



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Thirty-fourth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 8 June 1967,
 at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Statement by the representative of the World Health Organization on the activities of WHO in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and New Guinea</i>	61
<i>Agenda items 4 and 10:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1966:</i>	
<i>(b) New Guinea (continued)</i>	
<i>General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI) on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded)</i>	61
<i>Appointment of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea</i>	65
<i>Agenda items 4, 5 and 6:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1966:</i>	
<i>(c) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)</i>	
<i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967 (continued)</i>	
<i>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</i>	65

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

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; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

Statement by the representative of the World Health Organization on the activities of WHO in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and New Guinea

1. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of the World Health Organization to address the Council.

2. Mrs. MEAGHER (World Health Organization) drew attention to the fact that WHO submitted to the United Nations reports on health conditions in the Trust Territories every three years. The next report would be submitted to the Trusteeship Council, at its thirty-fifth session. WHO had also prepared a special report for the Council following a request to investigate complaints made by petitioners in Micronesia in 1966. She would therefore limit herself to supplying some information on the technical assistance provided to the Territories in 1966.

3. During that year, WHO had granted eight fellowships, four to Micronesians and four to New Guineans. The fellowships provided to Micronesians had enabled them to pursue studies in nursing (three months), public health administration (ten months) and dental care (twelve months, two fellows). The New Guineans had been awarded fellowships in malaria eradication (six months), tuberculosis control (two months), public health administration (ten months), and paediatrics (ten months).

4. In addition, four Micronesians and eight New Guineans in all had attended six seminars or training courses organized by WHO in the region, on such subjects as the training of auxiliary public health personnel, sanitation, hospital files and records and cholera control.

5. In March 1966, a regional adviser in health education had visited the Trust Territory of New Guinea to study the WHO-assisted programme for the training of public service personnel in the fields of health and education.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 10

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1966:

(b) New Guinea (continued) (T/1660 and Add.1, T/L.1119)

General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI) on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (continued) (T/COM.8/L.2, T/PET.8/22, T/PET.8/23, T/PET.8/L.10, T/PET.8/L.11)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

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

6. Mr. WEST (Special Representative) said that there could be no doubt that significant progress had been made towards self-determination, as witnessed by rapid advancement in higher education and economic

development, and widespread consultation with the people on constitutional matters. A sound foundation had now been laid for self-determination in New Guinea. Australia attached due importance to the constructive recommendations of the United Nations, but insisted that it was for the people of the Territory to determine the rate of political change.

7. The Council had been told that the Administering Authority was using the lengthy reports which it had submitted as a screen for concealing its policies. He did not see how that conclusion could be reached. In any case, the information supplied by the Administering Authority was what had been requested of it, and it was not for the Administering Authority to initiate changes in the system.

8. Certain members of the Council seemed to base their opinions on unauthenticated press reports and on the allegations of isolated individuals who did not reflect general opinion. Thus at the 1303rd meeting, a statement by Mr. Gaudi Mirau had been quoted as reflecting the position of the House of Assembly, although none of his colleagues had supported him and several had contested his point of view.

9. On the subject of land, he wished to stress that the safeguarding of the indigenous people's customary rights was a cardinal principle for the Administration. No land was acquired from the people unless those concerned freely consented and the Administration was satisfied that the transaction was not against their interests. Land acquired became the property of the Government of the Territory and was used for public purposes or leased conditionally. Although 70 per cent of the land thus leased was held by people from overseas or by public companies, such land represented only a very small proportion of the total arable land. The representative of Liberia had expressed surprise that people should wish to sell their land and then lease it from the Government, but that system had advantages, particularly in regard to inheritance, which presented particularly difficult problems in a matrilineal community. Moreover, land was an important national resource and a basic factor of production. In one area of New Britain, for example, the Government was buying some of the uncultivated land and leasing it for ninety-nine years to settlers from densely populated areas, and granting them loans for developing their plots. Most of that land had been leased to New Guineans, and supply exceeded demand. With regard to mining, the sum of \$1 per acre referred to by the Soviet Union representative (1303rd meeting) was not a purchase price but a minimum annual fee paid to the owner of the land where prospecting work was taking place. The actual fee was fixed by an independent tribunal and, under the Mining (New Guinea) Ordinance 1966, additional compensation was paid for any disturbance.

