian once again, and I shall ask the interpreter to be very careful in translating it into English, because we must have an accurate translation of the amendment.

The amendment is to replace the concluding words of paragraph 17 by the following phrase: "realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the implementation without delay in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples".

I have listened to the English interpretation of my amendment and would say that this time it was correct.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I regard the wording proposed by the Drafting Committee in this paragraph as entirely satisfactory and accurate. However, in fairness to the representative of the Soviet Union, I think that I should apologize to him for what I said previously. I apparently was dealing with an inaccurate translation into English of his amendment. I was speaking on the understanding that the Soviet representative had proposed the words "immediate implementation". Of course, "implementation without delay" is a very different matter, and I therefore do not wish to maintain what I said previously.

Nevertheless, I would repeat that I believe that the wording proposed by the Drafting Committee is in all respects satisfactory and accurate.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation has examined the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea.

We ourselves have some doubts about the words "give serious consideration" in paragraph 3. We think that this a very weak phrase and does not reflect the sense of the recommendations in this regard made by the Visiting Mission in its report; we do not think that the phrase reflects the point of view of most members of the Council in this regard. We had intended, therefore, to suggest an amendment to that wording, but the amendment which has now been proposed by the Soviet representative is satisfactory to my delegation.

I would suggest that in paragraph 3 the word "proposal" in the phrase "the Mission's proposal" be changed to the word "recommendation", because in this respect we are considering the recommendation of the Visiting Mission.

My delegation will have no difficulty in accepting the amendments proposed to paragraphs 1 and 2, since they are merely drafting changes.

I come now to paragraph 17. In its report the Visiting Mission stated that: "Rapid and sound progress towards the accepted goal of self-government or independence can be made only if three prerequisites are met ...

"That is why we propose that the target for implementation of the three plans which we have advocated should be set no later than 31 December 1963". (T/1597, paragraphs 267 and 269)

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

My delegation was a member of the Visiting Mission and naturally concurred in its recommendations. We should therefore like to see paragraph 17 amended in order to reflect the Mission's recommendations. The words presently contained in paragraph 17, "realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency ...", do not fully express the Visiting Mission's recommendations. My delegation, therefore, would support the Soviet amendment to paragraph 17.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of India whether his suggestion with regard to paragraph 3 is a formal amendment to change the word "proposal" to "recommendation"?

Mr. KIDWAI (India): Yes, it is.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that I have not fully understood the changes which the representative of India suggests should be made in paragraph 17, and I would ask him kindly to give some further explanation of the amendments which he wishes to introduce. The representative of India referred to a paragraph of the Visiting Mission's report which stated that three prerequisites must be met if progress is to be made towards the goal of self-government or independence. It is a question of training more professional staff, making a full study of the economic potential of the Territory and, finally, of creating a Parliament.

When we discussed this point in the course of the general debate I ventured to explain to the representative of the Soviet Union that these three conditions were complementary. In other words, if we take the Hypothesis that a parliament would begin functioning in 1963, since the training of professional staff will take some time, it is logical to assume that such a staff would be available possibly in ten years. The possibility that an economic survey of the resources of the Territory might to some extent clarify that point is, of course, true, but even on the hypothetical basis that a political economy is set up in the Territory in the near future, these two problems would continue to confront the Territory. If we tackle this problem of prerequisites and, at the same time, support the Soviet proposal, which is not very far removed from the idea of a sense of urgency, we should be complicating the drafting of paragraph 17 to such an extent that actually the phrase "the sense of urgency" would disappear completely since, as I have said, the matter of stepping up education in the Territory and carrying out an economic survey creates complementary problems. They are not, however, prerequisites for independence.

I would be grateful if the representative of India would explain a little more fully his quotation from the Visiting Mission's report. I interpret it in a certain way, and I hope that other representatives agree with me. I think that this recommendation with regard to the prerequisites concerned complementary requirements, but not prerequisites for independence. The problem which, of course, most concerns us, is the question of political advancement.

Mr. KILWAI (India): What I mean is that in the paragraph to which I have referred mention is made of the accepted goal of self-government or independence. That is the aim towards which the Visiting Mission proposes certain steps. The steps proposed are three and are laid down on page 88 of the report. These three steps are to lead to the goal of self-government or independence. I agree with the representative of Bolivia that the two are not inter-dependent. Even if these three proposals are not implemented, there can still be a granting of independence. My point is that in the last paragraph of the Drafting Committee's report no mention is made of the accepted goal of self-government or independence. It only refers to "realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life". It omits any mention of the aim of self-government or independence, and this fact has been brought out by the amendment presented by the representative of the Soviet Union. For that reason, my delegation will have no difficulty in supporting that amendment.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I think that we can now proceed to vote on the amendments proposed to the various paragraphs and to have a separate vote on those particular paragraphs, after which, if there is no objection, we can vote on the remainder of the report.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): My delegation would request separate consideration by paragraphs. This has often been done in the past. I ask this particularly in view of the fact that amendments have been submitted to separate paragraphs already and it may be that other amendments will be proposed in the course of the discussion.

