



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Thirty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 9 June 1965,
 at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

Agenda items 4 and 5:
Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:
 (a) *Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)*
Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)
General debate (continued) 59

Agenda items 4 and 6:
Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:
 (c) *New Guinea (continued)*
Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:
 (b) *New Guinea (continued)*
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and the special representative of the Administering Authority and of the advisers to the special representative 60

1. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he would refer only to those matters which he considered to be of fundamental importance to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

2. With respect to all matters concerning that Territory, the Council was greatly indebted to the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964, whose report (T/1620) constituted at all times the background to the discussions and formed a most valuable source of information.

3. That report made particular reference to the vastness of the area under consideration. The fact that its inhabitants were islanders, and thus to some extent cut off from the rest of the world, explained in great measure the outlook of the population. The economy of the Territory was based on the production of coconuts, which provided not only food but also shelter and clothing. The islands were supremely adapted to such an economy, and, as a result, diversification was all the more difficult. In many ways the "coconut economy" was an all-pervasive one. Furthermore, the great distances and the remoteness from the rest of the world were basic factors which no political theory could eradicate.

4. Australia did not consider that there could be good government in those areas without such a degree of balanced economic, social and political development as would enable the islands to become complementary to one another for the greatest good of the people concerned. That did not mean that it was necessary to reach a perfect balance before the inhabitants were able to take any decision on the question of self-government, but merely that it was not possible to force the pace in one field at the expense of others. In his replies to questions put by the Australian delegation at the 1248th meeting, Mr. Olter, while making clear his desire for the eventual independence of the Territory, had expressed the same view.

5. In the economic field, the islands had not yet reached a degree of development in any way comparable with modern standards in the outside world. The Administering Authority did not deny that. The most important thing, however, was that it was aware of the problem and was trying to deal with it; in some cases, perhaps, it might draw on outside help, for example, that of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

6. In the social field, and particularly with reference to education, the 1964 Visiting Mission had stressed the need for a new and dynamic policy. At the previous session, the special representative had affirmed that such a policy was basic to the plans for accelerated development prepared by the Administering

President: Mr. André NAUDY (France).

Present:

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

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

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(a) *Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1633, T/1638, T/L.1089 and Add.1) (continued)*

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (T/PET.10/L.8, T/PET.10/L.9 and Corr.1) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Goding, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took a place at the Council table.

Authority. He had cited facts and figures in support of that affirmation, which had been confirmed by the UNESCO representative in his statement at the previous meeting. That did not mean that the situation was yet anywhere near the ideal, and much remained to be done. Again, the problem had to be looked at from the point of view of quality as well as quantity. It was easy enough to build new schools, but it was not so easy to reach a stage in education which more advanced countries had taken very many years to achieve, in the face of great difficulties.

7. It might possibly be desirable to establish a junior college in the area, although the lack of an institution of that kind would not have the effect of retarding educational development in the immediate future. The inhabitants of the Territory already had open to them excellent institutions in Guam and in Hawaii, and he was inclined to think that in those circumstances it would be preferable to concentrate all efforts on the development of primary and secondary education.

8. Turning to the question of the political development of the Territory, he said that his delegation had noted with interest Order No. 2882 of the United States Department of the Interior concerning the powers and functions of the Congress of Micronesia. The very fact that that Order had been promulgated was of the greatest significance, since the Territory now had a legislature which had been elected on the basis of adult franchise and was supported by a tested structure of local government. The Administering Authority was thus proceeding step by step, and the progress which might be achieved in that way was more important than the shortcomings which might appear to exist in the system that had been chosen. Any process of development inevitably entailed shortcomings, and it was now the task of the Administering Authority to eliminate progressively those which existed in the present case.

9. It would also be for the elected representatives, in the light of their increasing experience in legislation, to determine the appropriate means of solving the problems arising in the Territory, including the problems of the changing forms of the legislature itself. Section 3 of Order No. 2882 determined the limits of the legislative powers of the Congress of Micronesia. His delegation considered that those limitations were necessary at the present time, for the United States would be scarcely able to discharge its responsibility to the United Nations in respect of the Territory if it did not retain some degree of power. That power would no doubt be totally abrogated only at the moment when independence was achieved. That time had not yet arrived, however, and the people of the Territory themselves recognized the fact. It was none the less true that the Administering Authority should agree to a progressive transfer of the powers it had retained; the Congress of Micronesia would henceforth be able to make known the wishes of the people in that regard.

