



CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories.....	275
Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ended 30 June 1956 (continued)	
Report of the Drafting Committee (continued).....	275
Revision of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council	277
Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories: reports of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions....	278
Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of New Guinea for the year ended 30 June 1956 (continued)	
Report of the Drafting Committee.....	278

President: Mr. John D. L. HOOD (Australia).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

Report of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories (T/1331)

[Agenda item 8]

1. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Chairman of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories, presented the Committee's report (T/1331) and drew attention in particular to paragraph 5, which explained why the Committee had been unable to devote as much time as it would have wished to the examination of the working documents and the observations of the Administering Authorities.
2. He also drew attention to paragraph 7, which stated that two delegations had announced their intention of withdrawing from the Committee. The Council would, therefore, have to elect two members to take their places, unless, of course, it decided to reduce the size of the Committee.
3. Mr. FELD (United States of America) recalled that the previous year the United States representative on the Committee on Rural Economic Development had pointed out that various aspects of the subjects entrusted to the Committee for study were being examined by the Trusteeship Council also. Other members of the Committee had observed that it had reached a stage in its work where the technical knowledge demanded of it perhaps exceeded that of the members. That situation had not changed; further investigation seemed likely to be increasingly technical and the Council might

therefore conveniently consider the Committee's future programme of work.

4. If there was difficulty in obtaining replacements for the Haitian and United States delegations, the Committee might perhaps continue with four rather than six members.
5. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that his delegation, too, would be unable to continue to serve on the Committee for the time being, although it would be happy to return to it after a year or so.
6. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed once again his delegation's concern at the delay in the submission of the Committee's final report. The Soviet delegation attached great importance to the problems with which the Committee had been set up to deal and hoped that the information would be available shortly.
7. The PRESIDENT proposed that, if there were no further observations, the Council should take note of the Committee's report. He also proposed that, as a result of the situation that had arisen, the Committee's membership should be reduced from six to four. Since three members had withdrawn, that would leave one seat to be filled, and he proposed that Guatemala should be appointed as the fourth member of the Committee.

It was so decided.

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ended 30 June 1956 (T/1312, T/1324, T/L.771 and Add.1, T/L.795, T/L.798, T/L.804) (continued)

[Agenda item 4 (c)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.771 AND ADD.1, T/L.795, T/L.798, T/L.804) (continued)

8. The PRESIDENT invited comment on annex II of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.795) and on the amendments submitted by the delegations of Italy (T/L.798) and India (T/L.804).
9. Mr. KIANG (China) noted that the fourth phrase of the Indian amendment was particularly important because of the special circumstance that the Nauruans might have to leave the Territory when the phosphate deposits were exhausted. Hence, the Administering Authority's most urgent task should be to ascertain the wishes of the people with regard to their future, to make definite plans for their resettlement and to notify the Council at the earliest possible date with regard to those plans. In the light of that situation it seemed to him that the recommendation in the Indian amendment, although similar to recommendations adopted in respect of other Trust Territories, was not in the present instance realistic.
10. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that while his delegation was not opposed to the policy of fixing target dates when such a procedure was feasible and had itself applied that policy in Somaliland under Italian adminis-

tration, he thought that it would be unrealistic to apply such a policy to all aspects of the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru. He would, therefore, propose the following text to replace the last part of the Indian amendment, after the words "in regard to their future":

"While appreciating the difficulties to which the Administering Authority has drawn attention in this connexion, the Council expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will continue to adopt plans, where appropriate with target dates, whenever it is satisfied that the employment of this procedure in respect of any aspect of development will assist in the promotion of the objectives of the Trusteeship System."

11. That text would take into account the fact that the Administering Authority had already, on several occasions, fixed target dates where certain aspects of the Territory's development were concerned. That was the most that could be expected of the Administering Authority in the particular circumstances prevailing in the Territory. He therefore hoped that the Indian representative would find it possible to accept his proposal.

12. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the principle of fixing intermediate targets and dates was applicable to all Territories, whether or not they were Trust Territories. In the case of Nauru, even though the Territory might ultimately be evacuated, developments in all fields should in the meantime be planned in accordance with pre-established intermediate targets and dates. The text proposed by the Italian representative appeared to acknowledge that principle, but hedged it about with so many reservations that it was unacceptable to the Indian delegation. There was no need to specify those reservations for it was surely understood that the implementation of any of the Council's recommendations must necessarily be subject to certain practical limitations and that no Administering Authority could be expected to implement a recommendation except to the extent possible. That was implied in the Indian amendment as it stood.