The PRESIDENT: That is, of course, for the Committee to decide. Is there any objection to the request of the representative of Australia for voting paragraph by paragraph throughout the report?

Mr. KILWAI (India): What would be the procedure as regards the amendments?

The PRESIDENT: I would propose that each paragraph be considered separately. The first paragraph would be considered first, with the amendment to that paragraph, and that paragraph voted upon, and so on. Where an amendment has been proposed to a particular paragraph it will be voted on first, and then the paragraph voted on as amended or otherwise. Is that satisfactory to the Council.?

Since I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Before paragraph 1 is put to the vote I have a comment to make -- not a proposal, but a comment.

We observed with considerable interest, if not a degree of curiosity, the use in paragraph 1 -- and, of course, in the two succeeding paragraphs -- of the term "Parliament". Could I ask, by way of elucidation, whether the members of the Drafting Committee had some particular reason for using this term "Parliament"? Parliament has a connotation which perhaps is hard to define. It would certainly take a long time to attempt to define the actual constitutional connotation of the term "Parliament". It does carry constitutional implications, I think -- certainly in English and in political usage in English-speaking countries. Moreover, the reiterated use of the term "Parliament of Papua and New Guinea" in this draft report does appear to attempt to predetermine, to some degree the nomenclature which would, of course, have to be adopted in due course in one or both of these Territories. In our view, such final terminology ought to be a matter for the people of the Territory themselves. It would perhaps be premature for the Council, if it does mean to do so, to attempt to lay down in advance such terminology, particularly -- and the Council is well aware of this -- as the people themselves have not yet decided on the name of the Territory. We do not know what the people will finally wish to call the Territory.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

Furthermore, as far as I am aware, in the case of previous Trust Territories which were in the process of attaining self-government in due course, the actual term "Parliament", I think, has not been used by the Trusteeship Council. We have doubtless used terms such as "Legislative Assembly" or "Representative Assembly" or the "Central Assembly". Hence my curiosity as to the reason for the very clear choice of this term in this draft report.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): As a member of the Drafting Committee, I should like to satisfy the curiosity of the representative of Australia. On page 67 of the Visiting Mission's report, when we talk about political advancement of the Territory, the text reads: "Chapter IV" and the term "representative Parliament" is used. In paragraph 208 of the Visiting Mission's report the term "House of Representatives" is used and the Mission goes on to state:

"... that ... for many reasons, principally because it gives a more accurate picture of the composition and function of the Parliament proposed".

Paragraph 211 of this same report states:

"Thirdly we believe that the establishment of a central representative Parliament ...".

Later in the text, in paragraph 216 we see the term "fully representative Parliament" used.

We discussed this particular issue in the Drafting Committee. The representative of New Zealand and the representative of the Administering Authority, Mr. McCarthy, were present, and at the beginning of the debate on this point I ventured to offer this interpretation. I said that what the Visiting Mission had in mind was a representative Parliament from which eventually a government could be born. We thought that the word "Parliament" carried this connotation; naturally, this was the very intention of the Visiting Mission. We also know, of course, that on the political plane and at the constitutional level organization there are two forms of constitution. You have the British type in which all powers emanate from Parliament. We also have the North American type of constitution where the powers are divided. Taking into account the historical past and the antecedents of the Administering Authority which has been following the British approach, we thought that this would be the most logical and clearest course and the best term to use to reflect precisely what was the Visiting Mission's intention.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

I know indirectly that many publications and many important newspapers in Australia have viewed this particular recommendation with alarm. Of course, if we were to use the term "House of Representatives" or "Assembly" in some manner, we might be suggesting the possibility that that Assembly should proceed by gradual steps and stages, that first it should be a House of Representatives and then perhaps a Senate and then perhaps an Executive Authority. On the other hand, if we use the term "Parliament" from the British standpoint, this would mean that as soon as a Parliament begins to emerge, at the same time political power is being born.

I must state that the Special Representative made a few comments from the viewpoint of constitutional trends in Australia. This is a point on which I consulted various persons, particularly the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. My view is very simple. What other authority or eminent source in this Council is more qualified to give us the precise, clear and exact meaning of the term "Parliament" than the United Kingdom representative? I would be grateful if he could tell us, in his capacity as the Head of the Visiting Mission, whether he agrees with the terms in which we drafted the sections of the report and how I have interpreted the term "Parliament" as it is understood in the United Kingdom.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): As a member of the Drafting Committee I feel that I also must comment in response to the question put by the representative of Australia, amplifying the comments made by the representative of Bolivia.

As he has said, we had a considerable amount of discussion as to the term that should be used. The report of the Drafting Committee was inevitably based upon the report of the Visiting Mission, and you will note that a large part of the report is an attempt to summarize the report of the Mission itself. Therefore, we only had a limited amount of leeway in choosing terms. If we were summarizing the report of the Visiting Mission, we had to use their terminology, not ours, even if we might have thought that we could have devised terms which would perhaps express the meaning more clearly. Therefore, we turned to the report of the Visiting Mission and found that the word "Parliament" was used perhaps in a number of different ways. We found, for instance, in one section, that there was a reference to a "Central Parliament"; then to a "Central Representative Parliament";

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

to a "representative Parliament", then to a "truly representative Parliament" or a "fully representative Parliament". Then, as the representative of Bolivia has said, in paragraph 208 some doubt was perhaps thrown on the use of the word "Parliament" because this paragraph refers to the "composition of the new House of Representatives". Then it says in brackets:

"we suggest that this title is preferable for many reasons, principally because it gives a more accurate picture of the composition and function of the Parliament proposed".