10. His delegation had also noted with great interest the sections of the Order relating to finance and the budget; those were very difficult matters to cope with in a Territory which was dependent on the Administering Authority for the larger part of its revenue.

In Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea, Australia left the appropriation of the whole of the revenue to the parliament of the Territory. His delegation expressed the hope that the United States would give full consideration to that matter.

11. Referring to the representatives in the parliament of the Territory, he said that in the Territories administered by his country, it had been decided that public servants, upon election to parliament, should resign their posts. The dangers inherent in the opposite situation had not escaped the attention of the United States, as could be noted in section 11 of Order No. 2882. The United States authorities did not seem to have defined their precise attitude in the matter, however, and it would be interesting to know what the views of the elected members of the Congress of Micronesia were in that connexion. At the previous meeting, the representative of Liberia had made some very pertinent observations on the minimum age of eligibility for election as a member of Congress. It was to be hoped that the Administering Authority and the Congress of Micronesia would also find an opportunity to consider that matter.

12. His delegation was likewise pleased with the provisions of section 8 of the Order, which excluded every possibility of unreasonable restrictions on the right to vote and particularly any discrimination based upon literacy. The expression of the principles on which those provisions were based was much more important than the disadvantages they might involve from time to time.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(c) New Guinea (T/1632, T/1642, T/L.1090) (continued)*

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:

(b) New Guinea (T/1635 and Add.1) (continued)*

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY AND OF THE ADVISERS TO THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gunther, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place at the Council table.

13. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) pointed out that the Trusteeship Council, in paragraph 41 of its last report (A/5804), and the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, in paragraph 212 of the report now before the Council (T/1635 and Add.1), had both indicated that the New Guinea House of Assembly should be encouraged to set up parliamentary committees. His delegation had noted that those recommendations were already being complied with, for, as stated by the special representative, several committees already existed. He asked for some informa-

*Resumed from the 1250th meeting.

tion on the membership, powers and activities of those committees, and more particularly the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

14. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) said that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, which consisted of elected members of the House of Assembly and was a permanent institution, was charged with the task of examining the activities of departments of the Administration as far as the gathering of revenue and the expenditure in those departments was concerned. It could call for papers within the archives of the departments and report to the House of Assembly on their efficiency.

15. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) wanted to know whether, once the budget estimates had been drawn up by the Administration, the House of Assembly was entitled to modify the proposals which had been submitted to it and, if so, to what extent. He also asked whether the Administration could plan for expenditure without its first having been authorized by the House of Assembly.

16. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) said that the Administration could not spend any moneys that had not been appropriated by the House of Assembly. The Administration could, of course, plan to spend money without having any sanction from the House of Assembly, but the actual appropriations depended upon the latter. In February or March of each year, the various departments prepared statements of the funds they needed for the following year. The departmental demands were then brought together, and the total amount of the demands was compared with estimates of revenue from internal sources. In that way it was also possible to determine how much of a grant the Administration could request from the Australian Government. At that stage, the fiscal policy of the Australian Government for the ensuing year and, consequently, the level of the grant were not known. The grant therefore had to be estimated, but in fact each grant represented an increase over that of the previous year. The estimates were submitted for comments to the Administrator's Council, which consisted of seven elected members of the House of Assembly and three official members, and were then sent to the Australian Government in the form of a request for a grant. When the actual amount of the grant was known, the estimates might have to be reviewed and be resubmitted to the Administrator's Council.

17. The budget session in the House of Assembly provided an opportunity for the representatives to debate any item in the budget. The House could not ordinarily increase the amount of spending because that would require additional taxation, and the House was not able to take such steps without a message from the Administrator. That was also the traditional practice in the Parliament of Australia. On the other hand, the House could, if it wished, decrease the spending by removing an item from the budget. That would likely result in a reduction by the same amount in the grant from the Australian Government.

18. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) asked whether the House of Assembly could effect transfers of appropriations from one budget item to another and could

decide, for example, that one less hospital or one additional school would be built.

19. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) said that the House could not take money from one item and put it in another item without obtaining a message from the Administrator; it could not do so on the technical ground that if it increased spending under any one item, additional funds might be required. Of course, if a proposal for transfer was acceptable to the official members, they could ask the Administrator to send a message on that point to the House, and in that way the budget could be altered.

20. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) said that it appeared to him from section 50 of the Papua and New Guinea Act, 1963 (T/1635/Add.1, annex II) and the statements of the special representative that no decision could be taken by the House of Assembly for the appropriation of revenue unless the purpose of the appropriation had been previously recommended or approved by the Administrator.

21. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) replied that that interpretation was correct. He said that the position was the same in the Australian Parliament, where no decision for the appropriation of revenue could have the force of law unless the purpose of the appropriation had in the same session been recommended by the Governor-General.

25. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) asked the special representative whether the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly were actually more restrictive in the matter of financing than section 50 itself and whether there was any possibility of amending them.

23. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) replied that the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly embodied the provisions of the Papua and New Guinea Act and that it was the common practice in the parliaments of the British countries for the Government alone to have the right to introduce money matters. Nevertheless, the Standing Orders Committee of the House of Assembly, the majority membership of that Committee consisting of elected members, was competent to amend the Standing Orders.

24. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) said he had been interested to note that seventy bills had been submitted to the House of Assembly from the time that it had been elected. As no law could be promulgated in the Territory without having been passed by the House and as, furthermore, no bill adopted by the House could become legally binding unless it was approved by the Administrator or the Governor-General, he would like to know whether there had been many bills passed by the House which had not received the assent provided for in the Constitution. He would also like to know to what those bills referred.

25. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) said that only one bill had not received the Governor-General's assent. It related to the powers and privileges of the House of Assembly itself; the Governor-General had proposed an amendment to it which the House had accepted. Not all ordinances that had been presented to the Administrator or to the Governor-General had yet been assented to, because some of them required

a rather long examination. The great majority of them had, however, been assented to.

26. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) asked the special representative if he would give the Council some information on the work of the commission of inquiry set up to review the provisions of the Native Employment Ordinance. He asked whether in the special representative's opinion the commission would be able to bring about an increase in the minimum wage.

27. Mr. GUNTHER (Special Representative) replied that the commission of inquiry, which had been set up at the request of the New Ireland Workers' Association, consisted of six members: three members who were employers of rural labour, two of whom, moreover, were members of the House of Assembly; and three members who were employees' representatives in rural industries. The chairman was an administration official. Although the wages for rural workers were, to be sure, low, it was necessary to add to them such benefits in kind as accommodation, clothing, food, medical services and transport. If that was done, the wages of a worker would not be £ 19 13s or £ 22 15s but would be well in excess of £ 100. The commission was taking evidence widely, and some of the employers had admitted that the increase being sought was justified. It would be wrong, however, to anticipate the commission's findings.

28. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) associated himself with the thanks expressed by the President to the Australian Government, the Administration of New Guinea and the people of the Trust Territory for the warm welcome which they had accorded the Mission.

29. He said that he would like, with the agreement of the representative of Australia, to ask a few questions of Mr. Guise and Mr. Toliman, who were members of the House of Assembly.

30. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) asked the President to invite Mr. Guise and Mr. Toliman to take places at the Council table. He stressed, however, that the functions of special representative vested in Mr. Gunther.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Guise and Mr. Toliman, advisers to the special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took places at the Council table.

31. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia), rising to a point of order, asked the representative of Australia whether the Council must rely entirely on the statements made by Mr. Gunther.

32. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that he had simply wished to make clear that Mr. Gunther was the special representative of the Administering Authority and that in such capacity the main burden of making known the position of the Australian delegation rested with him.

33. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Toliman to give some details on his election campaign and to indicate whether the views of the other candidates on national or local issues had differed from his own.

34. Mr. TOLIMAN (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that he had been one of five candi-

dates in the elections in the Rabaul District, in New Britain. He was a teacher and was interested in helping his countrymen; he had spoken to the villagers, who had frequently been assembled by the village councillors, and had told them that he would protect their interests without regard to race or colour. The position of the other candidates had been the same, but the voters had preferred to elect a candidate who knew English and was therefore able to speak on their behalf.

35. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Toliman what his views were on the question of national unity.

36. Mr. TOLIMAN (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that national unity did indeed constitute a problem in a territory where 700 languages were spoken. During his campaign, he had laid particular stress on the need to promote co-operation among all the inhabitants. The schools, which brought together students from Papua and New Guinea, were certainly very instrumental in developing the feeling of national unity. After having lived together during their schooling, former fellow students were equipped to help the members of the House of Assembly to make a united nation of Papua and New Guinea.

37. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Toliman what were his duties as Under-Secretary for the Administrator's Department and what was the role of the Administrator's Council.

