



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

Wednesday, 14 June 1967,  
 at 10.50 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda items 4, 5 and 6:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis-          tering Authorities on the administration of          Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June          1966:</i>	
<i>(c) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (con-          tinued)</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>General debate (continued) . . . . .</i>	87
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training          facilities for inhabitants of Trust Ter-          ritories: report of the Secretary-General . .</i>	91
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Dissemination of information on the United          Nations and the International Trusteeship          System in Trust Territories: report of the          Secretary-General . . . . .</i>	92

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

*Present:*

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

The representative of the following specialized  
 agency: World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEMS 4, 5 AND 6

<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering          Authorities on the administration of Trust Ter-          ritories for the year ended 30 June 1966:</i>
<i>(c) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)          (T/1661, T/L.1121)</i>
<i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the          agenda (continued) (T/COM.10/L.4-6, T/OBS.10/          10, T/PET.10/38)</i>
<i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the          Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands 1967 (con-          tinued) (T/1658 and Add.1)</i>

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Norwood,  
 special representative of the Administering Authority  
 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and  
 Mr. Kabua and Mr. Salii, advisers to the special  
 representative, took places at the Council table.*

1. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Repub-  
 lics) said that from the facts established in the  
 reports before the Council and the information sup-  
 plied during the debate, it was clear that after  
 twenty years of trusteeship, the Administering Au-  
 thority had still not carried out its obligations under  
 the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship  
 Agreement. At the political level, the United States,  
 preoccupied with its aims in the Far East, had  
 not drawn up any plan for the independence of the  
 Territory in pursuance of General Assembly reso-  
 lution 1514 (XV). The establishment of the Congress  
 of Micronesia in 1965 was surely no evidence of  
 advancement toward independence, since that step  
 originated in Washington, not with the people of  
 the Territory, which still had no genuine rights.  
 The High Commissioner, under Order No. 2882  
 of the United States Department of the Interior, had  
 both the power of veto over Micronesian proposals  
 and the power to override a refusal by the Congress  
 of Micronesia to accept draft legislation; he appointed  
 and dismissed all officials, and the highest posts  
 were held by United States citizens. In general,  
 opportunities for Micronesians to hold public office  
 were still too limited to meet the requirements  
 stated in the Charter; the reason for that was not,  
 however, that the Micronesians were not capable  
 of playing a greater role in the management of public  
 affairs. The Territory was being kept in artificial  
 isolation because plans were being made to annex  
 it to the United States or to make it a new State  
 of the United States, in accordance with the views  
 of Senator Fong of Hawaii, who believed that attaching  
 the Territory to Hawaii would constitute compliance  
 with the Trusteeship Agreement. His delegation wished  
 to draw the Senator's attention to Article 83 of the  
 Charter, which stated the powers of the Security  
 Council in the matter.

2. The United States had long been endeavouring  
 to convince Micronesians that they could not do  
 anything without it, and Peace Corps volunteers  
 by the hundreds were taking part in that effort.  
 At the economic level, advancement was held back  
 by the activities of foreign companies, which, according  
 to Mr. Salii, occupied a dominant position in the  
 Territory. As Julius W. Pratt, an American writer,  
 had said on pages 241 and 242 of his book America's  
 Colonial Experiment,<sup>1/</sup> the Territory was being treated  
 in the classical manner as a guaranteed outlet  
 for industry and a source of colonial raw materials  
 which provided substantial profits for "surplus"  
 United States capital.

3. He pointed out in that connexion that fishing had  
 been given scant attention and agriculture neglected  
 in order to give preference to production for export.

<sup>1/</sup> New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

The state of stagnation described by the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967, in its report (T/1658 and Add.1) was due, in his view, to that subordination of the Administering Authority's activity to purely selfish interests, which were combined with strategic and military concerns. Robert Trumbull, a journalist who had visited the Territory, had written, on pages 149 and 150 of Paradise in Trust,<sup>2/</sup> of his impression that the efforts made in the Palau Islands to improve living conditions seemed to benefit only the Americans and not the indigenous people; moreover The New York Times of 14 March 1966 had reported that many people in Saipan criticized the United States because they could not understand why no one was taking any interest in the islands' economic situation.