In other words, the term "House of Representatives" might have been a better term to use for the Parliament which the Mission was proposing. Then we took note of paragraph 218 which states:

"The proposals which we" -- the Mission -- "now put forward (which are made possible only by the groundwork already done)" -- that is, the proposals the Mission put forward for a Parliament -- "will, we believe, constitute a most important step towards the development of the full parliamentary system ... "

In other words, this proposal for a Parliament is a step on the way to a full parliamentary system. So the Mission has in mind something less than a full parliamentary system. Thus, in balancing up these various expressions used, we considered possibly substituting other terms to express the meaning more clearly; for example, would the term "more fully representative central legislature" be what the Mission had in mind? I thought that perhaps it would, but nevertheless one constantly got back to the point that what we were purporting to do was to summarize the report of the Mission and that as the Mission used the word "Parliament", that word has gone into the Drafting Committee's report.

May I say that my understanding is that in using the term "Parliament", one is using a generic term; within the framework of this word "Parliament", anything may develop. The Parliament at Westminster is known as the Mother of Parliaments and the Parliament at Westminster has spawned many Parliaments in different parts of the Commonwealth. All of those Parliaments bear a certain relation, particular in their form of proceedings, to the Parliament at Westminster. But every one has evolved in a different way according to the genius of the people of the particular country.

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

The Parliament in New Zealand, starting from the Parliament at Westminster, may appear to be the same, but its procedures in the course of nearly one hundred years have undergone a considerable number of modifications. Similarly, in Western Samoa you may see the ancient Stuart rituals being carried out in a thatched meeting-house under the cocoanut palm trees, but the spirit of this Parliament has many differences from the spirit of the Parliament at Westminster. And so, in the case of New Guinea, what I had in mind was that one was using the words "parliament" as a term with a big enough framework to enable the development without that framework of whatever kind of parliament the genius of New Guinea eventually brings up.

Sir Hugh FCOT (United Kingdom): I do not think that we need to spend very much more time on this dissertation, very interesting as it is, but I should like to confirm entirely what has been said by the representatives of Bolivia and of New Zealand. There is no more honourable or ancient term than the term of "parliament". That term is widely understood, and we used it because we intended to give exactly the impression which the two members of the Drafting Committee have conveyed to us today. We wished to use the widest possible term, we wished to use a generic term, we wish to use a general term which would be familiar to the people who were mainly concerned. We did not wish, and I would like to assure the representative of the Administering Authority of this, in any way to impose a name on the people of New Guinea. I would like to say, and I am sure that every member of the Visiting Mission would agree with me, that that must obviously be a matter for the people of New Guinea, in consultation with the Administering Authority.

We were intending to convey the sense of the recommendation, and we thought that the use of the widest possible term was the best way to do so. We did make a passing comment that the name "House of Representatives" might be more suitable for what we proposed than the existing term "Legislative Council". I still think so, but I believe the best attitude for us to take, and I think that perhaps it would put the mind of the Australian representative at rest, is to say that these are terms used in our report, but a decision in a matter of this kind, more than any other matter, must be a matter for the people concerned.

Mr. KIANG (China): Like the representative of the United Kingdom, I wish to suggest something to set at rest the mind of our Australian colleague. May I propose that we just use the word "Legislature" instead of "Parliament". I think that would be acceptable to all the members of the Council.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): In my first statement, I omitted to deal with a point upon which the United Kingdom representative has touched. This is the issue which was raised by the Australian representative when he said that the Territory still had no name. In this instance, I should like to recall that at previous sessions of the Council this particular point was discussed, and, as I remember, I was among the minority with my vote.

I do not think that it is necessary for a population to baptize itself. The Administering Authority has an equivocal position towards this Territory with regard to its name. It does not like the name of New Guinea, and it hopes that the people will find another name. Nevertheless, the Administration, in all its documents, uses the term "New Guinea".

I should like to draw the attention of the Council and of the Administering Authority to a very important point. In the second line of the first paragraph of the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1055), we use the term "Parliament in Papua and New Guinea". That is to say, we are not restricting this development solely to the Trust Territory, and, of course, if in future such a representative parliament were to be created, both sectors of the population probably would have to accept the fact that the name already existed. It may very well be that the name of the parliament would be "Papuan Parliament" or "New Guinea Parliament", and perhaps both terms would be used. But that is not particularly important.

Turning to the point made by the representative of China, after the comments made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and New Zealand, I feel that the term "Parliament" has more historical validity and implies that eventually such a parliament will be created from which will emerge a Government in the Territory itself.

