



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-seventh Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 11 July 1961,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (concluded):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960;</i>	
(ii) <i>Examination of petitions</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea</i>	175

President: U TIN MAUNG (Burma).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, 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: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

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

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960 (T/1561, T/1567, T/1569, T/L.1010 and Add.1);
- (ii) Examination of petitions (T/PET.8/L.6)

[Agenda items 4 (d) and 5]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NEW GUINEA (T/L.1023, T/L.1024)

1. Mr. THOM (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea, introduced the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea under Australian administration (T/L.1023) which had been approved unanimously by the Committee. The Committee wished to thank the special representative of the Administering Authority for his unflagging willingness to provide information.
2. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation did not feel that the Committee's recommendations provided effective measures for implementing the General Assembly Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)). It was therefore submitting two amendments (T/L.1024) to paragraph 40 of the annex.
3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider paragraph by paragraph the Drafting Committee's conclusions and recommendations appearing in the annex to its report (T/L.1023).

4. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote against paragraph 1 because vague wording about "steady acceleration in the rate of progress" did not adequately cover the situation.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

5. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said he wished to make a reservation concerning paragraph 2, in view of the fact that it was not really possible for the Administering Authority or the Trusteeship Council to impose any particular name on the inhabitants of New Guinea.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

6. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that, while his delegation had no objection to paragraph 5, it noted the Council's concern that there was no indigenous representative of the Trust Territory on the Administrator's Council and wished to repeat that that did not reflect any basic policy of the Administering Authority but simply the lack of qualified persons.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

7. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that his previous comment applied also to paragraph 6.

Paragraph 6 was adopted unanimously.

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

8. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for paragraph 8 to be voted on in two parts. His delegation would vote in favour of the first sentence, but would abstain on the rest of the paragraph because it considered that the Council should make a specific recommendation that religious missions should have no special representation on the Legislative Council.

9. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that his Government noted the Council's observations but could not accept the term "with regret". The Administering Authority had explained why the appointment of representatives of the missions had been necessary hitherto.

The first sentence of paragraph 8 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The remainder of paragraph 8 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 8 as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

10. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was the precise meaning of the words "under constant review" in the last sentence of paragraph 9.

*Resumed from 1149th meeting.

11. Mr. THOM (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, replied that the words meant that the Administering Authority would constantly consider the composition of the Legislative Council to see whether the appointments in question continued to be necessary.

12. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since that implied that no change was being recommended, the Soviet delegation could not accept the formula and would abstain in the vote on paragraph 9.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

In successive votes, paragraphs 10 and 11 were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

In successive votes, paragraphs 12 and 13 were adopted unanimously.

13. Mr. HOOD (Australia) wished to affirm once again, in connexion with paragraph 14, that the Administering Authority was taking all possible steps to render the recruitment of the public service adequate and efficient and would of course report on the matter to the Council in due course.

In successive votes, paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

14. Mr. HOOD (Australia) stated, with regard to paragraph 17, that the Administering Authority did not feel called upon to make any statement concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua in the present context. It had already declared that the objectives of policy in respect of both New Guinea and Papua were identical.

15. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he failed to understand the purpose of paragraph 17, in view of the fact that the Administering Authority had stated that its policy was the same in the case of both New Guinea and Papua. Since Article 76 of the United Nations Charter was applicable to New Guinea, as a Trust Territory, the objectives laid down in that Article would necessarily be applicable to Papua if the latter Territory was governed by the same policy.

16. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that, although his delegation was convinced that Australia acted in conformity with the Charter, in Papua as elsewhere, it could not vote in favour of paragraph 17 because it did not think that the Council was competent to make a recommendation, even an indirect one, concerning a Territory that was not a Trust Territory.

17. Mr. THOM (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, observed that paragraph 17 had been the subject of much discussion in the Committee; his own delegation had finally accepted it on the understanding that the wording meant that the basic objectives of Article 76 were being applied in practice, as distinct from being "applicable", the word used by the representative of the Soviet Union.

18. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said he agreed with the representative of France that the Trusteeship Council should not go on record as asserting any kind of interest in a Territory which was not a Trust Territory.

19. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said he could not agree that the Trusteeship Council must not assert any

interest in a Non-Self-Governing Territory. His delegation's view was that if the two Territories were to develop uniformly towards a common objective, that objective must be the one laid down for the Trust Territory; it was the Council's responsibility to seek assurances that in fact there would be no dilution of the objectives laid down for the Trust Territory. He therefore felt obliged to press for the inclusion of paragraph 17.

20. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the light of the explanation given by the representative of India, his delegation would vote in favour of paragraph 17.

21. In reply to a question from Mr. HOOD (Australia), Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the further statement called for in paragraph 17 should be made to the Trusteeship Council.

22. Miss TENZER (Belgium) suggested that, since it was New Guinea that was the concern of the Trusteeship Council, the paragraph should be amended to refer only to New Guinea.

23. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that if such a paragraph referred only to New Guinea it would be unnecessary. He could not understand the objection to mentioning Papua in a report to be adopted by the Trusteeship Council. It was frequently mentioned in the Administering Authority's report. The whole question had arisen because the Administering Authority had said it was developing New Guinea and Papua together towards a common future. The development in a Trust Territory of organs of government shared by a Non-Self-Governing Territory was an exceptional situation and the Council was obliged to take special note of that policy because it was stretching the concept of administrative union further than had been the case in respect of any other Trust Territory.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 18 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

24. Mr. HOOD (Australia) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote because, while it had a high regard for the services of the specialized agencies, it did not think that the recommendation was necessary.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 20 was adopted by 12 votes to none.

Paragraph 21 was adopted unanimously.

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

Paragraph 23 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

25. Mr. HOOD (Australia), explaining his delegation's abstention in the vote on paragraph 24, said that the Administering Authority would take account of the Council's regret that no New Guineans were represented on the Land Development Board. As the special representative had explained (1142nd meeting), the Board was a highly technical body and had to be staffed with qualified personnel. That was the sole

reason for the situation, and a very sound administrative reason, which did not reflect on the policies in general of the Administering Authority.

26. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 25, said that his delegation favoured a specific recommendation to the Administering Authority that it should not permit the alienation of land from the indigenous population. Unfortunately, paragraph 25 made virtually no recommendation to the Administering Authority; it merely suggested a "suitable" reduction in the period for which the Administering Authority granted leases, namely ninety-nine years. A few years' reduction would be no solution of the problem. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on paragraph 25.

27. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that, while he did not share all the views of the USSR representative on the matter, he agreed that the recommendation in paragraph 25 was rather vague, and his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote. In the absence of a clearly defined system of land tenure in the Territory, the Council was in duty bound to give the Administering Authority specific guidance. There was the potential danger that by the time New Guinea achieved independence a good part of the land would have been leased out to expatriates so that the indigenous population would have lost its heritage. He had no particular wording to propose, but he hoped that the Administering Authority would bear in mind the recommendations in paragraphs 22, 23 and 24 and would settle the land-tenure situation once and for all.

28. Mr. HOOD (Australia) assured the representative of Bolivia and the Council that the views of the Council would be kept very closely in mind by the Administering Authority. He wished to point out, however, that the Council could not call for economic development in the Territory and at the same time exclude the means of providing that development. Lease-holding rights for an adequate period were an indispensable means of assuring private enterprise of reasonable security.

29. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) regretted that some representatives of the non-administering members of the Council objected to the paragraph. While he would have favoured a clearer injunction that no further land should be leased to non-indigenous people, all the members of the Council did not agree on the matter, and what had emerged from the Drafting Committee was in the nature of a compromise.

30. The new recommendation had to be read in conjunction with the one made by the Council at its twenty-sixth session (A/4404, p. 139), which had been stated in unambiguous terms. The fact that more than 10,000 additional acres had been leased to non-indigenous people during the year under review fully justified the suggestion that the Council should express its concern. In his view, it should no longer be necessary to bring Australian or European farmers into the Territory in order to develop agriculture. The present state of affairs in parts of the world where a similar policy had been followed should discourage the Administering Authority from establishing non-indigenous settlers in the Trust Territory. Leasing land was not the only, and certainly not the best, means of encouraging outside investment. It seemed to him that Australian private citizens could

do more for the Territory by investing in industrial enterprises than in land.