13. He himself, however, would like to add the words "in continuous consultation with the Nauruan people" at the end of the third phrase of the Indian amendment after the words "under the consideration of the Administering Authority".

14. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) agreed with the speakers who had expressed dissatisfaction with the last part of the Indian amendment. He took issue with the Indian representative's suggestion that it was for the Administering Authority to interpret the Council's resolutions in the light of circumstances in a particular Territory. It seemed to him that the Council, which had accumulated considerable knowledge of conditions in the Trust Territories over a long period of time, should itself be able to take into account the particular circumstances in a Territory and should not leave to the Administering Authority the responsibility of disagreeing with it in cases where some qualification might be necessary. He would, therefore, appeal to the representative of India to reconsider his decision not to accept the text proposed by the Italian representative.

15. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that, as the Charter conferred upon the Trusteeship Council only the power to make recommendations, it was obvious that the Administering Authority must judge for itself whether a particular recommendation was acceptable.

16. His delegation would vote in favour of the Italian amendment, because it expressed the principle of fixing intermediate target dates for the political advancement of Trust Territories.

17. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that his delegation could not support the Italian amendment, because it seemed to leave the Administering Authority to decide whether the establishment of intermediate target dates would serve the purposes of the Trusteeship System, whereas the Council had already taken a stand on the matter. He would, therefore, support the Indian amendment as it stood.

18. Mr. TOUROT (France) said that he did not propose to discuss the amendments before the Council but simply to restate his delegation's attitude with regard to the establishment of target dates for the attainment of self-government or independence. While that was the normal goal of the policies pursued by an Administering Authority, it was not realistic to try to anticipate exactly when the new status was to be attained, for the process did not depend exclusively on the desires of the Administering Authority but also on the rate at which the inhabitants were able to advance and the effectiveness of their participation in the joint task of development. It was infinitely better that a Territory should evolve step by step, slow as that development might seem, rather than hastily acquire independence before the population was ready for it.

19. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) noted that the Indian amendment seemed to presuppose the adoption of the two amendments to annex II submitted by the delegation of Italy (T/L.798), for, while the Drafting Committee's text consisted only of a statement of facts, the Italian amendment took note of the Administering Authority's views and the steps it had taken to promote the attainment by the Territory of self-government.

20. The minor modification the Indian representative had made to his own amendment was entirely consistent with previous recommendations of the Council which had been accepted by the Administering Authority, whose practice it was to maintain continuous consultation with the Nauruans in respect of their future. The fourth phrase of the Indian amendment, however, seemed to him premature, in that it referred not so much to the political as to the physical future of the Nauruan people, namely, the question whether they wished to be transferred to another area. While it was highly probable that they would have to be resettled elsewhere, that should not be taken for granted; much would depend on whether water could be found in the Territory, whether the agricultural potential of the Territory could be developed, and on other factors. It might be misleading to the Nauruans themselves to make a statement on the matter at the present stage.

21. The final part of the Indian amendment embodied certain elements which were not acceptable to his delegation, for reasons of principle. As those elements were not of any practical importance to the Council, it seemed to him that it would be preferable for the Council to ask the Administering Authority to take certain steps and to assume that, when those steps had been taken, the Administering Authority would inform the Council.

22. Furthermore, the equal emphasis placed in the Indian text upon targets and dates could not be accepted by his delegation. To insist that every plan should be completed by a certain date would be to introduce an element of inflexibility which might undermine the value of the plan itself. It might well be asked, in fact, what

opportunity there was in Nauru to apply the principle of intermediate target dates. In the economic field, for example, there were vast imponderables, including not only the question of the economic potential of the land but also that of the willingness of the inhabitants to take the initiative in striving to improve their lot. In the political field, the Council itself had adopted a recommendation (A/3170, p. 328) asking the Administering Authority to encourage the Nauruans to extend their activity and make use of the powers they already enjoyed so that further powers might be granted to them. The next step, therefore, depended not upon the Administering Authority but upon the Nauruans themselves and it would be meaningless for the Administering Authority to establish a target date. The Administering Authority's policy was fairly reflected in the text the Italian representative had submitted to replace part of the Indian amendment. The Council should bear in mind that the Administering Authority had adopted plans and, where appropriate, had associated those plans with target dates. It considered that a wise policy and would be well satisfied if the Council expressed the hope that it should be continued; indeed, such a recommendation would go far towards removing a source of tension which had too long obstructed the work of the Council.