Mr. . NUCKER (United States of America): I wish merely to associate myself with the comments made by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, the United Kingdom representative. As a member of the Visiting Mission, I want to make clear my thinking with respect to the use of this word "Parliament". As we travelled through New Guinea and discussed this new body and referred to it in different terms, and used the term "House of Representatives", which might have been the influence of North American thinking, with respect to the legislative body, it became apparent to me that New Guineans and Australians alike understood and were at home with the word "parliament", and for this reason, more than any other I believe our Visiting Mission unconsciously agreed upon the use of the word "parliament" because it was understandable to the people involved.

I fully agree that there was no intent on the part of the Visiting Mission to predetermine the precise meaning of the word "parliament" in terms of the method of operation of this "Parliament" in its beginning phases. I fully believe that the word "parliament" permits the body of men to develop, as suggested by the New Zealand representative, in terms of their desires, their skills and their genius, as was so aptly put, but there was no connotation given to the word "parliament" by the Visiting Mission which would deteriorate in any way the ability of that body to develop in the manner in which their own skills and dictates would cause it to develop.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of China whether he wishes his suggestion to be considered as a formal amendment?

Mr. KIANG (China): I myself find no difficulty with regard to the term "parliament", and I do not feel any concern about that word. It seems to me that the Visiting Mission is very much inclined to retain the word "parliament" in the recommendation and I will certainly go along with that; in fact, I am prepared to vote for it.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

When I heard the representative of Australia make his comments, I was surprised that apprehension should have been expressed so late in the discussion in the Council. As a matter of fact, in my statement in the general debate I used the words "Legislative Assembly". I am not prepared to press for that, but if the Australian delegation wants to change the word, I will support it.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the Soviet amendment to paragraph 1, which seeks to replace the word "notes" by the word "endorses" in the first line.

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 1, as amended. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

<u>In favour:</u>	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Bolivia, China, France, India, New Zealand
-------------------	---

<u>Against:</u>	None
-----------------	------

<u>Abstaining:</u>	Australia
--------------------	-----------

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union to paragraph 2, which would change the words "notes that the Mission believes" to the words "approves the view of the Mission".

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

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

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the amendment to paragraph 3 which was proposed by the Soviet Union. This amendment would substitute for the words "give serious consideration to", the word "implement".

There were 2 votes in favour, 2 against and 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Under rule 38 of the rules of procedure, it is provided that another vote should normally be taken after a brief recess. Is it the desire of the Council to have such a brief recess, or does it prefer to proceed to the vote immediately?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I suggest a five minute recess. We feel that it may be possible to hold informal consultations in that time. I do not understand, for example, why all the members of the Visiting Mission could not declare themselves in favour

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

of this amendment so that their own recommendations may be put into effect. I think that perhaps further reflection and consultation may be required at this time. It seems to me that we could utilize these five minutes precisely for such consultations.

The PRESIDENT: Since there is no objection, we will have a brief recess.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): There was some doubt in the minds of the Secretariat as to who voted in what fashion on this proposal, since only eight members turned out to be voting. Perhaps we could have a roll-call vote in order to have this clearly ascertained.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I think that my statement will facilitate the voting in this case. As a matter of fact, the word "implement" was suggested. We want the Administering Authority to implement the Mission's proposal. But, after all, when you are making a recommendation, what you are doing is asking the Administering Authority to carry out the recommendations.

I abstained from voting because I did not think that the Soviet amendment really changed the basic meaning of the text. I would have no objection to voting in favour of this amendment in order to facilitate a solution of this problem.

The meeting was suspended at 12.25 p.m. and resumed at 12.35 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: A vote by roll call on the Soviet amendment to paragraph 3 has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bolivia

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

Abstaining: France, China

The amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the amendment to paragraph 3 moved by the representative of India -- that is, to replace the word "proposal" in the second line by the word "recommendations".

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet representative has asked to speak in explanation of his vote, but I think the appropriate procedure would be to have all explanations of votes after the voting has been concluded on all the paragraphs of the report.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: Before putting paragraph 10 to the vote I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order in connexion with the voting.

Mr. CHEREWKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Not only in connexion with the voting, Sir. We have a question with regard to paragraph 10. We do not know whether this matter was discussed in detail in the Trusteeship Council. It seems to me that it was not actually discussed. Why do we find here the sudden statement that the Council recommends the paving of the highway linking Lae and Goroka as a major step in the development of the Territory? Perhaps the Visiting Mission was particularly shaken up on this road and still remembers what an ordeal it is to travel over the highways of New Guinea. But we can hardly regard this as a serious recommendation -- to speak generally of the economic and political development of the Territory, and so on, and then all of a sudden to come out with the recommendation that it is necessary to put one particular road there in good order. On what basis is this recommendation made? Is it the view of the population? If it is, then perhaps we should say so. And if it is the view of the Legislative Council, then we should also mention that.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of New Zealand on a point of order.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I do not regard this as a particularly serious matter, but is this a point of order in connexion with the voting? I thought there had been time to discuss the report before the voting started.