4. One of the fundamental causes of the difficulties in the economy was the alienation of land formerly owned by indigenous people; it involved more than half the area of the Territory and had left the indigenous people of the Marshall Islands, in particular, with no more than 20 per cent of their land. If the Japanese had forced owners to sell their land, the United States Administration was only aggravating the situation by legitimizing their ouster through the provisions of its legal code. The answers given by the representatives of the Administering Authority concerning the solution of the land tenure problem merely evaded the question. For example, on being asked about the military uses of that land, the United States representative had merely replied that land was being expropriated chiefly for school and hospital construction, although it was well known that the number of establishments was disproportionately small in comparison with the amount of expropriated land. According to the issue of The New York Times which he had quoted earlier, United States officials had acknowledged that the funds allocated to school and hospital construction were not sufficient to implement the programmes provided for or to meet the immediate needs of the Territory. The same shortages existed with regard to roads and urban sanitation, as Robert Trumbull had stated on pages 190 and 14 and 15 of his book.

5. It would be hard to understand why the United States, a rich country, had not appropriated enough funds to remedy the situation of the Territory during twenty years of trusteeship, if one failed to realize that the Administering Authority had at first regarded the islands as a proving ground for nuclear devices. Citing a study entitled Pacific Island Bastions of the United States,<sup>3/</sup> by the American writer, Harold J. Wiens, he pointed out the primary importance of the Kwajalein base to the United States Air Force, which, in 1961, had converted it into a base for launching Nike rockets to intercept intercontinental ballistic missiles, and he noted that the amount spent for military installations on the island had been estimated, according to The New Yorker of 11 June 1966, at \$1,000 million, the inhabitants receiving only a pittance as compensation.

6. His delegation was therefore obliged to draw the following conclusions: First, although the Territory was under the Trusteeship of the wealthiest of the capitalist countries, it had by no means made the advances one might have expected. Secondly, the Administering Authority had not prepared the Territory, in accordance with Article 76 of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), for the exercise of self-determination and independence, and it had no intention of doing so. Thirdly, the Administering Authority planned on making the Territory one of its dependencies and was using it as a bridgehead in the fight against popular national movements in the Far East, particularly that of the Viet-Nameese people. He believed that the Council must call upon the Administering Authority to implement a comprehensive programme which would enable the people of the Territory to exercise its right of self-determination; to that end, the Congress of Micronesia should, first of all, be given the necessary powers. Furthermore, the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2105 (XX) and 2189 (XXI) regarding the elimination of military bases should be implemented. Lastly, measures should be taken to ensure the progress of the Territory in every field and the return of expropriated land. The Visiting Mission's recommendation concerning compensation to be paid by the Administering Authority to World War II victims should be implemented. In conclusion, he stressed that the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) were fully applicable to the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

7. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the Soviet delegation was adept at citing facts out of context. It had done so, in particular, with regard to the information given to the Council by Mr. Saliu concerning foreign investments, from which it had drawn conclusions which conflicted with what Mr. Saliu had actually said. It would have been better if the USSR representative had himself questioned the advisers to the special representative, but he had not done so. The United States delegation readily admitted that the Territory of the Pacific Islands was a developing region and that the problems which it had to resolve were both difficult and complex. It did not deny that the people of the Islands did not have self-government, but it maintained that it was the constant duty of the Government of the Administering Authority to ensure that the aims of the Trusteeship System were attained, and was convinced that the majority of the people of the Territory did not impute to the United States the intentions suggested by the Soviet Union. The objectives of the Administering Authority continued, in fact, to be those of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, to which the Soviet Union had, at the time, given its approval.

8. In studying the report of the Visiting Missions, the USSR delegation seemed to have sought out only those passages which could provide grounds for criticism, ignoring the fact that the report, while it did not consist of undiluted praise, nevertheless recognized that progress had been made. Furthermore, to speak of the Territory as a nuclear proving ground was to overlook the fact that a nuclear

<sup>2/</sup> New York, William Sloane, 1959.

<sup>3/</sup> Princeton, N.J., D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962.

test ban treaty had been concluded several years ago, so that such an allegation was pure propaganda. Finally, the USSR delegation's charges concerning the Congress of Micronesia were perhaps due to its disappointment at being confronted by a freely elected body whose proceedings were concluded openly.

9. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had only been citing facts or observations of the Visiting Mission. In paragraph 105 of its report (T/1658 and ADD.1), the Mission stated that the Territory's economy was virtually stagnant. In the same paragraph, it also stated that the economic development of the Territory had not been accorded the priority it deserved, and then gave a list of the areas in which the situation was not satisfactory. It was therefore not the representative of the Soviet Union who was trying to distort the facts.

