



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 13 May 1960,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Tribute to the memory of H.E. The Prince Aly Khan</i>	207
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (concluded)</i>	207
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on Nauru</i> . . .	209

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, 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.

Tribute to the memory of H.E. The Prince Aly Khan

On the proposal of the President, the members of the Council observed a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of H.E. The Prince Aly Khan.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (T/1513, T/1521, T/L.964 and Add.1, T/L.970) (continued)

[Agenda item 3 (f)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.970) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to continue its examination of annex I to the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.970).

Paragraph 7 was adopted.

2. Mr. VELLODI (India) suggested that in view of the importance of the question of training Micronesian administrative personnel the words "bear in mind the need for extending", in the second sentence in para-

graph 8, should be amended to read "take urgent steps to accelerate".

3. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he thought the Indian amendment improved the text of paragraph 8. He requested, however, that a separate vote should be taken on the first sentence of the paragraph, on which his delegation would abstain. It saw no reason to commend the Administering Authority, since the progress achieved in training Micronesians was negligible.

The first sentence of paragraph 8 was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second sentence of paragraph 8, as amended, in accordance with the Indian representative's proposal, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

4. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that before the Council took up section III of annex I he would like to explain his votes and his delegation's position with regard to the paragraphs in sections I and II on which no votes had been taken. There was no justification for the repeated commendations expressed in those sections, for it was clear from the statements made by the petitioners that conditions in the Territory were far from satisfactory. The Council should therefore have emphasized what was to be done, noting the deficiencies in the administration of the Territory and recommending specific measures to improve the situation.

5. The idea embodied in paragraph 4 of annex I, concerning the broadening and expansion of the powers of legislation of the district congresses, was a constructive one and he had therefore supported its adoption. He would like to point out, however, that it was not quite accurate inasmuch as those bodies had no legislative powers whatsoever at present. Finally, he would like it to be understood that despite his reservations he had been in favour of all the constructive elements in the Drafting Committee's recommendations.

6. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that the commendations expressed in the report, to which the USSR representative had taken objection, were simply those which had been expressed in the Council's deliberations.

7. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) proposed that in paragraph 9, which embodied an idea introduced by his delegation at the twenty-fourth session, the words "looks forward to an early opportunity of studying the results of this survey, and" should be deleted and that the words "the results of this survey will be submitted to the Council as soon as possible and that" should be added after the words "expresses the hope that".

Paragraph 9, as thus amended, was adopted unanimously.

8. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the last part of paragraph 10, beginning with the words "with a view" should be amended to read "with a view to achieving at least a measure of economic self-sufficiency as soon as possible". The present wording was too vague and did not convey the urgency of the need to achieve self-sufficiency.

Paragraph 10, as thus amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

9. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he thought the word "very" in the first sentence of paragraph 11 was superfluous and should be deleted.

10. Mr. VELLODI (India) agreed that the words "substantial contributions" gave the Administering Authority due credit without the addition of the word "very".

11. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that in the view of his delegation the Administering Authority was making very substantial contributions and the inclusion of the word was therefore correct. He questioned the wisdom of the Council's making such minor amendments to the reports of drafting committees, which seemed to him to be a departure from the usual practice.

12. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he was surprised at the remarks of the United Kingdom representative, for the Council had been amending such reports ever since its establishment and its members were entitled to propose any amendments, minor or major, as they saw fit.

13. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that since the report had been drafted in English it had been left to the English-speaking representatives to decide on the exact wording. In any case he did not think it was important whether the word was retained or deleted.

14. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had a question concerning the substance of the paragraph. He would like to know whether the Administering Authority would interpret the words "expresses its concern that the Territory continues to depend on the Administering Authority to cover nearly four-fifths of its budget" as meaning that the Administering Authority should reduce its assistance to the Territory, for if that was the case his delegation could not agree. It was, of course, in favour of taking steps to increase local revenue but thought that the Administering Authority should at the same time increase its contribution to the Territorial budget; thus the Territory's total revenue would be increased in two ways, making it possible to do more for the benefit of the people. If his delegation could be given the assurance that the implementation of the recommendation would result in an increase in revenue it would vote in favour of it; otherwise it would abstain.

15. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that he was sure that the Administering Authority would not be at all displeased to see the Territory's dependence on external assistance lessened; indeed, one of its primary objectives had always been to enable the Territory to free itself from dependence on such aid. At the same time he was confident that the Administering Authority would continue to make such contributions as it deemed necessary to enable the Territory to attain the standards envisaged in the Trusteeship Agreement.

Paragraph 11 as amended in accordance with the proposal by the representative of the United Arab Republic, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

16. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate votes on the first sentence of paragraph 12 and the first sentence of paragraph 13, on both of which his delegation would abstain.

The first sentence of paragraph 12 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The remainder of paragraph 12 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 12 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

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

The remainder of paragraph 13 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 13 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

In successive votes, paragraphs 15 to 22 were adopted unanimously.

17. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) proposed that paragraphs 1 to 6 of annex II should be put to the vote as a whole, since they merely reported the views of the special representative, who had agreed that those paragraphs were an accurate reflection of his statements.

18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no reason why section VI should appear separately as annex II. Moreover, he questioned the advisability of including the explanations given by the special representative of the Administering Authority among the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee. The paragraphs setting forth the special representative's views might usefully be removed from that section and included in the part of the report which gave the opinions of members of the Trusteeship Council and the factual data provided by the Administering Authority.

19. Mr. VELLODI (India) supported the Bolivian representative's suggestion that paragraphs 1 to 6 should be voted on as a whole, and the Soviet Union representative's suggestion that section VI should appear as part of annex I, in accordance with past practice. With regard to the Soviet representative's second suggestion, the Indian delegation had no objection to placing on record what the special representative had said.

20. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) agreed with the Soviet representative's first suggestion. With regard to the second, he thought that, since they were statements of fact, those paragraphs should appear in the report. He inquired of the Secretariat whether it was not true that such material had always been included in that part of the Trusteeship Council's previous reports.

21. Mr. COTTRELL (Secretary of the Council) replied in the affirmative.

22. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that, in that case, he felt that paragraphs 1 to 6 should be retained, in accordance with past practice.

23. The PRESIDENT put paragraphs 1 to 6 of annex II to the vote.

Paragraphs 1 to 6 were adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

24. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether, in the English text of the second part of paragraph 7, the word "will" in the clause "which will fully reflect the needs" should not read "should". On previous occasions he had stressed that the indigenous inhabitants should participate in the drafting of the organic legislation, since they best knew their country's interests and needs. The Administering Authority had not, however, given any specific assurance that the indigenous inhabitants would be included. He thought that by using the word "should" instead of "will" the Council could make a recommendation to that effect.

25. He asked for a separate vote on the first part of paragraph 7, ending with the words "other fields". His delegation could not agree with that statement and would vote against it. If his drafting amendment to the second part of the sentence were adopted, his delegation would be able to vote in favour of it. It would then abstain on the paragraph as a whole.

26. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that the replacement of the word "will" by "should" would introduce an element of uncertainty into the sentence. He thought that the use of the word "will" was correct and should be retained.

27. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the United Kingdom representative's explanation if it had been prompted by purely linguistic considerations. The Soviet Union delegation would vote in favour of the second part of the sentence, in the belief that the organic legislation should and must reflect the people's needs and interests.

The first part of paragraph 7 of annex II was adopted by 13 votes to 1.

The second part of paragraph 7 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 7 as a whole was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation in paragraph 5 of the Drafting Committee's report was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (T/1509, T/1517, T/1518, T/L.963 and Add.1, T/L.969) (continued)*

[Agenda item 3 (e)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NAURU (T/L.969)

28. Mr. IVELLA (Italy), Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Nauru, introduced the report of that Committee (T/L.969), which had been adopted unanimously.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to consider the annex to the report paragraph by paragraph.

30. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) proposed, with regard to the last part of the second sentence of paragraph 1 of the annex, that the words "or more" should be added after the words "resettlement in one" and that the words "or their territories" should be added at the end of the sentence. He felt that the present text was somewhat restrictive.

31. Mr. VELLODI (India) supported the addition of the words "or more" but felt that the words "or their territories" might be unnecessary, since the Administering Authorities were not discussing other alternatives at the moment.

32. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that his delegation would not press for the inclusion of the words "or their territories".

33. Mr. VELLODI (India) suggested that the words "Nauruan affairs" in the last sentence of paragraph 1 should be replaced by the words "conditions in Nauru".

34. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always considered that the question of the future of the Trust Territory was the most important aspect of the item under consideration. It would vote against paragraph 1, in which the Council seemed to be telling the Nauruans that their future would not be on the island. That paragraph implied that it had already been decided to resettle the Nauruans in another country. Such an idea was in complete disregard of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement, under which the people of Nauru were to be assured of the possibility of remaining on the island in the future. The Soviet delegation would not agree to any proposal to resettle the people of Nauru elsewhere and it would therefore vote against the paragraph and against any other proposal which implicitly or explicitly would be in favour of the resettlement of the people of Nauru.

35. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) pointed out that the paragraph stated explicitly that "the final decision and choice of alternatives will rest entirely with the Nauruan people".

36. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to vote on paragraph 1, as amended by the addition of the words "or more" in the second sentence and the substitution of the words "conditions in Nauru" for the words "Nauruan affairs" in the last sentence.

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

37. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while his delegation was in general agreement with the idea put forward in paragraph 2, it proposed that the last part of the last sentence, starting with the words "and hopes", should be deleted. Since it was known that the members of the Nauru Local Government Council regarded their present powers as extremely limited and the matters with which they dealt as inconsequential, it was completely unjust to reproach them even by implication and to allege that they were failing to exercise those powers to the full. The appropriate course would be to enlarge the Council's powers.

38. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) assured the Council that the Administering Authority would continue to take all appropriate measures to promote the political advancement of the Nauruans. With reference to the observations made by the Soviet representative, it was

* Resumed from the 1062nd meeting.

his delegation's view that the Local Government Council possessed adequate powers which it had failed to exercise fully and that it should be encouraged to do so. His delegation fully recognized the importance of the issues raised in the paragraph and would vote in favour of it.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

39. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 2 as a whole, while bearing in mind its reservation with regard to the last part of the paragraph.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted unanimously.

40. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) noted, in connexion with paragraph 5, that the Nauruans had expressed the desire to be represented at the Council when the report of the next visiting mission was under consideration rather than when conditions in the Territory were next examined by the Council. While his delegation had no objection in principle to the proposal in the paragraph, it could not commit itself definitely in the matter and would therefore abstain from the vote.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

41. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that paragraph 6 gave the impression that the Council accepted as a fact the statement that there had been no scientific developments since 1954 relevant to the problem of making the worked-out Nauruan phosphate lands cultivable. Since his delegation did not feel able to accept that as the case, he proposed that the two sentences in the paragraph should be combined and the word "Because" in the second sentence replaced by the words "and since in the opinion of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization".

42. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, even if the attribution to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization was made clear, it would be improper for the Council simply to take note, without reservation, of the categorical statement that there had been no scientific developments in the field since 1954, which of course was not correct. It was regrettable that the Drafting Committee had failed to mention the suggestion made by the Indian delegation and supported by the Soviet and other delegations that a new technical mission should be dispatched to the Trust Territory, and that it had made no recommendations whatever for future action. He noted that there were countries which found it quite possible to make worked-out phosphate land cultivable and that for instance in the United States it was indeed mandatory under the law to do so.

43. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) pointed out that owing to the different soil conditions the situation in the United States with regard to the utilization of worked-out phosphate land was not comparable to that in Nauru.

44. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that his delegation agreed with the Soviet representative that the Council should not confine itself to taking note of the statement by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. He therefore proposed the addition at the end of paragraph 6 of a sentence reading:

"The Council recommends that the Administering Authority continue to keep the problem under active consideration."

