



**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL**  
*Thirty-second Session*  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

*Monday, 28 June 1965,*  
*at 3.20 p.m.*

**NEW YORK**

**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda items 4 and 6:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis-</i> <i>tering Authorities on the administration of</i> <i>Trust Territories for the year ended 30</i> <i>June 1964:</i>	
<i>(c) New Guinea (concluded)</i>	
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission</i> <i>to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New</i> <i>Guinea, 1965:</i>	
<i>(b) New Guinea (concluded)</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on New</i> <i>Guinea (concluded) . . . . .</i>	<i>175</i>
<i>Consideration of draft resolution T/L.1095 . . . . .</i>	<i>178</i>
 <i>Agenda item 6:</i>	
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission</i> <i>to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New</i> <i>Guinea, 1965 . . . . .</i>	<i>179</i>
 <i>Agenda item 11:</i>	
<i>Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Coun-</i> <i>cil to the Security Council . . . . .</i>	<i>181</i>

*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 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, T/L.1099 and Corr.1, T/L.1095) (concluded)

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) (concluded)

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NEW GUINEA (T/L.1099 AND CORR.1, T/L.1102) (concluded)

1. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France), explaining his vote at the previous meeting on paragraph 14 of the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1099 and Corr.1) and on the USSR amendment to that paragraph (T/L.1102 para.9), noted that paragraph 14 was related

to paragraphs 285 to 292 of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965 (T/1635 and Add.1), which cited several cases of racial discrimination, all of which he had borne in mind when voting in favour of paragraph 14. With regard to the USSR amendment, the French delegation preferred to abide by the conclusions on the Public Service in paragraphs 247 to 249 of the Visiting Mission's report; moreover, it supported the views expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and New Zealand at the previous meeting. For those reasons, it had been unable to vote in favour of the amendment, but it had abstained in the vote, in order to show the importance it attached to the problem.

2. His delegation noted that the question of the wages paid to workers other than those employed in the Public Service was dealt with in paragraph 15 of the annex to the report.

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of the report (T/L.1099 and Corr.1), beginning with paragraph 18, which had been redrafted to read:

"The Council expresses the hope that, in accordance with the observations of the World Health Organization (T/1642), opportunities will be provided for indigenous inhabitants to study medicine at the university level to enable them to become fully qualified doctors and thus to assist in the control of the health problems of the Territory."

*Paragraph 18, as redrafted, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 19, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

4. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) asked for a separate vote on the last sentence of paragraph 20.

*The first two sentences of paragraph 20 were adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The last sentence of paragraph 20 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

5. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) explained that he had abstained on the last sentence of paragraph 20 because it went further than the recommendation of the Visiting Mission (T/1635 and Add.1, para. 343) that the Australian Government should examine the possibility of obtaining assistance from UNESCO. It seemed better to leave it to the Australian Government to examine the possibility rather than to make a firm recommendation.

*Paragraph 20 as a whole was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

6. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the USSR amendment (T/L.1102, para.10) proposing two new paragraphs for insertion after paragraph 20.

7. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) proposed that the first paragraph of the USSR text should be redrafted to read: "The Council notes with regret that the Administering Authority has not permitted the inhabitants of the Territory to take advantage of opportunities ...".

8. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that neither the USSR text nor the version proposed by the Liberian representative was correct. The Administering Authority had not been called upon to permit or not to permit the people of the Territory to accept scholarships; there had been no applications from the people for scholarships.

*The Liberian sub-amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

*The USSR amendment (T/L.1102, para. 9) was rejected by 5 votes to 1.*

9. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted against the USSR amendment since he had heard that it was not in accordance with the facts.

10. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the vote just taken confirmed his delegation's view that the Administering Authority was afraid to allow New Guineans to leave the country and escape its authority and to allow the House of Assembly to take decisions on the inhabitants' participation in the United Nations scholarship programme. On the one hand, New Guineans were not allowed to benefit from United Nations scholarships and, on the other hand, higher education in the Territory itself remained a dream since the university was still only in the planning stage.

11. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) gave examples of cases of New Guineans who had travelled abroad, in one instance to the Soviet Union. His Government had no desire to prevent such travel.

12. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Australian representative had refrained from commenting on the second paragraph of the USSR amendment to the effect that the House of Assembly should decide the matter under discussion. The attitude of the Australian delegation reflected the basic policy of the Administering Authority on the matter and on the question of the powers of the House of Assembly. It seemed that it had not sufficient confidence in the House of Assembly to entrust to it a decision on whether inhabitants of the Territory could take up United Nations scholarships.

13. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that the House of Assembly was a legislative body, which was not required to decide administrative matters of that kind.

14. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) wished to submit an amendment to paragraph 21 (T/L.1099 and Corr.1, annex). In view of the desire of the New Guineans to decide for themselves when and how they would exercise self-determination, the statement that their right to self-determination should be exercised "in the near future" might not be acceptable to them. In addition, it should be specified that the right to

self-determination included the right to independence. He therefore proposed that the end of the paragraph should be redrafted to read: "... with a view to enabling the people of the Territory to exercise at a time acceptable to them their right to self-determination, which includes the right to independence, and recommends that the United Nations Information Centre at Port Moresby review its activities with a view to making them more effective."

15. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States amendment was typical of the new phraseology which had recently been appearing in certain Council documents. Its aim was to enable the colonial Powers to annex Trust Territories. The principal organs of the United Nations, including the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, spoke always of the right to self-determination and independence. It was only in the Trusteeship Council that statements were directed against those principles and that certain members hankered for bygone days which would never return.

16. He would vote against the United States amendment.

17. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) thought that it was eminently desirable to inform the people of New Guinea that they could exercise their right to self-determination at a time acceptable to them. It was known that they had some questions on that matter and had expressed a desire to determine the timing themselves. Furthermore, he did not see why it should not be made clear that the New Guineans had a right to independence as part of self-determination. Self-determination meant, of course, that the people made up their own minds.

18. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the colonial Powers were trying to use the United Nations Information Centre at Port Moresby to serve their aim of annexing the Trust Territories. Such a practice was contrary to the principles proclaimed in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

*The United States amendment to paragraph 21 was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 21, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

19. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), referring to the USSR amendment (T/L.1102, para.11) proposing a new paragraph for insertion before paragraph 22, emphasized that the people of the Territory knew that they had the right to self-Determination and independence and, when they saw fit, would set a date, in conjunction with the Administering Authority, for the exercise of that right. It was not for the Council or any other organ of the United Nations to try to force a time-limit on those people.

20. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the situation in the Territory was well known. Even if the House of Assembly fixed a date for the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence, the Australian Government would have six months in which to consider that decision and veto it.

No positive solution could be expected because the Administering Authority was not interested in respecting the interests and demands of the indigenous inhabitants.

*The USSR amendment (T/L.1102, para. 11) was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

21. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found it most significant that only Administering Authorities had voted against the USSR amendment.

22. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) proposed that, in order to bring the text of paragraph 22 (T/L.1099 and Corr.1, annex) into line with other conclusions adopted by the Council in recent years, the following words should be added at the end of the paragraph: "bearing in mind also General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960".

23. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the colonial Powers were using resolution 1541 (XV) to delay the independence of the colonial peoples. The Special Committee had resisted all attempts to force a reference to that resolution into its recommendations except in one case, when a reference to resolution 1541 (XV) had remained in the text of its report through an oversight as the expression of the view of certain members of the Special Committee—the colonial Powers. That resolution related solely to Non-Self-Governing Territories and had no relevance whatever to Trust Territories. By insisting on the inclusion of a reference to resolution 1541 (XV), the colonial Powers were further compromising the Trusteeship Council in the eyes of the United Nations and the whole world.

24. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that at earlier meetings he had explained the relevance of resolution 1541 (XV) to the Territories under discussion. The USSR representative was inconsistent. On the one hand he stressed that the resolution related to Non-Self-Governing Territories; on the other he claimed that the Special Committee had included a reference to it in its report by mistake. Yet the reference had been included in a general statement of conclusions applying to a group of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Caribbean area (A/5800/Add.7, chap. XXV, para. 310). Nor had it been included by mistake; a vote had been taken on it. He wished to assure the representative of an imperialist Power who had just spoken that the United States delegation believed that the various alternatives should be open to all peoples and not only to those of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

25. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) urged the Council to concentrate on the question of whether or not to include a reference to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), which embodied some excellent principles.

26. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Council should have time to study the report of the Special Committee to which he had referred. He therefore moved the suspension of the meeting.