10. The statement made about the purchase of 28,000 acres of land at Vanimo for \$24,000, and the purchase of a further 134,000 acres, was incorrect. The land remained the property of the people. The transactions in question affected only the right to harvest timber. On 9 March 1967, the Assistant Administrator for Economic Affairs had stated in the House of Assembly that a lump sum was paid for timber rights equal to the fees the Administration expected to receive for

the right to cut the timber during the period of the permit. Should owners wish to obtain regular income from the sale of timber, they could invest the sum received in Territory loans or other securities bearing interest. Thus the landowners in the Vanimo area had invested 90 per cent of the purchase price in Territory loans for forty years. That was not exploitation.

11. He had carefully noted the French representative's remarks [1302nd meeting] on the programme of higher education and the development of scientific and engineering studies, and also the United States representative's comments [1303rd meeting] on the participation of indigenous people in the administration and on economic diversification. Discriminatory practices were outlawed in New Guinea, but it was difficult to legislate with complete effectiveness on social behaviour. At all events, efforts to prevent discriminatory practices would be continued unremittingly, particularly in the House of Assembly Select Committee of which Mr. Eupu was a member.

12. On the subject of economic policy, he wished to reiterate that the Territory needed outside capital, as the House of Assembly had stressed in its Development Capital Guarantee Declaration.

13. There appeared to be some feeling that the Australian Government was not doing all it could to encourage constitutional development; and it had been suggested that, for the majority of the population, self-determination was synonymous with complete Australian withdrawal. Neither of those assumptions was correct. In fact, the future of the Territory had been the subject of discussions between the Select Committee on Constitutional Development and senior ministers of the Australian Government in 1966. The important thing, as the Minister of State for Territories had recently declared, was that in Papua and New Guinea the Administration had established the basis of political institutions which, when the time came for independence or self-government, could serve as a foundation for a stable government capable of serving the needs of a people living in a democratic State.

14. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) drew the Council's attention to the fact that peace, order and progress prevailed in the Territory. There were no political prisoners, and the fundamental freedoms were enjoyed by all. Of course, some problems still remained to be solved. After a visit to the Territory in July 1966, he himself had noted that some new problems calling for constant co-operation between the races had arisen, and that a number of the old problems had not yet been completely solved. New Guinea had a modern parliament; but, in spite of the encouraging progress made, the 2,000 tribes living in the Territory did not yet have the necessary cohesion. Another encouraging factor was the presence in the Council Chamber of two indigenous members of the House of Assembly, who had proved fully conscious of their responsibilities. The main objective of Australian policy was to permit free expression of the people's will. Australia was not imposing its own will or its own political ideas on the indigenous people, and it had no intention of allowing others to impose their theories and prejudices on the population either.

15. The Australian Government had, of course, given the most careful consideration to General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI), as it had to all the other relevant resolutions. In that connexion, his delegation wished to point out that the Australian Government's position was based essentially on the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement freely concluded with the United Nations with the approval of all Members of the Organization. If the Soviet delegation thought that the provisions of the Charter should no longer be applied, it should say so frankly. For his own part, he seemed to remember that in various United Nations bodies, particularly the Committee of Twenty-Four, the Soviet delegation had stressed the need for all countries to comply with the obligations they had assumed under the Charter. The adoption of the provisions of the Charter relating to dependent territories had been due, in large part, to the efforts of the Australian delegation. Some delegations at San Francisco in 1945 had been less interested in the fate of dependent peoples. General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) did not provide any constructive suggestions for solving the problems of New Guinea, as it was intended to distort the facts and even to represent non-existent "facts" as the truth.

16. Operative paragraph 1 of the resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Papua and New Guinea to self-determination and independence. But that right meant above all that the inhabitants themselves were entitled to decide when to express their views on the future of their country.

17. Operative paragraph 2, in which the General Assembly deplored the failure of the Administering Authority to implement resolution 2112 (XX), completely ignored the efforts and the progress already made towards self-determination for the population.

18. With regard to operative paragraph 3, in which the Administering Authority was called upon to implement resolution 1514 (XV), he pointed out that the two members of the House of Assembly present in the Council Chamber were representatives of the New Guinean people democratically elected on the basis of a common roll of electors and universal suffrage.