38. Mr. TOLIMAN (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that his office was at Headquarters, at Port Moresby, and that reports were submitted to him concerning Rabaul or other parts of the Territory, such as the highlands. He also toured the districts and was thus able to see how the Administration operated. The Administrator's Council met once a month. Its members informed the Administrator of the situation in the districts and requested his approval regarding matters chiefly concerned with land.

39. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom), recalling that the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962, in its report on New Guinea (T/1597 and Add.1), had noted a tendency to concentrate on primary education, asked Mr. Toliman how much emphasis was currently placed on primary education and on secondary and higher education.

40. Mr. TOLIMAN (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that the Government was putting more emphasis on higher education, without, however, neglecting primary education. Australian teachers were giving instruction in the primary and secondary schools in the Territory, and many primary and other schools had been built in areas where none had existed before.

41. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Guise, who represented Milne Bay in the House of Assembly, to give some details regarding the work he had done as a member of the former Select Committee on Political Development.

42. Mr. GUISE (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that the task of the Committee, which had consisted of six members and had been presided over by Mr. Gunther, had been to consult the people on the

subject of reconstituting the former Legislative Council into a new House of Assembly. The people who had appeared before the Committee had considered that increased representation was necessary and had asked that the electoral districts should be subdivided again so as to increase the number of representatives. With regard to European representation in the House, the people had been unanimously in favour of having reserved seats.

43. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) referred to Mr. Guise's campaign during the elections for the House of Assembly and asked what had been the principal points of his platform and what had been the differences between his policies and those of his opponents.

44. Mr. GUISE (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that there had been four candidates, including himself, in his district. In his platform he had advocated the expansion of education at all levels and the establishment of a university; the drafting of a constitution for Papua and New Guinea, and, when independence came, membership of the Commonwealth; the expansion of co-operative societies to ensure fuller participation by the people in the economic life of the country; the protection of land rights; an increase in the grants-in-aid given to the Christian churches for the expansion of education; the appointment of Papuans and New Guineans to public service posts; an increase in salaries; and the expansion of workers' associations.

45. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Guise to describe his duties as leader of the elected members of the House of Assembly and to give the Council some details on the more important bills that had been adopted since the election of the House.

46. Mr. GUISE (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that he was, in a sense, the leader of the elected members of the House, including the representatives of non-New Guinean communities, and that in that capacity he acted during the sittings of the House as intermediary between the elected members and the official members. However, he had no mandate to speak on important issues on behalf of the elected members.

47. The Public Service Ordinance, to which the elected members had proposed an amendment, had given rise in particular to one of the most important debates of the House.

48. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Guise whether he regarded the establishment of the House of Assembly as a step towards the attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System.

49. Mr. GUISE (Adviser to the Special Representative) thought that the present House of Assembly was indeed a step in the right direction, and that now that a select committee on a constitution had been set up steps should be taken, as a matter of priority and urgency, to bring to the attention of the people and to discuss with them the constitutional changes that would be necessary in order to attain the objectives of the Trusteeship System.

50. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had listened with interest to the information which had just been given to the

Council and that it had carefully analysed the documents relating to conditions in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, although those documents, as usual, had been issued somewhat late. He welcomed the indigenous representatives from New Guinea and assured them that his delegation kept the interests of the New Guineans and Papuans in mind in its activities in the Trusteeship Council. He asked the representative of Australia whether it had been the result of a wilful or accidental omission that neither the Administering Authority, in the part of its annual report^{1/} dealing with the setting of intermediate and target dates for the granting of independence or self-government to the Territory, nor the Australian representative himself, in his opening statement (1250th meeting), had mentioned the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which had, however, appeared in the recommendations adopted by the Council at its thirty-first session.

51. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that he had mentioned General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in his opening statement. He had not taken part in the drafting of the annual report of the Administering Authority on New Guinea, but the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement—to which the Soviet Union was a party—were the main instruments as far as that Territory was concerned.

52. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the representative of Australia's reply indicated that he was either refusing to exercise the plenipotentiary powers at his disposal or else did not wish to use them. If it was true that he represented the Administering Authority, was he not responsible for the documents which it issued concerning the Trust territory?

53. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he did not profess to know what had been in the mind of those who had drafted the Administering Authority's annual report.

54. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether that remark should be interpreted as meaning that the omission of any mention of resolution 1514 (XV) in the report in question had been accidental and should not have occurred.

55. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied in the negative. The Soviet Union representative was free to interpret his replies in any way he liked.

56. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to learn the position of the Administering Authority on paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which stated: "Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust . . . Territories . . . to transfer all powers to the peoples of those Territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to

^{1/} Commonwealth of Australia, Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations: Administration of the Territory of New Guinea, 1st July 1963-30th June 1964 (Canberra, A.J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer), Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1632).

enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom".

57. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) reminded the Council that Mr. Guise, an adviser to the special representative, had already answered that question when he had described the processes for ascertaining the freely expressed wishes of the people. Furthermore, the New Guinea Parliament had adopted a resolution on the subject, to which the special representative had referred in his opening statement (1250th meeting).

58. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Australian representative had not answered his question. He wished to learn the position of the Administering Authority on paragraph 3 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which stated: "Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence".

59. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, so far as New Guinea was concerned, that factor was not being used as a pretext. With regard to his reply to the previous question, the wishes of the people were the basis for the Administering Authority's interpretation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

60. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Australian representative's reply was merely an attempt to evade his responsibilities. He asked whether the Australian representative considered that paragraph 3 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was as applicable to New Guinea as to any other colony. More specifically, he wished to know whether inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness could be used as a pretext for delaying the grant of independence to that Territory.

61. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, in his opinion, there must be a reasonable balance among those factors. What constituted a reasonable balance was another matter. The Minister for Territories had stated in April 1965 that it was not part of the Australian Government's thinking that New Guinea must wait for self-government until it was economically viable or until it had sufficient trained people.

62. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, having read the documentation on New Guinea, he was constrained to point out that only one New Guinean had received a university education, a fact which was characteristic in terms of the Administering Authority's achievements. Nevertheless, in the Soviet delegation's opinion, nothing—not even the lack of trained leadership—should delay accession to independence. When Libya, for example, had become independent, 90 per cent of its population had been illiterate and only sixteen persons had held university degrees. That had not prevented the Libyan people from governing themselves, and his delegation was convinced that the peoples of Papua and New Guinea were equally capable of doing so.

63. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) explained that, in speaking of "sufficient trained people" he had not meant that all administrative posts should be filled

by university graduates; the university was not the only form of training. He agreed with the Soviet representative that the New Guinean people were as capable as any other people.

64. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked when, since that was the case, Papua and New Guinea would be given an opportunity to exercise the right to self-determination and independence which was guaranteed to them by the Charter and by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

65. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that Mr. Guise, the special representative's adviser, had already answered that question very clearly. The Administering Authority would act according to the wishes of the people, and those wishes were constantly being ascertained in the way Mr. Guise had described.

66. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether that reply meant that the Administering Authority had no plan of its own with regard to the development of the Territory towards the final goal of the Trusteeship System.

67. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the Administering Authority based its plans on the wishes of the people; in conformity with those wishes an instrument, part of a continuing series of instruments, had been set up by the people and for the people.

68. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether Australia, in its capacity as Administering Authority, did not consider itself bound to implement General Assembly resolutions 558 (VI), 752 (VIII), 858 (IX), 946 (X), 1064 (XI), 1207 (XII), 1274 (XIII) and 1413 (XIV).

69. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he would not attempt to answer that question, which was a deliberate attempt at provocation.

70. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took note of the Australian representative's attitude. The Soviet delegation attended the Council in order to deal seriously with serious problems. It hoped that the Administering Authorities were animated by the same spirit, even when the Soviet delegation's questions and position on the problems on the agenda were not to their liking.

71. It was regrettable that the Australian representative was unfamiliar with the resolutions he had just enumerated, even though they had been mentioned in the Council more than once. Those resolutions concerned the setting of time-limits and intermediate stages for the attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System. The General Assembly's requests in that regard were undoubtedly reasonable, as was borne out by paragraphs 8, 152 and 163 of the 1965 Visiting Mission's report (T/1635 and Add.1).

72. He then quoted paragraphs 147 to 151, concerning Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea, and paragraphs 144 and 145, of chapter XIX of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries

and Peoples (A/5800/Add.6). In those paragraphs the Special Committee had formulated some general and particular recommendations and conclusions with regard to the Territory. He asked what the Administering Authority had done, since the end of the Special Committee's session in December 1964, to give effect to those recommendations.

73. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) suggested that, in view of the way in which the Soviet Union representative had framed his question, he should read the annual report of the Administering Authority and the

report of the Visiting Mission and listen to what was said in the Council.

74. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had familiarized itself with all the documentation it had received and had attentively followed the Council's debates. It had nevertheless felt obliged to ask the question because it had not found an answer either in that documentation or in the explanations given by the representatives of the Administering Authority.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.