*The motion was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.*

*The United States amendment to paragraph 22 was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 22, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

27. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that he would vote in favour of paragraph 23 if his understanding of the last phrase was correct. He understood the phrase "should keep them aware of the decisions they are to make in regard to their future" to mean that the people should be kept aware of the decisions they faced in regard to their future and not that they should be told what decisions to make.

28. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom), speaking as a member of the Drafting Committee, confirmed that understanding.

*Paragraph 23 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

29. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America), referring to paragraph 24, said that all administrative functions would of course be transferred at the time of independence. The paragraph presumably meant that the Administering Authority should proceed with the transfer of as many administrative functions as possible. He therefore proposed that the words "in the transfer of all administrative functions" should be replaced by the words "increasingly to place New Guineans in administrative functions".

30. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that the United States amendment seemed to be very important and he wondered whether it should not have been circulated twenty-four hours in advance of its consideration.

31. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that on past occasions the United States delegation had asked the USSR delegation to submit its amendments in advance. If any delegation was obstructing and disrupting the work of the Council it was the delegation of the United States, which should co-operate in applying the rules of procedure of the Council.

32. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he saw little justification for raising that point in regard to an amendment proposed by any delegation at the present stage, when in order to expedite the work of the Council the procedure in question had been followed for the last two days.

33. With regard to the amendment itself, it seemed to him that it expressed what paragraph 29 had been meant to express. As it stood, that paragraph was not at all clear: if it meant that the Administering Authority was to hand over every post in the Administration to New Guineans or Papuans forthwith, it was manifestly impracticable.

34. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise that the Australian representative had allowed nearly a week to elapse since the submission of the report before saying that he did not understand certain of the recommendations.

35. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that he had notified the Council on the previous Friday (1265th meeting) that he would have some brief amendments to put forward but that it had been suggested then that he make them when the paragraphs in question were reached. Moreover, it was still his position that, whereas the twenty-four-hour rule should be invoked in the case of lengthy amendments, brief

amendments might be submitted and acted upon as each paragraph was considered. That indeed had been the procedure at the last few meetings. The delegations of the Soviet Union and of Liberia, as well as his own, had submitted amendments which were then acted on at the same meeting.

36. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out, firstly, that rule 57 said nothing about the brevity or otherwise of resolutions or amendments, and, secondly, that the United States representative's statement was refuted by the fact that the amendments introduced by the French representative at the 1264th meeting, although very brief, had been submitted in writing in document T/L.1101.

37. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) suggested that, instead of the United States amendment, the word "progressive" might be inserted before the word "transfer" in paragraph 24.

38. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom), speaking as a member of the Drafting Committee, said that that would convey the exact sense the paragraph had been intended to have.

39. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that he gladly accepted the Chinese suggestion and would withdraw his own amendment. He would like to add, in explanation of the vote he would cast, that "the progressive transfer of all administrative functions" meant, to his delegation, that it would be completed only upon the final emergence of the Territory from dependent status.

*The Chinese amendment was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 24, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 25 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

40. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) asked for a separate vote on the last sentence of paragraph 26.

41. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation was at a loss to understand the purpose of the recommendation in that last sentence. The people of New Guinea knew that Papua and New Guinea were administered in an administrative union through joint organs, including the House of Assembly, to which representatives from both Territories were elected, and it had been clearly understood for years that, subject to the wishes of the people themselves, a common political future was envisaged for the two Territories.

*The first sentence of paragraph 26 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The second sentence of paragraph 26 was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 26 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

42. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had found that there had been no hesitation on the part of the Administering Authority to reiterate again and again its intentions with respect to Papua and New Guinea.

He had therefore asked for a separate vote on the second sentence and had abstained in the vote on that sentence. He had, however, considered the paragraph as a whole good and had therefore supported it.

43. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1099 and Corr.1).

*The recommendation in paragraph 4 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The recommendation in paragraph 5 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

44. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the work of the Drafting Committee. His delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 5 because it supported the conclusions and recommendations as a whole, but it wished to place on record the fact that it had abstained in the vote on several of the paragraphs.

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION T/L.1095

45. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation (T/L.1095).

46. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was incomplete and incorrect. The process of developing the necessary steps to transfer all powers to the people of the Territory was a continuing one and was well under way. The latest move had been the creation of the House of Assembly, the common roll, the election of an indigenous majority and so forth. He would point out, moreover, that paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which was referred to in the preambular paragraph in question, included the phrase "in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire". The freely expressed will and desire of the people had been made quite manifest to the Visiting Mission, as was borne out by its report (T/1635 and Add.1).

47. With regard to the last preambular paragraph, he would merely point out that the powers of the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea were not extremely limited and that it was not correct to state that "legislative and executive authority over the Territory continues to rest with the Administering Authority". He would not go over the many points that had already been fully discussed in the Council but would point out, in passing, that in the third preambular paragraph there was no mention of the Trusteeship Agreement, which was a basic document in relation to the Territory.

48. His remarks applied also to operative paragraph 2 and part of operative paragraph 3. With regard to the last part of paragraph 3, calling for the repeal of the so-called "discriminatory clauses of electoral ordinances providing for special and official seats in the House of Assembly for Australian citizens", he would point out that the situation had been made quite clear to the Council by the leader of the elected representatives of the indigenous majority in the House of Assembly.

49. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) asked for separate votes on the penultimate preambular paragraph and operative

paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. In the case of the former, his delegation realized that the Administering Authority had taken some steps to transfer power to the people and had established the House of Assembly. With regard to operative paragraph 3, his delegation recalled that Mr. Guise had told the Council at the 1252nd meeting that it had been the express wish of the people of Papua and New Guinea that provision should be made for special and official seats.

50. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) said that France's position with regard to the evolution of Trust Territories was well known. Basing itself on the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreements, France held that the people concerned had the right of self-determination and that their freely expressed aspirations should be taken into consideration with regard to the exercise of that right, which led to full self-government or independence. It was the duty of the Administering Authority, which had the primary responsibility zealously to promote the development and advancement of the people so that the objectives of the Trusteeship System might be attained without undue delay and in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants.

51. The report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1099 and Corr.1), which to a great extent reflected the recommendations of the Visiting Mission, seemed to his delegation to be consistent with the principles he had set forth and in keeping with the special conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. The Council, having adopted the conclusions and recommendations proposed in that report, had fulfilled its duty of ensuring that relations between the Administering Authority and those it administered were harmonious and of encouraging and ensuring the evolution of the Territory.

52. The USSR draft resolution put forth certain considerations and used certain terms which were not in keeping with the views that he had just stated. It made judgements and proposed solutions which, in the French delegation's opinion, did not correspond to the situation in New Guinea as described to the Council and did not represent the most appropriate means of improving, where necessary, the conditions at present prevailing in the Territory. Hence, while it fully endorsed the principle of self-determination reaffirmed in the USSR draft resolution, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the draft.

53. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, too, found it difficult to accept the draft resolution. It included certain recommendations and expressions of opinion which had already been dealt with in the discussion of the report. Moreover, it seemed to his delegation that the Administering Authority must retain the ultimate powers for so long as it held the Territory in trust for the United Nations. The draft resolution made no mention of the Trusteeship Agreement, nor did its language concord with the language of the Charter. As for its calling upon the Administering Authority to "implement without delay" certain provisions, it had always been the view of his delegation that it lay with the people themselves to make such decisions.

54. His delegation would therefore be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

55. Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom. His delegation, too, would be unable to support the draft resolution.

56. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution (T/L.1095). In accordance with the Liberian representative's request, separate votes would be taken on the penultimate preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

*The first four preambular paragraphs were adopted by 3 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*The fifth preambular paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 1.*

*The sixth preambular paragraph was rejected by 5 votes to 2.*

*Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was rejected by 5 votes to 1.*

*Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

57. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that his delegation had not taken part in the vote on operative paragraph 1 because it did not think that the right to self-determination and independence should be phrased as it was in that paragraph, which was not in accordance with the terminology used in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

58. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America), explaining his vote, said that in the opinion of his delegation, the USSR draft resolution had been an attempt to replace, or at least add to, the report that the Council had adopted. Although there were some laudable points in the draft resolution, there were also attempts to change the meaning of the report adopted by the Council. His delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution in order to show its full support for the report already adopted.

59. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the United States representative that the USSR draft resolution had been submitted more than a week before the report of the drafting Committee had been submitted. He failed to see how a draft resolution could try to replace something that had not been in existence at the time the draft resolution had been drawn up.