19. In operative sub-paragraph 4 (a), the General Assembly called upon the Administering Authority to remove all discriminatory electoral qualifications. But there was no discrimination in the Territory in regard to elections. If certain qualifications had been retained in some regions, it was because the population wanted them to be, and the New Guinean Parliament was open to members of all races. Sub-paragraph (b) contained a reference to discriminatory practices in the economic, social, health and educational fields. It was true that some anomalies did exist in certain areas, but the Administration and the House of Assembly were doing everything to remove them, so that there would soon be complete equality not only between the Europeans and New Guineans, but also between the latter and members of all other races. With regard to sub-paragraph (c), which called for elections on the basis of universal suffrage, his delegation was surprised that the General Assembly should pretend to ignore the fact that the Territory had a House of Assembly elected by universal suf-

frage from a common roll of electors and consisting largely of indigenous members of the population, and that the same democratic principles would be observed in future elections. On the question of independence, which was mentioned in sub-paragraph (d), he wished to stress once more that the indigenous people themselves would express their views on the matter when they saw fit to do so, and that they were perfectly well aware of the various options open to them.

20. Finally, with regard to operative paragraph 5, which referred to military activities allegedly incompatible with the United Nations Charter, he said that the activities in question were consistent with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement and were, in fact, very modest in scope compared with those undertaken in other countries.

21. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia), speaking on a point of order, asked whether Mr. Eupu who had been given the floor wished to speak as member of the Australian delegation or as representative of the New Guinean people.

22. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) recalled that it was not the first time that confusion had arisen in the Council. Mr. Zurecnuoc and Mr. Eupu were members of the Australian delegation but had asked to speak in their personal capacity. The representative of Liberia would surely not object to the Council's hearing the elected representatives of the New Guinean people.

23. The PRESIDENT reminded the representative of Liberia that it was the Council's practice to allow the advisers to the Special Representative of the Administering Authority to speak in their personal capacity.

24. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that his delegation would regard the statements of the advisers to the Special Representative as reflecting the viewpoint of the Australian delegation, as there was no provision in the Charter or the rules of procedure that members of the House of Assembly could come and speak before the Council independently.

25. Mr. EUPU (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that the people of New Guinea did not want independence immediately. It preferred to wait, trying meanwhile to create the best possible conditions for its accession to independence. There would be new elections to the House of Assembly in 1968, following which the representatives of the people would have ample opportunity to determine the further course of the Territory's development.

26. Mr. ZURECNUOC (Adviser to the Special Representative) said he was participating in the Council's work for the first time and wished to thank the Council for contributing so greatly to New Guinea's progress towards self-government and independence. However, the New Guineans wanted to achieve independence on a sound basis, avoiding certain difficulties which too rapid development had created elsewhere. He thanked the members of the Council for their encouraging words to the representatives of the New Guinean people to whom he would communicate their message.

27. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) expressed surprise at the objections which had been raised by the

representative of Liberia and trusted that, the formal position aside, he was not questioning the right of Mr. Zurenuoc and Mr. Eupu to be regarded as authentic representatives of their people.

28. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the false allegations of the Australian representative and certain other delegations called for a reply. They had, in fact, attempted to use the concept of the will of the people, the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples as a screen to justify the arbitrary actions of the Administering Authority. Thus, the United Kingdom representative had maintained (1302nd meeting) that General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) was not in conformity with the Declaration, because it allegedly disregarded the wish of the people of the Territory to live and prosper under Australian trusteeship. That attitude was in no way surprising, for if the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States had wished to take up the defence of the people of the Territory, they would have had to denounce their countries' colonialist and imperialist policies towards colonial and dependent peoples—policies which did not shrink from blackmail or intimidation when the interests of the monopolies had to be served. The Australian representative had said that the Territory would attain self-government and independence when the foundations of a sound economy had been laid and an efficient administrative apparatus established, which was proof that after fifty years of trusteeship the Administering Authority was still getting ready to introduce the indigenous population to efficient administrative methods. While in half a century only two members of the indigenous population had managed to receive a higher education, the United Kingdom representative had expressed concern about the rate of progress in higher education, because it outstripped the possibilities and rate of development of secondary education. In a country which, according to the *South Pacific Post*, was 95 per cent illiterate, it might be wondered, in the circumstances, just when a people which was kept in ignorance, exploited and used as a source of cheap labour could ever learn to manage its own affairs.