The PRESIDENT: I was about to say that in the normal course the rules provide that there is to be no discussion after the voting starts. I suppose that it is up to the Council; if the Council wishes to waive the rules in this regard and permit discussion on this item, that is for the Council to decide. But the normal procedure would be to have no discussion after the start of the voting.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): How can I fail to be surprised, Mr. President? The representative of New Zealand started a technical discussion on paragraph 1 with regard to the exact meaning of the word "Parliament". Everyone spoke, although you said that we were then about to start the voting, and questions were put. Why then can we not put a question with respect to paragraph 10.

You have not yet declared that the voting on paragraph 10 has started. We asked for the floor before the voting started, and if any question arises why should it not be clarified, particularly as we agreed to consider this paragraph by paragraph? If you will look at past records of the Trusteeship Council's meetings you will see that it has always been permitted for members of the Council to put questions and express their points of view, and this was also done at the present meeting as well. But of course, you may rule as you see fit. If the Drafting Committee does not find it possible to provide a reply to our question, then we can of course proceed.

The PRESIDENT: I would say to the representative of the Soviet Union that the discussion on the word "Parliament" took place before there was any voting, in the recollection of the Chair.

It is up to the Council to do as it wishes. The normal procedure is to go right through the voting once the voting has commenced, but the Council can decide otherwise if it wishes.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would not oppose the idea that the Council may alter its rules of procedure -- if this is indeed an alteration of the rules -- so that I could immediately answer the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. I must, however, confess that I did not quite grasp the precise point that was bothering him.

The PRESIDENT:: I must insist that if there is to be discussion of this question, the Council decide to waive the rules in this regard.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): A point of order, Mr. President. I would suggest, for your ruling, that we might listen to the answer on this particular point which has been raised, so that, having been raised, it should be disposed of, and that we should then decide to vote on the remaining sections of this draft report without further discussion. If anything is to be said, it can be said in explanation of vote. I submit this as a formal proposal, if I am entitled to do so.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Kingdom has moved that the rules be waived, with respect to paragraph 10, to provide for discussion on this item.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): If I may, I would like to amend that, Sir: only to permit a representative of the Drafting Committee to make a reply to the question which has been raised, and that we should then proceed without further discussion.

The PRESIDENT: You have heard the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom. Is there any objection?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We consider this to be a quite arbitrary proposal. If there is anything to discuss, then let us discuss it. Otherwise, what sort of democracy is this, this recommendation of Sir Hugh Foot that we should receive only this one explanation? If this explanation happens to be inadequate and if we wish to discuss it further, then by all means let us discuss it. But you are apparently trying to limit discussion here, Mr. President. Of course, you may do so; the majority of the Council is under your control. But then please do not play the democrat and pretend that you are in favour of freedom of expression and discussion. We consider this an absurd and unacceptable proposal, that a certain person be permitted to speak and that everyone else then be denied the right

(Mr. Oheremko, USSR)

either to put question or provide answers. This is something you could perhaps do in the colonies, but not in the organs of the United Nations. We strenuously object to this attempt of the colonial Powers to limit the right of any delegation to speak here. Either there should be no discussion at all or else the discussion should be on an equal footing, with equal rights for all delegations.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the United Kingdom representative in exercise of his right of reply.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I do not think that we should waste any further time on this matter. The representative of the Soviet Union told the Council earlier that he wished to raise questions on only four paragraphs of this report. Ample opportunity was provided at the right time to discuss the report. The Soviet representative has had the same opportunity as everyone else. I suggest that when I put forward, out of courtesy to him, the suggestion that he should have an answer to his question, it is unreasonable for him to return with an attack.

I adhere to my proposal that a representative of the Drafting Committee should answer the specific question that has been raised and that the Council should proceed to vote on the rest of the Drafting Committee's report.

The PRESIDENT: Since the Soviet representative objects to that proposal by the United Kingdom representative, I shall now put it to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): After this procedural debate I am not quite sure what question the Soviet representative has put. I would therefore ask him to pose a concrete question that I may answer.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I address this remark to the representative of Bolivia: As a result of the decision which the Council has just taken, I have been deprived even of the right to repeat my question.

The PRESIDENT: The question related to the inclusion of specific references in paragraph 10 of the Drafting Committee's report.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): In the Visiting Mission's report mention is made of some of the difficulties in the Territory's means of communication. I regret very much that I have to speak on behalf of the members of the Visiting Mission; it would have been preferable for this question to have been raised earlier. In any case, I shall now quote from the Visiting Mission's report:

(spoke in English):

"By 1961 nearly 5,000 miles of road in the Trust Territory were open to traffic; existing roads are, however, mainly rough rural roads, and no one who travels in New Guinea can fail to be impressed by the difficulties which arise from the absence of road or rail communication. In many parts of the country -- particularly in the Highlands -- all communications and all commercial activities must be undertaken by air. This of course puts a very severe limitation on all kinds of development including agricultural development. Wau and Bululo have greatly benefited from the road which links them to the port at Lae and there is already a very rough road connecting Lae on the coast to Goroka in the Highlands.