#### AGENDA ITEM 6

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965 (T/1635 and Add.1, T/1636 and Corr.1, T/L.1103)

60. Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand), introducing his delegation's draft resolution on the reports of the Visiting Mission (T/L.1103), said that the expression of appreciation of the work of the Visiting Mission was no less sincere for being customary. The Council had reason to be grateful to the Visiting Mission for the way in which it had carried out its extremely arduous task. The comprehensiveness and clarity of the reports

(T/1635 and Add.1, T/1636 and Corr.1) and the sympathy and wisdom which pervaded the recommendations in the reports were the measure of the Mission's achievements. Both reports developed and complemented the reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962, and the four members of the Mission had made a valuable contribution to the debate in the Council by centring it on key issues.

61. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that the following phrase should be added at the end of the second preambular paragraph: "including the replies by the representatives of the Nauruan people to questions put to them by members of the Council". She also proposed the insertion of the following new operative paragraph after paragraph 2:

"Further take note of the observations of the representatives of Australia, including the observations made by the representatives of the Nauruan people regarding the future of the Trust Territory of Nauru."

62. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that in the discussions regarding the status of the representatives of the Nauruan people it had been pointed out that they were members of the Australian delegation. The Liberian representative's point might be met by rewording the whole of the second preambular paragraph to read:

"Having heard the oral observations made by the representatives of the Nauruan people serving on the Australian delegation and the representatives of Australia concerning the said reports."

63. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the purpose of the draft resolution was to express the Council's appreciation of the work done by the Visiting Mission, which had visited not only Nauru but New Guinea. It would therefore be invidious to mention the people of only one of the Territories; he wondered whether the Liberian representative would wish to insert a reference to the representatives of the people of New Guinea also.

64. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the wording she had proposed for the second preambular paragraph recognized the fact that the representatives of the Nauruan people were members of the Australian delegation, for it read "the representatives of Australia... including... the representatives of the Nauruan people".

65. The point raised by the United Kingdom representative was sound. She had no objection to including a reference to the people of New Guinea also, but she would have preferred separate draft resolutions, one on each of the two Territories.

66. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that the idea behind the Liberian representative's amendment was excellent. In view of the fact that the Nauruan and New Guinean leaders had been included in the Australian delegation, it would be sufficient merely to insert the words "including the New Guinean and Nauruan representatives" after the words "representatives of Australia" in the second preambular paragraph.

67. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she was not sure that that formulation was correct, for she did not think that the representatives of Nauru had made observations regarding the report; they had merely replied to the questions put to them by members of the Council.

68. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) supported the Chinese amendment, which appeared to meet the points raised by the Liberian representative.

69. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what observations the Nauruan and New Guinean representatives had made on the reports; to the best of his recollection, they had been polite enough not to express any opinion. The Liberian representative's proposal was perfectly correct, in that it related, not to observations made by the Nauruan representatives on the report of the Visiting Mission, but to the replies they had given to the questions put to them.

70. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) replied that, if the Nauruan and New Guinean representatives had made no direct comments on the reports, they had made observations concerning them.

71. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) wondered whether it was necessary to include the second preambular paragraph in a draft resolution which was concerned with noting the reports of the Visiting Mission and expressing appreciation of its work. The questions discussed during the debate had been adequately covered in the Council's report. If the Council preferred to retain that paragraph, however, he would support the wording proposed by the Chinese representative; if the paragraph was retained, the operative paragraph proposed by the Liberian representative seemed unnecessary.

72. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she had no objection to the deletion of the second preambular paragraph if the draft resolution was intended exclusively to convey the Council's appreciation to the Visiting Mission.

73. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) formally proposed the deletion of the second preambular paragraph.

74. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that he thought the omission of such a paragraph would conflict with past practice. The Secretary of the Council could perhaps say whether that was so.

75. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that past resolutions had always included such a paragraph.

76. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that, past practice notwithstanding, it might be wiser to omit the paragraph in question from the present draft resolution and thereby avoid the objections that had been expressed.

77. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) disagreed. Regardless of the question whether the participation of the Nauruan and New Guinean representatives should be reflected in the draft resolution, he still opposed the deletion of that paragraph.

78. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR's position on the draft resolution was very clear. When the Visiting Mission had been

appointed, his delegation had had reservations regarding the inclusion in it of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, the former because it was an interested party in the administration of Nauru, and the latter because, in the light of experience in the Council, the United States could hardly be expected to have an objective approach to the situation in the Territory. The Trusteeship Council had never respected the principle that all its members should participate in visiting missions, and the colonial Powers had done everything possible to prevent the USSR from taking any part in them. He wished to reaffirm his delegation's position on the matter.

79. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she would not press her amendments provided that the point she had made was adequately covered in the report.

80. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) suggested that it would be more logical to defer consideration of the draft resolution until the Council had formulated its conclusions and recommendations regarding Nauru.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 11

Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council (T/L.1100)

81. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the words "paying particular attention to the facts enumerated in the petition" should be added after the words "in the Trust Territory" in the first sentence of paragraph 9 of the draft report (T/L.1100), in order to reflect more accurately the wording of the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1093). Secondly, he suggested that the word "grievances" should be used in place of the word "allegations" in the last sentence of paragraph 9, since the word "allegations" seemed to cast doubt on the accuracy of the petition. Lastly, he thought that it would be necessary to have a section, immediately after paragraph 9, giving the views of individual members on the matter.

82. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom) said that, if the first amendment suggested by the Soviet Union representative was acceptable to the Council, he would like to request also the addition of the words "recalling the grievance of the petitioners and" after the words "a draft resolution (T/L.1094)" in the third sentence of paragraph 9.

83. Perhaps the word "complaints" could be used in place of the word "allegations" in the last sentence.

84. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that his delegation had no objection to that wording, or to the first amendment suggested by the Soviet Union delegation. With regard to the request that the observations of individual members should be included, he pointed out that the normal procedure of the Council was to include observations in a special section of the report rather than scattering them throughout the report; his delegation would oppose any change in that procedure.

85. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the usual form in which the Council's report was drafted was unsatisfactory since it did not provide for the views of delegations to be recorded on all matters discussed in the Council. Apparently

the United States representative was afraid of allowing the Soviet Union delegation's position to be stated in the section of the report now under discussion.

86. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had waived a rule in order to make it possible for the petition to be discussed. The views of the Soviet Union delegation on the subject were already set out in the draft summary of observations<sup>1</sup> and the Soviet Union representative was at liberty to request that the summary of his observations should be amplified, as were other members.

87. In reply to a question from Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom), Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that past reports had not included any section in part I giving the individual opinions of delegations.

88. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that, in the past, observations of individual members had been recorded after each of the sections of part II.

89. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the amendments proposed to the draft report (T/L.1100).

90. He suggested, in the light of the observations made, that the Council should adopt the additions to paragraph 9 proposed by the USSR and United Kingdom representatives and that the word "allegations" should be replaced by "complaints".

*It was so decided.*

91. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal that a paragraph mentioning the views of individual members with regard to the petition should be added at the end of part I.

*There was 1 vote in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.*

*After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.*

*The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 2 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

92. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) wondered whether, in the report submitted to the Security Council, there was normally a chapter entitled "Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in the Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". She recalled that the Council had decided at its 1257th meeting to annex to its reports the statement made by the Secretary-General at the opening meeting.

93. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that no such chapter was included in the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council, though such a chapter appeared in its report to the General Assembly. In view of the proposal adopted at the 1257th meeting, the Secretariat proposed to annex the Secretary-General's statement to the reports of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

94. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thought that, in the light of that explanation, it might perhaps be wise at some

<sup>1</sup>/ Document circulated to members of the Council only.



subsequent time to consider revising the form in which the Council's reports were presented.

95. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought it strange that not all the points on the agenda were reflected in the report to the Security Council, although they were reflected in the report to the General Assembly on the other two Trust Territories. Clearly the item referred to by the Liberian representative was as relevant to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as it was to New Guinea and Nauru. He wished to reserve his delegation's position on the question.

96. The PRESIDENT recalled that, at the 1262nd and 1263rd meetings, the Council had adopted its con-

clusions and recommendations relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The section recording individual opinions of members would be incorporated when the Secretariat had received the relevant texts. With that understanding, he would ask the Council to vote on the draft report (T/L.1100) as a whole.

97. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that delegations should be allowed to submit corrections to the draft summary of individual observations both while the Council was in session and after the conclusion of the session.

*The draft report (T/L.1100), as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.