10. Very little progress seemed to have been made since the United States had assumed the administration of the Territory twenty years earlier. It was difficult to understand why that was so, especially as the United States was a rich country and had the material means to fulfil its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

11. The United States representative had considered that the USSR representative's statement had struck a false note in the debate. Actually, however, it had only been the other colonial Powers in the Council—Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom—which had sung the praises of the United States. He had not distorted Mr. Salii's statements; he had merely quoted them literally and drawn the most logical conclusions from them.

12. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America) said that he did not intend, for the moment, to reply more fully to the allegations made by the USSR representative. He would merely urge him to read the whole of the report, instead of just quoting isolated passages out of context.

13. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) thought the unparliamentary language used by the USSR representative regrettable and out of place in the proceedings of the Trusteeship Council, although he could understand that that representative had little knowledge of the workings of parliamentary bodies.

14. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that the United States representative was constantly accusing him of distorting the facts, asked precisely what facts he was supposed to have distorted. Was it not true, for example, that the Congress of Micronesia had no real power and could not adopt any law without the assent of the High Commissioner?

15. To the New Zealand representative's comment he replied that he could not speak the same language as the colonial Powers—which did nothing but sing one another's praises—because he felt it his duty to keep to the facts.

16. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) thanked the President, who had acted as Chairman of the Visiting Mission, and the three other members of the Mission for their objective report.

17. He hoped that the Administering Authority would do still more to inform the people of its political rights, as defined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). As the primary objective of the Trusteeship System was to lead territories towards self-government, it was regrettable that Micronesians did not hold any senior posts in the Administration and were thus not being prepared for independence. The Administering Authority must, therefore, put an end to that situation.

18. The powers of the Congress of Micronesia were very limited. The High Commissioner's veto enabled him to exercise almost absolute control, although he was less well placed than the Micronesians to know what was best for them. Moreover, the Congress should be able, if not to distribute the funds provided by the United States, at least to decide how local revenues should be used.

19. With regard to the Territory's economy, he noted that the Visiting Mission had recommended, firstly, an effort to build up the *infra-structure*, particularly in the field of transport; secondly, the full utilization of resources, especially with regard to agriculture and fisheries; and thirdly, a reform of the land tenure system, as the land could not be brought to optimum productivity under the present system. In particular, the Administering Authority should restore the lands confiscated by the Japanese to their legitimate owners, which, in very many cases, had not yet been done. It should also compensate the owners of land which it retained for its own use.

20. The Mission's report did not indicate any appreciable advances in the health field. It was to be hoped that the appropriations for the current financial year would make it possible to modernize existing equipment and facilities and ensure their more rational use.

21. The fiscal system must also be reformed. If the Territory was to exercise its right to self-determination, the people themselves must provide revenue by paying more taxes, so as to be less dependent on the Administering Authority. The United States nationals working in the Territory should also pay taxes there.

22. Lastly, the Administering Authority must press the Japanese Government for payment of the war damage compensation still owing to the Territory.

23. Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom) thanked the special representative and the representatives of the Congress of Micronesia for the frankness with which they had replied to the questions asked them by members of the Council. They had described conditions in the Territory with objectivity and in a constructive spirit. The contributions of Mr. Kabua and Mr. Salii had been of particular help as regards the reactions of Micronesian public opinion and there might be additional points on which they could provide clarification.

24. In its 1966 conclusions and recommendations,<sup>4/</sup> the Council had noted a certain imbalance in the

<sup>4/</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Special Supplement No. 1, document S/7425, para. 99.

progress made in the Pacific Islands; while there had been advances in the political sphere following the transfer of legislative authority from the High Commissioner to the Congress of Micronesia, in the economic sphere, on the other hand, production had increased relatively little and the Council had expressed the fear that unbalanced economic and social development might produce serious repercussions in political development. The report of the 1967 Visiting Mission (T/1658 and Add.1) confirmed that the progress made in the various fields was unequal, economic development continuing to be slow. In that connexion, he welcomed the fact that the Mission had been accompanied by an economic adviser, whose presence had been particularly useful as the Nathan report had just been published when the Mission arrived in the Territory.

25. It was clear that the most significant progress had been made in the field of education. The educational programme which the Administering Authority was putting into effect had come in for some criticism in the Visiting Mission's report, but the criticism was constructive and the Administration would undoubtedly take it into account. The special representative had stated, moreover, that emphasis was to be placed on vocational training in secondary schools, that a technical school would be established, and that an over-all study of the educational system had been undertaken by the Stanford Research Institute. It was also encouraging to note that the Administration was obviously trying to overcome the students' prejudice against manual work and such activities as agriculture and fishing, which were essential to the Territory's development.