"We realize the very heavy cost of building good roads in the rough country of the New Guinea mainland (we estimate that on an average the building of a good standard road in the mountain areas would not be less than £20,000 a mile)... We feel sure that the next main road to be put in good order should be the one linking Lae and Goroka and we understand that this road should present no great engineering difficulties at least for the stretch of road nearest to Lae. This road will have the additional advantage of opening up the Markham Valley which holds out valuable prospects for agricultural development, particularly in the raising of cattle. We believe, moreover, that once the road is established development will quickly follow in the Highlands and along the road as well." (T/1597, paragraphs 174 and 175)

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

(continued in Spanish):

That is the specific recommendation made by the Visiting Mission. For the further information of the Soviet representative, I should like to say that there are 500,000 inhabitants in the Highlands of New Guinea, who have a strong community sense. The soil is fertile. This could really be exploited in depth.

In this connexion it was felt by the visiting Mission that a link with the coast would be of great political importance, and not merely of economic importance. The Drafting Committee therefore included this recommendation from the Visiting Mission's report. It would after all mean linking 500,000 people with the rest of the Territory. This seems to us of great importance, and that is why we made the recommendation.

To satisfy the curiosity of the Soviet representative, I would say that we consulted the Administering Authority on this point, and it told us that it was prepared to undertake all of the necessary work -- repairing bridges, and so forth -- in order to establish this necessary and useful link.

The .PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue the voting on the Drafting Committee's report.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the Soviet Union amendment to Paragraph 17, which amendment I shall re-state. The words after "the sense of urgency" would be replaced by the following: "for the implementation without delay in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples."

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

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

Abstaining: Bolivia, China

The amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 4 on the first page of the Drafting Committee's report, which accepts the working papers T/L.1044 and T/L.1044/Add.1 as the basic text on New Guinea for the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly.

That paragraph was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I am advised by the Secretary that it has not been possible to circulate at the present time the corrected text of the individual observations on New Guinea. It is suggested that the Council should adopt these observations as approved by each delegation and those approvals communicated to the Secretariat. These observations can then be included in the report under the relevant headings.

Mr. DOISE (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to speak on a point of order. Are we now going to vote on the whole of the report?

The PRESIDENT: It was the intention to put the report as a whole to the vote, if this procedure was adopted providing for the approval in this way of the individual observations.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): In the course of the debate on New Guinea my delegation did not intervene because our views coincide with those in the Visiting Mission's report. In the course of the debate, however, particularly when the representative of the Soviet Union offered some criticism, I answered him, expressing some opinions which I considered to be relevant to the contents of the report. I would now request that these remarks should be included in some fashion in the text of these statements of the positions of delegations.

The PRESIDENT: I am advised by the Secretary that this will be up to the representative of Bolivia when the draft of the summary of his observations is submitted to him.

Is there any objection to the procedure which has been suggested? Since I hear none, it is so ordered. Therefore, we shall vote on the report on the Trust Territory of New Guinea as a whole.

The report as a whole was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I merely wish to say, in explanation of my vote, that in the wording of the first three paragraphs of the report, I preferred throughout the wording proposed to us by the Drafting Committee.

Mr. DOISE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my vote on the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union with respect to paragraph 3. We voted in favour of that amendment because my delegation has always felt that the Trusteeship Agreement was a contract between two parties. Therefore, we must have the Administering Authority's reply to the Mission's proposals, and this reply has not yet, quite understandably, come forward.

We are also convinced that Australia will continue its co-operation with the Council. Therefore, since we still do not know the view of the Administering Authority, which is important in view of the technical problems involved, we could not decide whether or not a proposal for elections, for example, could be implemented quickly. That is why I took the position I did with regard to the amendment of the Soviet delegation.

With regard to paragraph 17, we were not able to support this, and on this we have exclaimed our position many times. We do not vote on certain resolutions in the United Nations in general terms only, but in view of the realities involved in each problem.

I abstained from voting on paragraph 10 because I thought -- and this is the point raised by the Soviet Union -- that this problem of the road linking Lae and Goroka should have been discussed in the general debate. If there is no written rule, at least there is a tradition in the Council that proposals and resolutions adopted at the end of a debate should be in accordance with the idea of giving a resumé of the agreement reached in the general debate and that such proposals can only be adopted after conclusions have been expounded formally during the general debate.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain the reason why I abstained from voting on paragraph 17 and the Soviet amendment to that paragraph.

In the original draft we spoke of a "sense of urgency" and I thought that the terminology was strong enough to convince the Administering Authority that it should accept the recommendations of the Council. The addition of the words "immediate implementation", whether or not this would speed up positive action by the Administering Authority, seems to me to be a matter of rhetoric. Therefore, I abstained from voting on this text.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation voted in favour of paragraph 3. At the same time, we should like to go on record as stating that the words "give serious consideration to" are rather weak. We still think that the Administering Authority should implement, rather than give serious consideration to the Mission's proposal. In that belief, and hoping that the Australian delegation will implement the proposal, we voted in favour of that paragraph.

MM/jpm

T/FV.1202
64-65

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

We abstained from voting on paragraph 17 because it contains no mention of the ultimate goal of independence from which is a very important matter.