31. If, as the Administering Authority asserted, the agriculture of New Guinea had now progressed to a certain point, the Administering Authority would be better advised to lease whatever land it had acquired to indigenous inhabitants, teach them new methods of agriculture, provide them with the necessary implements and encourage the formation of co-operatives for the cultivation of commercial crops.

32. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he realized that the recommendation in paragraph 25 represented a compromise; for that reason his delegation would abstain and not vote against it. He wished to make it clear, however, that the position of his delegation was conditional, pending a clarification by the Administering Authority of the laws governing the rights of the indigenous inhabitants in the matter of land tenure.

Paragraph 25 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

In successive votes, paragraphs 26 and 27 were adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 28 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

33. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) criticized the wording of paragraph 29. After noting that there had been a "slight increase" in the minimum wage—which now amounted to about \$US 0.15 per day—the paragraph expressed the hope that the wage would be "raised further". The Council should make a positive recommendation for a tangible increase in the minimum wage, which was not merely "low", as paragraph 29 put it, but extremely low and indeed could hardly be lower.

34. He was in favour of compromises, but they must be reasonable compromises which took into account the interests of the indigenous population. In the circumstances, his delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 29.

35. Mr. HOOD (Australia) recalled that it had been repeatedly pointed out that, in addition to the minimum cash wage, workers received food, accommodation and clothing. He hoped that the USSR representative had not lost sight of that fact.

36. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the figure he had cited was derived from the information supplied by the Administering Authority that the minimum wage of workers was thirty to thirty-five shillings per month. No worker could provide himself with the necessities of life with such a sum. For example, how would he be able to clothe and educate his children?

37. Mr. HOOD (Australia) pointed out that education, too, was gratis. He regretted that the USSR representative persisted in disregarding the substantial earnings paid to the workers in kind.

38. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he was sure the Administering Authority itself accepted the necessity of raising the minimum wage. Although as a member of the Drafting Committee he had agreed to the wording of paragraph 29, it seemed to him that it could be improved a little. It would be more in line with the opinions expressed by the International Labour

Organisation and by the Council itself if the second sentence of the paragraph were amended to read:

"Noting the slight increase in the minimum wage in the period under review, the Council recommends that this wage, which remains low, should be substantially raised."

The Indian amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 29, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

39. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote in favour of paragraphs 30, 31 and 32, although it considered them inadequate because they were concerned with certain details but failed to deal with the question of public health in general.

Paragraphs 30, 31 and 32 were adopted by 11 votes to none.

40. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the insertion in paragraph 33, after the first sentence, of the following additional sentence: "The Trusteeship Council recommends to the Administering Authority that it immediately abrogate the discriminatory laws and practices mentioned above."

41. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that he could not support that proposal. The recommendation of the Drafting Committee had been properly formulated to put the matter into perspective in a way which was not objectionable to the Administering Authority. A direct request to the Administering Authority to take immediate steps in the matter would, however, be objectionable.

42. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that he would like the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to make a statement in connexion with the point raised by the representative of Australia.

43. Mr. THOM (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, said that in his view the additional sentence proposed by the USSR representative was unnecessary. He pointed out that the words "adopting remedial measures" meant correcting the existing situation, so that the proposed additional sentence would merely be a repetition.

44. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) observed that two different factors were involved: there was legislation, which it was within the Administering Authority's power to alter, and there were practices, which were a matter of custom and which unfortunately were very slow to change. He asked if the USSR representative would agree to alter his amendment to read: "The Trusteeship Council recommends to the Administering Authority that it immediately abrogate the discriminatory laws and combat the practices mentioned above." If so he would be prepared to vote in favour of the amendment.

45. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed to the French representative's proposal. The purpose of the USSR amendment was to ensure that racial discrimination was brought to an end in the Trust Territory. It corresponded to recommendations already adopted by the General Assembly in relation to Non-Self-Governing Territories.

46. Mr. HOOD (Australia) wished once more, before the vote was taken, to state the position of the

Administering Authority. The special representative had carefully explained the position to the Council at a recent meeting. As the French representative had rightly pointed out, there were practices which could not be abolished at once but must be changed gradually by various means, including political and, if necessary, legislative means. The Administering Authority intended that before very long all discrimination in New Guinea should be abolished, but it would not be honest on his part to accept the terms of the USSR amendment because it would be impossible to carry it out. His delegation would report to the Council in 1962 what had been done in that connexion and he felt sure that the Council would not find that report inadequate. He strongly objected to the word "immediately" in the proposed amendment.

47. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the USSR amendment as amended by the French representative. He appreciated the position of the Administering Authority and naturally recognized that it could not be expected to do the impossible. His delegation's vote in favour of the amendment would be a vote in favour of the principle which was at stake, or in other words a vote against racial discrimination.

The USSR amendment was adopted by 12 votes to none.

Paragraph 33, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none.

Paragraph 34 was adopted unanimously.

48. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraphs 34, 35 and 36 merely took note of a number of isolated facts without making any assessment on the basis of those facts. It was necessary to compare the present situation with the needs of the Territory in order to judge the extent of the discrepancy. Whether the conclusions in that part of the report were adopted or rejected would make very little difference to the indigenous people in the Trust Territory. Nevertheless, his delegation would vote in favour of those conclusions, not because it endorsed them or considered them to be sufficient, but because it could not vote against, for instance, a statement that a certain number of schools had been built in a given year. The report did not state that thousands of schools were needed. According to paragraph 34, less than 50 per cent of the school-age population was attending school. Thus emergency measures were urgently required. The report, however, merely noted that nine new Administration primary schools had been opened during the period under review. His delegation could not regard that as an adequate comment.

49. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) did not agree with the USSR representative. The Council was not invariably called upon to make explicit recommendations. A recommendation might well be implied in a conclusion. The obvious implication of the conclusions in paragraphs 34, 35 and 36 was that the situation should be remedied. Furthermore, paragraph 34, for example, reiterated the recommendation made by the Council at its twenty-sixth session, namely, that the Administering Authority should assume a greatly expanded direct role in education (A/4404, p. 145). It did not recommend specifically that there should be universal free primary education, for several reasons. First, education was already free, as the Coun-

cil had noted at a previous session. Secondly, he did not feel free that the Council should press for the universality of primary education at the present stage, for there were more urgent needs in the Territory, one of which was secondary education. It was true that paragraph 35 used the word "hopes" rather than "recommends", but in his view that word was quite satisfactory because, as the members of the Council knew, the question of the shortage of teachers and the inadequacy of their training programmes was engaging the attention of the Administering Authority. There was therefore no need for the Council to recommend or urge that action should be taken. Paragraph 37, too, used the word "hopes", again in connexion with something which was engaging the attention of the Administering Authority, i.e., the elimination of the bottleneck at the intermediate level. If the USSR representative would prefer the word "recommends" he would have no objection, but he felt that "hopes" served the same purpose. The same applied to the last sentence of paragraph 38; for the Council to say that it considered that education at the university level would require a very rapid increase in secondary educational facilities was tantamount to recommending that steps should be taken in that direction.

Paragraph 35 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 36 was adopted unanimously.

50. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that in the last sentence of paragraph 37 the word "hopes" should be replaced by the word "recommends", and the word "will" should be deleted.

The amendment was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 37, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 38 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 39 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

51. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the amendments proposed by the USSR delegation to paragraph 40 (T/L.1024).

52. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), referring to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), particularly in Trust Territories, expressed the view that each country and each people should be studied in the light of its own particular circumstances. From that point of view he recognized the validity of the USSR proposal. At the same time he had certain doubts, of a purely legal nature, concerning the first amendment, not because he did not believe in the future independence of all people who were at present under colonial or semi-colonial domination, but principally on account of the Trusteeship Agreement for New Guinea and of Article 80 of the Charter. Neither the Bolivian delegation nor any other member of the Council was entitled to give an opinion with regard to the rights of an Administering Authority in a Trust Territory under the Trusteeship Agreement.

53. In connexion with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which stated that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational

preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence, he pointed out that according to the information in the Council's possession, New Guinea was still at a very early stage of development. Paragraph 5 spoke of the need for the peoples freely to express their will and desire, but the Administering Authority stated that for the time being the people of New Guinea were not in a position to do so. In the Bolivian delegation's view, the Council could not require the Administering Authority to implement the resolution immediately, without regard for the existing instruments and the relevant articles of the Charter.