Paragraph 6, as amended, in accordance with the two proposals made by the representative of India, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

45. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Indian amendment, while not wholly meeting the demands of the situation, had somewhat improved the original text; hence, his delegation had abstained instead of voting against the paragraph.

46. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the additional sentence proposed by the Indian representative seemed to imply, however unintentionally, that the Administering Authority was not giving due consideration to the problem.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 was adopted unanimously.

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

Paragraph 10 was adopted unanimously.

47. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that his delegation was providing the Council with all available information on the operations of the British Phosphate Commissioners in Nauru and had repeatedly explained why it was difficult for the Commissioners to furnish the further information requested by the Council. It would therefore abstain in the vote on paragraph 11.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

In successive votes, paragraphs 12 to 14 were adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted unanimously.

48. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there was a contradiction between paragraphs 16 and 17: if the statement in paragraph 16 was accepted, i.e., that differences that existed between workers regarding wage rates were allegedly the result of differing standards of education, experience, qualifications and work output, it would not be possible to remove disparities between Europeans and other workers employed by the British Phosphate Commissioners, as urged in paragraph 17.

49. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) pointed out that paragraph 17 referred solely to the length of the work-week; he therefore proposed that the words "in working hours" should be inserted after the word "disparities".

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 13 votes to 1.

50. Mr. VELLODI (India) proposed that the word "any" should be replaced by the word "the" in both cases where it appeared in paragraph 17, since there was no question that disparities did exist between Europeans and other workers employed by the British Phosphate Commissioners.

51. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the words "to redouble its efforts" in paragraph 17 suggested that the Administering Authority exerted efforts to remove the disparities in working hours but failed to do so, which was not the

case; he therefore suggested that the words "to exert efforts" should be substituted.

52. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that the wording suggested by the Soviet representative would imply that the Administering Authority had taken no action in the matter, whereas it had in fact had discussions with the British Phosphate Commissioners. In any event, his delegation would abstain from voting on the paragraph, since, although it agreed that disparities in working hours should be removed wherever possible, the difficulties experienced by the British Phosphate Commissioners in obtaining and holding qualified non-indigenous staff from outside the Territory should be taken into account.

53. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) agreed that it would be inaccurate to suggest that the Administering Authority had failed to make any efforts along the lines indicated.

54. Mr. IVELLA (Italy) suggested that the words "to make further efforts" should be used in preference to the words "to exert efforts".

55. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that the wording suggested by the Italian representative would reflect the situation more accurately but did not remove his delegation's basic objection to the paragraph.

56. The PRESIDENT put paragraph 17, as amended by the Australian, Indian and Italian representatives, to the vote.

Paragraph 17, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

In successive votes, paragraphs 18 to 21 were adopted unanimously.

57. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would be obliged to vote against paragraph 22 as it stood, since the wording of the paragraph was designed to disguise the contradiction between the plans of the Administering Authority for the resettlement of the Nauruans and the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement. His delegation could not accept the references to "changed circumstances" and to resettlement "outside the Territory". The Trusteeship Council must insist that the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement should be observed.

58. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that his delegation considered paragraph 22 to be a reaffirmation of the pledge Australia, as Administering Authority, had taken to carry out its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. The Administering Authority must be considered the best judge of what would in fact promote the objectives of the Trusteeship System in the Territory.

59. With regard to the words "changed circumstances", he was sure that every member of the Council would readily agree that if and when the Nauruans were settled outside the Territory their circumstances or living conditions would be changed. He could therefore see no objection to saying so in the report.

60. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) was in general agreement with the remarks made by the USSR representative. He considered the phrase beginning "whenver it is satisfied" to be superfluous and suggested that the first part of paragraph 22 should be redrafted to read:

"The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that it will continue to adopt plans for the advancement of the Nauruans in all fields in fulfilment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System...."

61. With regard to the last part of the paragraph, since no definitive plans with regard to the resettlement of the Nauruans had yet been made, and since the time had not yet come when they must be made, he proposed that the reference to "changed circumstances" should be deleted and that the last part of the paragraph should read: "...and provide the Nauruans with the educational and vocational training which they require".

62. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that paragraph 22 merely noted the statement of the Administering Authority. It was not for the Council to alter that statement. He could not, therefore, agree to the proposals made by the representatives of the USSR and the United Arab Republic.

63. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the beginning of the paragraph should be amended to read: "The Council hopes that the Administering Authority will continue...". The United Kingdom delegation might then be able to vote in favour of the amendment suggested by the representative of the United Arab Republic, with which the USSR delegation entirely agreed.

64. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that he could not support the USSR representative's proposal that the paragraph, which purported to reflect a statement of the Administering Authority, should be converted into one expressing a hope by the Council. Paragraph 23 expressed the hopes of the Council and he felt that paragraph 22 should remain as it stood.

65. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked the Australian representative whether the Administering Authority considered that any plans for the advancement of the Nauruans could do otherwise than assist in the promotion of the objectives of the Trusteeship System. In his delegation's view the phrase "whenver it is satisfied" was quite superfluous and could be deleted.

66. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) said that the USSR representative's suggestion was not acceptable to his delegation. The purpose of paragraph 22 was not to cast doubts upon the intentions of the Administering Authority but to note the statement it had made.

67. In reply to the question asked by the representative of India, he said that naturally the Administering Authority did not contemplate taking measures in Nauru which would be contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement. The purpose of the reservation was merely to emphasize that the Administering Authority must be the judge on matters of policy and must be satisfied that whatever it did would further the objectives of the Trusteeship System.

68. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that in view of that reply his delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 22.

69. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) suggested that, in view of the fact that the special representative had told the Council that no definite plans for resettlement had yet been drawn up, paragraph 22 might be omitted altogether.

70. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that the custom in similar reports in recent years had been first to note what the Administering Authority had said regarding the existing situation and then, in a second paragraph, to express the Council's views about what should be done in the future. He considered that paragraph 23 would lose some of its value if paragraph 22 were omitted.

71. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) opposed the suggestion for the deletion of paragraph 22. The question of the attainment of self-government or independence and the related question of the establishment of intermediate target dates and time-limits was one that was considered important by the Council. His delegation had made a statement of its attitude in that connexion with regard to Nauru and he felt that the Council should formally take note of that statement. He pointed out that the recommendation adopted by the Council at its twenty-fourth session (A/4100, p. 167) was almost identical with the proposed paragraph 22.

72. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that any statement made by the representatives of the Administering Authority was of course their own responsibility, but a decision by the Trusteeship Council to take note of a statement was another matter. Since certain delegations were clearly not in agreement with the statement of the Administering Authority reproduced in paragraph 22, the best solution would be to change the wording. For example the paragraph might begin: "At the twenty-sixth session of the Trusteeship Council the representative of the Administering Authority stated...". Anything that followed would then be the responsibility of that representative. The hopes of the Council would be expressed in paragraph 23, as at present.

73. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) could not agree that for the Council to note a statement expressed an opinion one way or the other. The inclusion of a paragraph such as paragraph 22 was a well-established practice, as the United Kingdom representative had pointed out.

74. He proposed that a vote should be taken on the paragraph as it stood.

75. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) regretted that the Australian delegation had not accepted the proposal made by the USSR representative. While on various points the Australian delegation had made its position extremely clear, he did not think that the statement reproduced in paragraph 22 had been made during the debate.

76. Mr. VELLODI (India) formally moved that paragraph 22 should be amended to read: "The Administering Authority stated that it will continue to adopt plans...".

The Indian amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 22, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

77. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that paragraph 23 should be replaced by the following paragraph, which reproduced the wording of General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV):

"The Council, taking into account the provision of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement and the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV), invites the Administering Authority to formulate early successive intermediate targets and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational development so as to create, as soon as possible, favourable conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territory of Nauru."

78. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia) moved the adjournment of the meeting, in view of the lateness of the hour and the serious issues raised by the USSR proposal.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.