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation could not agree with the report of the Drafting Committee since it did not make provisions for measures towards the attainment of independence by New Guinea. No mention is made of independence in this report; therefore, we consider that this report is a further element of evidence that the Trusteeship Council should bear in mind its present membership when the majority in it belongs to the colonial Powers and their closest allies and that therefore the Trusteeship Council is unable to and is incapable of taking steps towards the fulfilment of the decision of the General Assembly with regard to the liquidation of colonialism, including the liquidation of the Trusteeship System which is but a variant of colonialism.

AGENDA ITEM 3c

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU: OBSERVATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL REPRESENTING THEIR INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS ONLY (T/L.1052)

The PRESIDENT: These observations have been approved by the members of the Council and they will of course be inserted as usual under the various headings of the report. I understand that all the individual observations have been approved by the members in consultation with the Secretariat. As I see no objection, I take it that this document is approved.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I think it will now be appropriate for the Council to vote on the report of Nauru as a whole. We shall now vote on the adoption of the report on Nauru as a whole.

The report of Nauru as a whole was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 5

REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO NAURU AND NEW GUINEA; 1962;
DRAFT RESOLUTION (T/L.1050)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to point out that the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of China, contained in document T/L.1050, is similar to resolutions adopted in the past concerning other visiting missions. The principal purpose is to authorize the printing of the report in accordance with rule 99 of the rules of procedure. Is there any objection to this proposal?

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation does not see that any proposal has been introduced on this subject. I believe that the delegation of India intended to make certain proposals on this subject and if that delegation does make its proposal, we are prepared to consider it and to act accordingly. But at the present time we see no proposals before us on this subject.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further observations on this subject, we shall vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of China in document T/L.1050.

The draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to none.

AGENDA ITEM 12

DRAFT REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY COVERING THE PERIOD 20 JULY 1961 TO 20 JULY 1962 (T/L.1048 and Add.1)

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will abstain on the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly as a whole for the reasons we stated earlier during the discussion on the separate parts of the report. We consider that if the separate parts of the report are unsatisfactory

(Mr. Cberemko, USSR)

then the sum resulting from the addition of these separate parts is likewise unsatisfactory.

As regards the introductory part of the report of the Trusteeship Council as prepared by the Secretariat, we should like to draw attention to the fact that the Secretariat might make a better presentation of the section dealing with petitions because at the present time this section is drafted in a rather unsatisfactory manner and bureaucratic fashion, I would say. If this section were to be read by people who had not attended the meetings of the Trusteeship Council, they would not really know if the Trusteeship Council did or did not in fact consider the petitions. We consider that room should be made in that part of the report for the reflection not only of statements of the Special Representative of the Administering Authority but that room should be made for the exchange of opinions that took place in the Council. We consider this to be important, and I think that the Council could entrust the Secretariat with the task of expanding the section dealing with the consideration of petitions. This is particularly necessary because at the present session the petitions were examined directly in the Trusteeship Council and not in the Standing Committee on Petitions. That fact must be reflected in our report.

The PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that the representative of the Soviet Union has made a proposal to leave certain matters to the Secretariat, I think that it would be wise to call on the Council Secretary to comment on this proposal.

Mr. RAPOPORT (Council Secretary): The report has been prepared in the usual fashion. It is true that in the past there were reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions which contained more information. It is also true that this present report gives as foot notes the summary records of the meetings of the Council where the petitions were discussed. But if the Council wishes at any rate the Secretariat to modify this report or to include anything, an opportunity should be given to the Council to do this or some other procedure should be found to approve whatever changes the Secretariat would make in the draft because I do not think that the final product of the Council can be left to the Secretariat on its own responsibility.

The PRESIDENT: If the Chair may make a suggestion, would the Council be agreeable to leave this matter to the Secretariat subject to the approval of the President and Vice-President?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We agree to this proposal bearing in mind that the Secretariat will, of course, carry out the necessary consultations with the delegations before actually presenting this text for the approval of the President and Vice-President. We agree with your proposal, Mr. Chairman.

The PRESIDENT: As I think that the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union is clear to the Council and as there is no objection to it, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Council now has before it the question of the adoption, subject to the reservations mentioned, of the preliminary parts of the Trusteeship Council's report contained in documents T/L.1048 and Add.1.

The report was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT: That concludes the business of the Trusteeship Council for this year. I should like, on behalf of the Council, to take note of the fact that the terms of Bolivia and India will expire at the end of this year. I know that I express the feelings of all the members of the Council when I say that this is an event which we deplore. Since there will be an election of one member of the Council at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, it would not be appropriate to comment on the future membership, but I am sure that I express the feelings of all the members in expressing the Council's appreciation to those two distinguished delegations for the work they have done on the Council over a period of many years, both as members of the Council and as countries which have supplied members of Visiting Missions.

I should like to express the great appreciation of the Chair to the members of the Council for their courtesy and co-operation, particularly to the Vice-Chairman for his invaluable assistance, and to our very capable staff -- Dr. Protitch, who has had to be away for this past week, Mr. Cottrell, Mr. Rapoport -- and to their staff and to all the members of the supporting staffs, the interpreters, the verbatim reporters, the precis writers, the conference officers, and the engineer, and the others whom I may have neglected to mention who made absolutely essential contributions to our discussions.