29. The special representative had stated that there was no indigenous senior official in any of the Territory's fifteen main administrative departments. It was no wonder therefore that the Australian authorities considered that it would take at least thirty years before New Guinea could achieve self-government. For obvious reasons, the Australian Government had failed to consider the question of the Territory's accession to independence, as called for by General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI), and apparently had no intention of doing so. The Australian representative had seen fit to add that his Government refused to "incite" the people to independence and that it was for the House of Assembly to take that action. However, the House of Assembly—and that was its essential characteristic—was not a sovereign body, because all its decisions had to be approved by the Administering Authority. The two members of the House of Assembly now seated at the Council table, who had unfortunately made themselves the advocates of Australian colonial policies, would be well advised

to examine those policies more closely, for their aim was to subject the Territory to the Australian and international monopolies. That was the purpose also of the law of 1 September 1966 concerning the economic development of the Territory, which granted important rights and privileges to foreign private companies. That so-called law placed a heavy mortgage on the Territory's future and limited, or even destroyed, the people's sovereignty over its natural resources.

30. The so-called law for the expropriation of land owned by indigenous inhabitants was another example of colonialist despoilment. The Australian representative had endeavoured to belittle its scope by stating that it applied only to 3 per cent of the land. He had added that Australia owned the underground resources, while the land itself remained the property of the people. Such explanations might deceive illiterates but not people familiar with the fierce greed of the international monopolies. The United States representative had been greatly moved by the fact that 5 per cent of the rent was allegedly paid to the owners of the expropriated land. The expropriation itself did not disturb him in the least. The Soviet delegation, however, believed that Australia's seizure of the Territory's natural wealth was illegal and contrary to the Charter, in particular to Article 76. Moreover, there was no guarantee that the amount of expropriated land would remain at 3 per cent. According to the Australian representative the law was designed to protect indigenous people against "adventurers" and "speculators" who might exploit them. But 70 per cent of the land so expropriated had been transferred to Australians or to foreign monopolies. Thus the indigenous population was being robbed, if not by isolated "adventurers", then by international monopolies and the Administering Authority itself. The report of the mission of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development stated that the Australian settlers owned more than 1 million acres of the Territory's most fertile land, i.e. one sixth, not 3 per cent, of the arable land. The expropriation of the indigenous inhabitants and the purchase of their land at very low prices were continuing. The Australian and foreign companies published no information on their profits from the colonial exploitation of the Territory. However, the report stated that the profits had been substantial. Capital investment from 1960 to 1963 was estimated at £5 to £6 million, and profits at £3 to £5 million. The Australian representative had said that his country would bow to the will of the people. The Soviet delegation wished to know why, if that was the case, Australia had not granted independence to the people of the Trust Territory of Nauru, which had been demanding it for several years.

31. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru was not on the agenda of the meeting.

32. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), said that one could judge from the example of Nauru just how sincere were the Australian delegation's statements concerning New Guinea.

33. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) observed that the New Zealand delegation was zealously supporting the arguments of Australia. That fact was not at all surprising to anyone who knew the magnitude and diversity of New Zealand interests in the Territory, where many New Zealanders had settled and where in fact there were New Zealanders in the House of Assembly. He had not intended to prevent the two members of the House of Assembly from addressing the Council. He had merely wished to know whether they would speak in their capacity as elected legislators. The representative of Australia and the Special Representative had not given a satisfactory explanation.

34. Australians held 70 per cent of the most fertile land, situated in the most densely populated regions, where cheap labour was plentiful. Moreover, ex-servicemen received 100 acres of land if they were of Australian origin but only forty acres if they were of indigenous origin. If matters continued in that way, the economy of the Territory, even after independence, would be in the hands of foreigners. According to the Australian representative, peace and happiness prevailed in the Territory; but violence would inevitably erupt if the indigenous people were reduced to the status of second-class citizens. In that regard, General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) was fully justified, and the people of the Territory should take over the management of its own affairs.

35. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), exercising the right of reply, said that it was pointless to reopen the general debate at the present stage of the Council's work. The abundant documentation before the Council showed that the allegations of the Liberian and Soviet representatives were unfounded.

36. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that his delegation's wish was simply to see the elected representatives of the New Guinean people recognized as such in the Council. New Zealand certainly had an interest in Papua and New Guinea. The progress of the people of the Trust Territory towards self-determination was not just an academic issue to neighbours in the south-west Pacific. That there were a few New Zealand farmers and planters in Papua and New Guinea was irrelevant—there probably were some in Liberia also. And if there was a person of New Zealand origin in the House of Assembly then, having been put there by New Guineans, he obviously had their confidence and support. The New Zealand delegation had not suggested that the Liberian representative had tried to deny the New Guineans the floor; it was concerned only that the New Guinean Parliamentarians be regarded as an authentic voice of their people.

37. Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom), exercising the right of reply, referred to certain accusations against the United Kingdom delegation contained in the Soviet representative's statements. The latter had questioned the validity of the United Kingdom delegation's interpretation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); in reply, he reaffirmed that, in his view, that resolution was being implemented in New Guinea and Papua. The United Kingdom delegation was the better qualified to judge the matter as its Government had guided to independence three Territories with which the Council

had concerned itself in the past and which were now States Members of the United Nations. Moreover, contrary to the assertions of the Soviet representative, his delegation had not said that higher education was too advanced in New Guinea and Papua; it had simply asked a question on the subject, to which the Special Representative had replied that the secondary school system had a sufficient number of students to fill the places available at the institutions of higher education.

38. The PRESIDENT said the debate was completed and he wished to thank the representative of Australia, the special representative and his advisers for the valuable contributions they had made to the Council's work.

Mr. West, special representative of the Administrative Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, and Mr. Zurecnuoc and Mr. Eupu, advisers to the special representative, withdrew.

Appointment of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea

39. The PRESIDENT said that, after consultation with the members of the Council, she suggested that the representatives of China and New Zealand should be appointed members of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 4, 5 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1966:

(c) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued) (T/1661, T/L.1121)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued) (T/COM.10/L.4-6, T/PET.10/38)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967 (continued) (T/1658 and Add.1)

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. Norwood, special representative for the Administrative Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Mr. Salii, adviser to the special representative, took places at the Council table.

40. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) thanked the Special Representative for the information he had given at the previous meeting and said he was particularly glad to learn that the United States Congress had raised the upper limit of appropriations allocated to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. He wished to know how the new appropriations would be distributed among the various sectors of economic and social development.

41. Mr. NORWOOD (Special Representative) said he had stated at the previous meeting that the Administering Authority was now engaged in determining require-

ments in the various sectors of economic and social development: education, health, transport, communications, etc. For the current financial year \$300,000 had been allocated for the execution of a general plan designed, *inter alia*, to repair the damage caused by the typhoons. In the electricity and power sector, where many installations dated from the Second World War, a great effort at modernization had to be undertaken. Following the studies which had been made, \$1.2 million had been set aside for that purpose, plus \$1 million for water supply. For both political and economic reasons, the marked lag in communications must be made up; it was estimated that between \$1.5 and \$2 million would be spent on telephonic and radiophonic installations. In the field of transport, an allocation of \$300,000 should allow the purchase of ships designed to meet the administration's needs which normal commercial services could not satisfy. Furthermore, \$800,000 would be assigned for the building of a hospital, \$200,000 for the purchase of agricultural machinery, \$300,000 for the construction and repair of roads, and so on.

42. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) asked for further explanations of the conditions in which the High Commissioner exercised his right of veto over certain decisions of the legislature.

43. Mr. NORWOOD (Special Representative) pointed out that the High Commissioner was the chief executive and that his right of veto was in fact designed to ensure a balance between the executive and the legislative power. The High Commissioner's veto could be overridden by a majority vote of two-thirds in the Congress of Micronesia. In 1966 only two of the twenty-nine measures adopted by the Congress had been vetoed. The first veto was of a bill which sought

to impose restrictions on the purchase of lands by the Administering Authority; the text concerned mainly the Marshall Islands and the High Commissioner had felt that it would be difficult to apply to the whole Territory. However, it would be reconsidered at the next session of the Congress of Micronesia after certain amendments had been made. The second veto was of a decision by the Congress of Micronesia to allocate to each of the six districts credits of \$70,000 over which the district administrators would have exercised exclusive control. That measure had encountered strong opposition in the Congress; the High Commissioner had considered that the Territory did not have sufficient resources to implement it and that, moreover, the power thus entrusted to the district administrators, who were representatives of the executive power, was excessive.

44. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) asked Mr. Salii, Adviser to the Special Representative, whether the Congress of Micronesia had considered using the procedure which could be adopted when the High Commissioner applied a veto.

45. Mr. SALII (Adviser to the Special Representative) said that the Congress of Micronesia was perfectly aware of the powers at its disposal. After the rejection of the second measure mentioned by the Special Representative, certain of its members had considered overriding the High Commissioner's veto by obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority. However, they were not certain of being successful and also the explanation given by the High Commissioner during a long discussion in the Congress had appeared sufficiently convincing.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.