54. With regard to the second USSR amendment, he pointed out that it was perfectly consistent with paragraph 39, which had just been adopted. The USSR representative would no doubt agree that the consent and goodwill of the Administering Authority in complying with the General Assembly's desire for the liberation of all peoples were decisive factors.

55. In view of those considerations, he would vote in favour of the second USSR amendment but would be unable to support the first.

56. Mr. THOM (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, said that paragraph 40 represented an agreed conclusion and, so to speak, a summing-up of the whole report. It had been drafted after considerable discussion and was a compromise between the views of the administering and non-administering members. His delegation's decision to vote against the USSR amendments was due solely to its reluctance to abandon a carefully worded compromise which represented what most of the members of the Council thought best for the Trust Territory.

57. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation would be obliged to oppose the amendments put forward by the USSR delegation. Firstly, as the United Kingdom representative had said, they would destroy the balance of the paragraph, which had been the result of careful negotiation and compromise. Secondly, he considered that the average individual who was not skilled at legal interpretation or familiar with United Nations terminology might interpret the amendments as being quite inconsistent with the remainder of the report. For example, the phrase "the Council further recommends that the Administering Authority should prepare ... a plan for immediate measures to transfer all power to the people of the Trust Territory" might give the impression that the Council was in favour of the Administering Authority's actual transferring all power to the indigenous people of New Guinea within, say, a year. He felt confident that that was not the view of the great majority of the members of the Council. The paragraph also referred to the "freely expressed wish and desire" of the people. He failed to see how that could be ascertained in an area where, as the Council knew, it would be at least two years before administrative control could be extended to the entire Territory. The members of the Council might be able to interpret the proposed wording so as to be consistent with the other decisions and recommendations they had made, but the language in question was likely to be misinterpreted by the ordinary reader and, moreover, could be quoted out of context and used to indicate an opinion on the part of the Council which he was convinced the Council did not hold.

58. Furthermore, as he had said before in the Council (1139th meeting), and also in the Fourth Committee, the word "independence" as used in the United Nations included the concept of self-government in association with another Power. It might well be that New Guinea would finally choose some form of association with the Government of Australia under full self-government. There were a number of ways in which independence could be achieved, but the proposed paragraph might be represented as meaning that the Council had in some way decided that the future of New Guinea must be separate independence.

59. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he disagreed with the two USSR amendments. The Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples did not supersede the United Nations Charter or the Trusteeship Agreements but was merely complementary to them. Member States should certainly be guided by that Declaration but, as the Bolivian representative had said, they should also bear in mind the specific political, economic and social conditions in each Territory; that was clearly stated in the Charter itself.

60. His delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 3 of the annex to document T/L.1023, which welcomed the Administering Authority's plan to extend full administrative control over the entire Territory by the end of 1963. It would therefore be illogical in the same document to call upon the Administering Authority to prepare a plan for the transfer of powers to a population who were not even under the Administering Authority's control. In the circumstances, it would be preferable to let the text prepared by the Drafting Committee stand.

61. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the Bolivian representative's statement, said that the second USSR amendment simply reproduced operative parative paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and applied it to the Trust Territory of New Guinea. He had understood the Bolivian representative to say that, while he would vote in favour of the second USSR amendment, he had reservations, on legal grounds, concerning the first amendment. In so far as the General Assembly was concerned, a precedent for the course of action advocated in the USSR amendment was to be found in resolution 1413 (XIV), operative paragraph 1 of which requested the Administering Authorities to propose time-tables and targets for the attainment of independence by the Trust Territories of Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi in the near future. He did not think that there was anything to prevent the Trusteeship Council from adopting a similar recommendation, since both the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements were concerned with securing the early attainment of independence or self-government by the Trust Territories.

62. With reference to the United States representative's statement, he could not agree that the average person was likely to misinterpret the USSR amendment; on the contrary, the man in the street would have a clear understanding of those amendments just as he had of General Assembly resolutions. The same could not be said of the colonial Powers. He appreciated the fact that the United States delegation, which had not voted in favour of the Declaration, would vote against the application of its operative paragraph 5 to New Guinea. Despite its assurances that it was not

opposed to the principles embodied in the Declaration, the United States delegation had always engaged in manoeuvres designed to frustrate the practical implementation of the Declaration and had found reasons why it should not be applied to individual Territories. By contrast the purpose of the USSR amendment was to ensure the implementation of the Declaration.