23. His delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting on the text proposed by the Italian representative, simply because it refrained as a matter of policy from voting for or against recommendations and conclusions addressed to it. He hoped, however, that that text would be adopted.

24. Mr. JAIPAL (India) noted that the Australian representative appeared to feel that any reference in the body of the recommendation to consultation with the people of the Trust Territory under Article 76 b of the Charter would be premature. The Indian delegation agreed that a full-scale consultation at the present time would be premature but surely it was not premature to refer to that contingency in the recommendation. He could not agree, therefore, to withdraw any reference to it. The argument frequently advanced by the Administering Authorities that the Council should refrain from either reviewing the past or trying to anticipate future developments did not accord with his delegation's concept of the Council's responsibilities.

25. If any part of the Indian amendment other than the last phrase were defeated, particularly the part concerning consultation of the people at an appropriate time under Article 76 b, he would be obliged to vote against the text proposed by the Italian representative.

26. U PAW HTIN (Burma) said that the Italian text, while incorporating the principle set forth in the Indian amendment, subjected it to reservations which his delegation found unacceptable. If the future of Nauru was to be planned on the basis of clearly defined stages, it should be understood that such development was to be in accordance with Article 76 b of the Charter, as in the case of other Territories. The Italian amendment did not make provision for that understanding and represented a somewhat negative approach.

27. The PRESIDENT called on the Council to vote on annex II and the amendments thereto.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Italian amendment, adding a new paragraph after paragraph 1 (T/L.798, para. 6), was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Italian amendment, adding a new paragraph, after paragraph 2 (T/L.798, para. 7), was adopted by 5 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

28. The PRESIDENT called on the Council to vote on the Indian amendment (T/L.804), to which the Italian delegation had proposed a verbal sub-amendment.

The Italian sub-amendment was adopted by 4 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

29. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that he had voted in favour of the Italian sub-amendment, since he considered it more suitable than the corresponding part of the Indian amendment.

The Indian amendment (T/L.804), as amended, was adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

30. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the efforts made by the Indian delegation to reach a compromise on the question of self-government or independence for the Trust Territory. Nevertheless, he had been compelled to vote against the Indian amendment because, with the Italian sub-amendment, it was too far removed from the principles his delegation supported in that connexion, which were set forth in paragraph 7 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.795).

31. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that his delegation had taken no part in the vote either on annex II or on the Italian amendments.

32. The progress of the Trust Territories towards the aims set forth in Article 76 b of the Charter could be clearly discerned from the reports of the Administering Authorities and the debates in the Council. Annex II merely repeated out of context information supplied elsewhere and was thus likely to give a false impression. Evolution was an organic process which could not safely be measured in the light of isolated factors.

33. He had not wished to vote against annex II or against the Italian amendments, since the facts and ideas they embodied were unobjectionable. Nor had he wished to abstain, since that would have implied that his delegation had no opinion on the subject. His only course had, therefore, been to take no part in the vote.

34. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted against the final wording of the annex, since it did not comply with the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject.

35. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that, if the Italian sub-amendment had been defeated, the United States delegation would have supported the Indian amendment. He recommended to the members of the Council to study the very interesting remarks made in the course of the meeting by the representative of Australia.

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

Revision of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council (T/L.761)

[Agenda item 20]

36. U PAW HTIN (Burma) presented his delegation's draft resolution (T/L.761) and recalled that it had been submitted at the Council's nineteenth session (793rd meeting), but consideration of the question had been postponed.

37. He hoped the members of the Council would support the draft resolution, which introduced a desirable amendment to the Council's rules of procedure.

The draft resolution (T/L.761) was adopted unanimously.

Administrative unions affecting Trust Territories: reports of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions (T/L.786)

[Agenda item 7]

38. Mr. JAIPAL (India), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, presented the Committee's report (T/L.786). He pointed out that during the year in question the Standing Committee had decided by general agreement to examine the practical operation of the various administrative unions. In doing so, the Committee had been assisted by several documents, some of which were reproduced in the annexes. He commended the report to the Council's consideration.

39. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the conclusions and recommendations contained in section H of the chapter on Tanganyika of the report.

The conclusions and recommendations in section H were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

40. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, the conclusions and recommendations just adopted would be included in the chapter of the Council's report on conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

It was so decided.

41. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 211 of the report, which stated the Standing Committee's conclusion regarding the administrative union affecting the Trust Territory of New Guinea. He proposed that the Council should take note of the Committee's decision.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) said that in the Committee his delegation had voted in favour of the part of the report concerning Tanganyika, but he wished to reiterate the reservations his delegation had expressed at that time, which were to be found in paragraph 167 of the report.

43. He also reserved his delegation's position with regard to the points raised in its observations on the report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions to the eighteenth session (T/L.716), which were to be found in paragraph 122 of that report.

44. His delegation had voted against the conclusions concerning the administrative union affecting New Guinea because, in its view, the Administering Authority had in no way departed from the policy under which the relationship between New Guinea and Papua was not so much an administrative union as that of two different Territories with a common government.

45. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) assured the representative of Guatemala that the power of the East Africa High Commission to legislate was qualified by the limitation imposed by the third schedule to the Order, which limited that power to certain subjects. In any event, the phrase "peace, order and good government" was a purely technical term describing the legislative power of any assembly. It was not true that the organization in question had a political character.

46. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that his delegation's views with regard to the administrative union affecting

Tanganyika were recorded in the report and he had nothing to add.

47. With regard to New Guinea, in his delegation's opinion, Papua was united with New Guinea rather than the reverse, since it was his understanding that New Guinea was influencing Papua and that trusteeship principles were being applied in the colony. Moreover, the functioning of the administrative union was almost entirely administrative in character.

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of New Guinea for the year ended 30 June 1956 (T/1326, T/L.776 and Add.1, T/L.799, T/L.807) (continued)*

[Agenda item 4 (b)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.776 AND ADD.1, T/L.799, T/L.807)

48. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, presented the Committee's report (T/L.799).

49. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that his delegation, together with the delegations of Guatemala and Syria, had submitted two amendments (T/L.807). He would propose other minor amendments, in the name of the same three delegations, as the Council considered the relevant paragraphs.

50. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the conclusions and recommendations contained in annex I of the Drafting Committee's report.

Paragraph 1 of annex 1 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

51. Mr. CHACKO (India) proposed that the word "hopes" in paragraph 2 should be replaced by "recommends", that the word "will" should be deleted and that the words "its attention" should be replaced by "consideration". He also proposed the deletion of the phrase "taking fully into account their wishes and views thereon" at the end of the paragraph.

52. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said he had no objection to the first three amendments, but could not see why the last phrase should be deleted. The Administering Authority considered that it would be undesirable to decide upon an official name for the people until they themselves were in a position to state their views on the matter.

53. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that his delegation did not consider it necessary at the present time for the indigenous inhabitants to be consulted on the choice of an official name. When they were truly in a position to be consulted, it might not be the responsibility of the Administering Authority to take the decision, but the Administration should take action on the matter now.

54. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) suggested that the phrase "in consultation with the indigenous inhabitants" should be inserted between the words "continue" and "to give".

55. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) did not consider that the Syrian suggestion was as satisfactory as the wording proposed by the Drafting Committee.

56. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) asked for a separate vote on the words proposed by the Syrian representative, which connoted the deletion of the last phrase of the paragraph.

* Resumed from the 831st meeting.

The proposal to replace the word "hopes" by "recommends" was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The proposal to delete the word "will" was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The proposal to replace the words "its attention" by "consideration" was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The proposal to insert the phrase "in consultation with the indigenous inhabitants" between the words "continue" and "to give" was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

57. Mr. CHACKO (India) asked for a separate vote on the last phrase of the paragraph, starting with the words "taking fully . . .".

58. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) asked for a separate vote on the word "fully".

The word "fully" was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The phrase "taking fully into account their wishes and views thereon" was adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

59. Mr. CHACKO (India) proposed that the word "only" should be added before the words "two indigenous inhabitants" in paragraph 3 and that the phrase "with a total membership of twenty-nine" should be inserted after "Legislative Council". He also proposed the deletion of the remainder of the paragraph after the words "in the near future", since his delegation did not consider that the indigenous inhabitants should be consulted about increasing the number of members of the Legislative Council.

60. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) did not think it necessary to attempt to belittle, as did the first two Indian amendments, the indigenous membership of the Legislative Council. The facts those amendments stressed were made perfectly clear in the factual section which would precede the annex.

61. With regard to the deletion of the reference to consultation with the indigenous inhabitants, he pointed out that those words were fully consistent with the provision of Article 76 b of the Charter that the freely expressed wishes of the people should be taken into account in promoting the progressive development of the Trust Territory towards self-government or independence.

62. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) observed that the first two amendments were purely factual, as the Australian representative had admitted, and that the third was justified by the fact that political development in the Territory was still too elementary to make consultation of the people possible.

63. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that the Drafting Committee had not intended the words "taking into account as far as possible the wishes of the indigenous people" to apply to the increase of indigenous representation but rather to the actual appointment of new members to the Legislative Council.

64. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that that intention would be made clear by the addition of the words "in regard to individual appointments" at the end of the paragraph.

65. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) asked for separate votes on the insertion of the word "only" and the phrase "with a total membership of twenty-nine".

In successive votes, the proposals to insert the word "only" and the phrase "with a total membership of twenty-nine" were rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

66. The PRESIDENT suggested that in the absence of any objection, the words proposed by the Indian representative for addition at the end of paragraph 3 should be adopted.

It was so decided.

There being no objection, paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted.

67. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) suggested that the words "expresses the hope" in paragraph 4 might be deleted, since the clause following that phrase described the exact policy the Administering Authority was already following.

68. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) did not think that the Council should consider suggestions that were not submitted as formal amendments.

69. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) formally proposed the deletion of the words "expresses the hope".

The New Zealand proposal was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

70. Mr. CHACKO (India) proposed that the words "among the indigenous employees of the Administration" should be added after the words "eligible persons" in paragraph 6.

71. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that he had no strong objection to the amendment, but was afraid it might have a restrictive effect, since indigenous persons outside the employment of the Administration were also eligible.

The amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

72. Mr. CHACKO (India) proposed that the word "recalling" in paragraph 7 should be replaced by "reiterating".

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

73. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the last sentence of the paragraph.

The last sentence of paragraph 7 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 as a whole was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

74. Mr. CHACKO (India) explained that he had abstained from voting on the paragraph, because he was not quite sure what was meant by the word "recalling", in the light of the previous year's recommendation (A/3170, p. 301).

75. He proposed that the word "long-term" should be added before the word "plans" at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 8.

76. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) thought that such an amendment would have a restrictive effect, since

over-all plans for economic development must include long-term plans, but short-term plans might be of considerable importance for the immediate purposes of the Trust Territory.

77. Mr. CHACKO (India) observed that, in making such a recommendation, the Council was not ruling out all other possibilities. Moreover, he thought that the Administering Authority already had a short-term development plan.

The amendment was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

78. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the third sentence of the paragraph.

The third sentence of paragraph 8 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

79. U KYAW MIN (Burma), speaking as a member of the Drafting Committee, said that the word "effective" in the second sentence of paragraph 9 should be replaced by the word "extensive".

80. Mr. CHACKO (India) proposed that the phrase "consideration of the matter is proceeding and that" should be inserted after the words "notes that" in the second sentence of the paragraph.

The amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

81. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the last sentence of paragraph 10.

The first two sentences of paragraph 10 were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The last sentence of paragraph 10 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

82. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) said that he had not felt it necessary to vote on the last sentence, since it was obvious from the Administering Authority's annual report¹ that it was actively pursuing the programme in question.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

83. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that the text proposed by Guatemala, India and Syria (T/L.807, para. 1) to replace paragraph 13 was intended as a reiteration of the recommendation, first made by the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1260, para. 261 to 264) and then adopted by the Trusteeship Council (A/3170, p. 313), that the restrictions in question should be abolished.

84. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that he would vote against the proposed text, which seemed simply to reiterate a recommendation to which the Administering Authority had already expressed its considered opposition. Too much was being made of the difference of opinion between the Administering Authority and

the Trusteeship Council in the matter of restrictions on movement; the Administering Authority had already stated that it had the matter under close consideration and planned to relax the restrictions as civic responsibility increased among the indigenous population. Moreover, the Indian representative's interpretation of the facts was incorrect; although the Visiting Mission had recommended the immediate revocation of all restrictions on movement, the Council had merely requested the Administering Authority to re-examine the question and had suggested that the restrictions should be abolished immediately in a few towns on a trial basis. Thus, both the Council and the Administering Authority considered that there should be a progressive relaxation of the restrictions; the only difference between them was the question of timing. The text submitted by the Drafting Committee allowed of that interpretation; his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on it.

The amendment proposed by Guatemala, India and Syria (T/L.807, para. 1) to paragraph 13 was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

85. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) suggested that the word "in" at the end of paragraph 16 should be deleted.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

86. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) suggested that in the interests of greater accuracy, the words "has been" in the first sentence of paragraph 17 should be replaced by "is being".