I think it has been a fruitful session and one that has contributed one more chapter to the sober and constructive work of the Trusteeship Council throughout its history.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for your kind words, and to say, on behalf of my Government, that we have fulfilled an international obligation here in the Council and during the two opportunities I had of having the honour of being a member of a Visiting Mission. I was the Chairman of one of them, and I went to the Territory of New Guinea. I wish to say that in the various activities in which I have had the honour to participate in the United Nations, I was very pleased to be able to contribute to constructive solutions with regard to the development of the territories which we have briefly visited, when we acquired profound sympathies for the inhabitants.

As is no doubt known, my Government is extremely interested in this work. And in this Council, of course, we have not only represented our country but we have represented a geographical region. We hope to represent this continent subsequently.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Normally, at the end of a session only pleasant words are said, and people congratulate each other and express their happiness at the fact that the session has concluded. Unfortunately, it is my task to draw attention to certain unpleasant matters, but we will try to do this without any unnecessary exacerbation and in a constructive spirit, so that similar events may perhaps be avoided in the future.

Just a few minutes ago, my attention was drawn to a statement made in the University of Nebraska. This statement was made on 19 July of this year by the President, and though I have read the statement, I shall not speak of its content because the President has the full right to say everything that he might deem necessary to say. But I should like to draw attention to one circumstance, namely that in the heading of the Press release containing this statement it is indicated that it was made not only by the United States representative in the Trusteeship Council, Mr. Bingham, but also by the President of the Trusteeship Council, and that official title is mentioned. Therefore, we cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that in that address there are passages which distort the position of the Soviet Union in the United Nations, as well as outside the United Nations. Groundless assertions are made with regard to the Soviet Union and the socialist

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

countries, and since in the heading it is indicated that the statement was that not only of the representative of the United States but also of the President of the Council, we deem it necessary to draw attention to the abnormal nature of the situation. In the past, also, we have had occasion to speak on this subject. We wished to do so during the meetings of the Fourth Committee in connexion with a statement made by Mr. Bingham on a United States television broadcast in February of this year. But we reflected on the matter then, and decided not to draw any special attention to the matter. You will recall, Mr. President, that in February you spoke as the representative of the United States but, at the same time, you could not avoid your official capacity as President of the Trusteeship Council.

At that time, you stated on the television broadcast that the balance of forces was such in the Trusteeship Council that the Soviet representative was not even listened to there. I think you said something to the effect that when the Soviet representative spoke everybody immediately began to fall asleep and to continue sleeping while the Soviet representative was speaking. That, I think, is what you said, but I did not hear very much snoring in unison during our statements here in the Council, and it seems to me that the United States representative and you, Mr. President, were very much on the alert when the Soviet representative spoke. There were no symptoms of sleepiness noted by us here. But these perhaps were words which were provoked and which slipped out during the broadcast.

However, we wish to draw attention to the question of principle involved and the wish to avoid instances in the future in which you might make statements as representative of the United States that should not be associated in any way with your official position as President of the Trusteeship Council, if only for observing the most elementary norms of proper behaviour. It might perhaps be possible to avoid mention in the heading of the fact that you are acting not only as United States representative, but also as President of the Trusteeship Council.

As I have said, I would have preferred not to have made these comments, but I was obliged to do so because these cases have recurred and we would not like them to occur again in the future, particularly as you will retain your office as President of the Council until the end of the year.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

I should like now to pass on to a more pleasant subject and to express our gratitude to the two delegations of non-administering Powers for the co-operation which they have extended to us here in the work of the Council. Unfortunately, the anti-colonial Powers in this Council are rather scarce, and three delegations cannot do much here.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

We regret that at the end of this year India and Bolivia will leave the Trusteeship Council. This is particularly unfortunate because, as of 1 January 1963, in place of these two outgoing non-administering States, only one non-administering State, to be elected by the General Assembly, will return to the Council. We believe that that will even further emphasize and worsen the existing situation in the Trusteeship Council.

But perhaps we ought not to be too sad about that. Such a state of events simply demonstrates the fact that life goes on and that the colonial system is being shattered and is falling apart within the sight of all. Whatever role, significance and prestige the Trusteeship Council may have had in the past is progressively diminishing. Perhaps the Trusteeship Council -- as indeed the entire trusteeship system -- should now disappear from the international scene. The sooner this happens, the better. I do not think that anyone will regret such an event because the liquidation of the trusteeship system will mean that the purpose of the Trusteeship Council, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of the General Assembly, has been achieved.

We shall conclude our statement on this note but we wish first to thank the President for having given us the opportunity to express our sentiments at the end of this session.

Mr. KIANG (China): Before the commencement of this meeting, the President of this Council, through the Secretariat, advised us to forgo our usual practice of paying tribute to the President and Vice-President. We shall abide by that wish.

I would, however, propose to all of my colleagues that, at the end of this meeting, we should all rise in expression of our thanks to the President and Vice-President.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The twenty-ninth session of the Trusteeship Council is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.