63. He felt that the delegations which had supported the Declaration in the General Assembly would be able to vote in favour of the USSR amendments without any reservations; the other delegations would naturally vote against them.

64. Mr. HOOD (Australia) feared that if the USSR amendments were accepted the Trusteeship Council would be venturing into the field of decision concerning the independence of peoples and possibly going beyond its functions, which were those of the supervision, and not the control, of administration. Ultimate decisions of policy rested with the Administering Authorities concerned. The Trusteeship Council should not seek to impose on an Administering Authority an injunction such as that in the USSR amendment.

65. His country's intentions in New Guinea were clear and were fully in accord with the terms of the United Nations Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Drafting Committee apparently thought so too, and he felt that its text should be left as it stood.

66. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that his reservations with regard to the first USSR amendment (T/L.1024) arose from the fact that he was not clear about the way in which General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) affected the Administering Authority in the light of Article 80 of the Charter and of the Administering Authority's obligations arising out of the particular circumstances of the situation prevailing in each Territory.

67. In so far as the second USSR amendment was concerned, he interpreted it to mean that the Administering Authority should submit such a plan forthwith and indicate that it would be implemented within a given number of years.

68. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), he could not support the first USSR amendment. The strict application of the provisions of the resolution would not be to the advantage of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories whose people were not yet capable of exercising their rights to self-determination and independence. The resolution should be implemented in the light of the United Nations Charter. The first step should be to ensure that the necessary conditions for independence or self-government were present. The setting of target dates would not in itself lead to an improvement in the situation of a Territory or its people. It would be better for the Administering Authority to accelerate the process of the Territory's advancement so as to enable the people of New Guinea, at an early date, to discuss their future with the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council. Indeed, were the Council to accept the first USSR amendment it might even be arrogating to itself a right which should belong to the people of the Trust Territory, since the Council did not know whether those people would be in a position to accept any particular date it might select for them.

69. With regard to the second USSR amendment, he wondered whether the people of the Trust Territory were as yet capable of exercising their right to self-determination. In the light of the criticism in the Council of the situation in New Guinea, it was hard to speak of the "freely expressed wish and desire" of the people of the Territory.

70. Mr. KIANG (China) said that the measures outlined in the USSR amendments could not be applied in New Guinea because the necessary conditions were not present. He was convinced that the members of the next Visiting Mission to New Guinea would find that the Territory was not ready for the course advocated in those amendments.

71. The Council should remember its own conclusions and recommendations on the subject at the twenty-sixth session, when it had invited the Administering Authority to formulate early successive intermediate targets and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational development in New Guinea so as to create, as soon as possible, favourable conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence (A/4404, p. 148). Those conclusions and recommendations were in line with Article 76 b of the Charter, particularly with the phrase "and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples". Furthermore, the Council should bear in mind that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) could not supersede the Charter.

72. For all the foregoing reasons he could not accept either of the USSR amendments.

73. The PRESIDENT put the first USSR amendment (T/L.1024) to the vote.

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

74. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that when the report of the Trusteeship Council was discussed in the General Assembly at its sixteenth session, the delegations would certainly wish to know the way in which the members of the Council had voted on a question concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Since the second USSR amendment reiterated word for word

operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration, he would like the vote on it to be taken by roll-call.

75. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that he hoped the members of the Council would bear in mind the fact that a proposal to the effect that the Administering Authority should submit to the Council a plan for immediate measures to transfer all powers to the people of New Guinea was not one which was agreeable to the Administering Authority.

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.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Bolivia, Burma, India.

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

Abstaining: China, Paraguay.

The second USSR amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

76. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that paragraph 40 of the annex to document T/L.1023 merely referred to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). He proposed that the title of the resolution, namely, Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, should be quoted in full; in that way the average reader would know which resolution was being referred to.

77. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) and Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) agreed.

The USSR amendment was adopted.

78. The PRESIDENT put paragraph 40, as amended, to the vote.

Paragraph 40, as amended, was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation in paragraph 5 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1023) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.