It was so decided.

Paragraph 17, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

87. Mr. CHACKO (India) suggested that the new paragraph proposed in the three-Power amendments (T/L.807, para. 2) should be added to the text of the report as paragraph 18, under the heading "Dissemination of Information on the United Nations".

That amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 4 of the report (T/L.799) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

88. U KYAW MIN (Burma), speaking as one of the two members of the Drafting Committee responsible for the drafting of annex II, proposed that the following phrase should be added at the end of the recommendation in paragraph 6 of the annex: "and in such a manner as to give to the indigenous population a stronger sense of direction and purpose in their progressive advancement towards the attainment of the objective of self-government or independence".

89. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that his delegation, in expressing its wish in the Drafting Committee not to take part in the drafting of annex II, had intended to indicate its general opposition to that annex in any form.

90. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that the word "proposes" in the first sentence of the recommendation in paragraph 6 should be replaced by the word "plans", since the Administering Authority did in fact have such a plan, which was already in effect. The remainder of

¹ Commonwealth of Australia, *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea from 1st July, 1955, to 30th June, 1956* (Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer, 1957). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1326.

the paragraph dealt with a number of programmes already adopted by the Administering Authority, which in themselves demonstrated the vigour with which the Administering Authority was addressing itself to the task confronting it. It therefore seemed unnecessary to recall a recommendation which the Administering Authority had strongly opposed.

91. The addition proposed by the representative of Burma seemed to take no account of the basic facts presented to the Council, not only by the Administering Authority but by the 1956 Visiting Mission, regarding the strong sense of purpose and direction displayed by the indigenous inhabitants and the astonishing progress they were making as a result of that sense of purpose derived basically from the stimulation, facilities and assistance given to the inhabitants by the Administering Authority. Moreover, as the Visiting Mission had noted, it was directed essentially towards economic rather than political advancement. Given those facts, it would hardly seem necessary to encourage the Administering Authority to depart from policies which had proved to be successful.

92. His delegation found it difficult to understand the use of the phrase "appear to be" in the second paragraph of the recommendation. If the Council was satisfied that the actions were in conformity with its recommendations, it should say so; if it had doubts on the subject, it might properly seek clarification. It should be pointed out, however, for the sake of accuracy, that the actions being taken by the Administering Authority were not entirely in conformity with the recommendation adopted at the eighteenth session (A/3170, p. 322). The Administering Authority did not agree that targets and dates should be set in all cases. It believed that, where appropriate and practicable, it might be desirable to link some elements of its plans with estimates of the period which would be required for their accomplishment. Nevertheless, it was far more concerned with what would happen than with when it would happen and it had no wish to clothe what amounted to conjecture in the form of promises or commitments.

93. In connexion with the last phrase in the second paragraph, he pointed out that the methods of development used by the Administering Authority were already being employed, where appropriate, in all fields; there was, consequently, no need to express the hope that they would be extended to other fields.

94. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) proposed that the latter part of the paragraph after the words "in the political and other fields", should be replaced by the following text:

"expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will continue to adopt plans, where appropriate with target dates, whenever it is satisfied that the employment of this procedure in respect of any

aspect of development will assist in the promotion of the objectives of the Trusteeship System".

95. He pointed out that the Council had already accepted that phraseology with regard to intermediate targets and dates in the case of the Territory of Nauru.

96. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said that the adoption of the text proposed by the United States representative would entirely satisfy his delegation's objections.

97. U KYAW MIN (Burma) said that, in a spirit of compromise, he would accept the text suggested by the United States representative in place of his own proposal.

The United States amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

98. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) asked whether the representatives of Belgium and the United Kingdom had taken part in the vote on annex II in the Drafting Committee.

99. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that the Drafting Committee had not taken a vote on the annex.

100. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that it was customary for such proposals to be voted on in the Committee. He would like to know what procedure had been followed in the Committee for the adoption of the text under discussion.

101. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said it was not his opinion that all recommendations of the Drafting Committee had to be the subject of a vote. Most of them had been accepted unanimously, without a vote. In the present case no vote had been requested, even though two delegations had not taken part in the preparation of the text.

Paragraph 1 of annex II was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

In successive votes paragraphs 2 to 4 were adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

102. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendations in paragraph 6 of annex II because they did not in any way meet the problem concerning which the Council was required to report to the General Assembly and were far from the spirit and meaning of the General Assembly resolutions. The effect of the recommendations was to place the essential question of self-government or independence in a false perspective.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.