26. In the field of public health, the special representative had admitted that the Administration had not yet attained the goal set by President Kennedy—the establishment of health services which met the minimum standards considered acceptable in a community in the United States. That was a difficult goal to attain in view of the Territory's widely scattered area; the special representative had explained that it was difficult to organize "flying doctor" services like those in Australia and that it was impossible to send doctors and nurses to each atoll. The solution might perhaps be found in the development of preventive medicine and sanitation, as suggested in paragraphs 45 to 47 of the Visiting Mission's report. He was glad to see that the new Director of Public Health had a solid background in those matters.

27. The special representative had acknowledged that economic development posed urgent problems. The United Kingdom delegation had already asked him for further details on the distribution of the supplementary appropriations (\$7.5 million for the current budget year and \$17.5 million for the next) which the United States Congress was to allocate to the Territory. The special representative had given the Council some valuable information on how those funds might be applied in the economic sector, indicating that the Administering Authority realized the need to build the necessary economic infra-structure, particularly by improving the system of inter-island transport. The views expressed in

that connexion were in line with those of the Visiting Mission, especially the Mission's observations on the question of shipping services (T/1658 and Add.1, para. 162). That requirement should be given special priority. Another point to which the United Kingdom delegation also attached importance was the improvement of extension services, particularly in agriculture. A great effort must be made in that respect, as the Visiting Mission had emphasized in paragraph 123 of its report.

28. The Nathan team had formulated three controversial recommendations concerning the confiscation of land by the Administration, the importation of foreign labour and the attraction of outside capital. The special representative had made it clear that he shared the reservations expressed by the Visiting Mission. The Administering Authority was displaying a degree of caution and an awareness of the social implications of those recommendations appropriate to its responsibilities. The USSR representative had said that the Administration had confiscated 50 per cent of the Micronesians' land; in fact, the Administration was merely managing most of the land, under special legislation. As to the private companies holding concessions, only four or five were not Micronesian; their leases were of limited duration and they paid rent which went to swell the revenue of the population.

29. In general, the Visiting Mission had shown itself relatively optimistic about the prospects for economic development, more particularly the constitution of capital in the Territory itself. It had suggested in particular that the Economic Development Loan Fund should be replaced by a development corporation with broader functions. The special representative had been unable to reply precisely to a question on the subject from the representative of France, but the United Kingdom delegation felt that an establishment of that kind might serve as a catalyst for the many sources of capital and technical expertise which needed to be called on, both from inside and outside Micronesia.

30. In the political and constitutional sphere, the Congress of Micronesia had already commenced its task in promising fashion, and his delegation associated itself with the tribute paid to its members by the Visiting Mission. The Congress would continue to face difficulties, particularly in regard to public finances and the budget. It was important that the legislature should exercise the budgetary control essential under a democratic system. The fiscal system should also be revised. The Visiting Mission had advanced some proposals on the subject and the special representative's statement showed that a radical transformation of the system through the institution of a personal tax might be feasible. As the standard of living in Micronesia compared favourably with that of most developing countries (T/1658 and Add.1, para. 102), it was illogical that only 5 per cent of the Territory's budget should be financed from local taxes. It was important that Micronesians with the means to do so should contribute to public revenue and that overseas residents working in the Territory should also pay taxes.

31. The Administering Authority was experiencing difficulties in bringing Micronesians into responsible posts in government at the policy-forming level and so enabling them to gain administrative experience before they were called upon to manage their own affairs. His delegation accordingly considered that instead of simply attending ministerial meetings, Micronesian representatives should be responsible members of the Cabinet, as the Visiting Mission suggested. It was certain that that problem must be tackled before the people decided their political future. Progress had been made in the field of local government, which the United Kingdom had always regarded of basic importance in preparing the peoples of dependent territories for democratic self-government. It had particular significance in the Territory of the Pacific Islands, where the districts were widely separated; the field was one which afforded local leaders an opportunity to become aware of their responsibilities and acquire experience.

32. During the debate in the Council, little had been said about the Territory's future political status. That group of small and scattered island communities did not fit in easily with the accepted notion of a State. It might well be desirable to study the needs of the Trust Territory and other Pacific territories with similar problems to see if perhaps some special status should be envisaged for them consonant with their size and population and the inescapable geographical difficulties in the way of their economic development. His delegation thought that the people of Micronesia must learn to live in interdependence before becoming independent. The important thing for the Micronesians was to learn to rely on themselves and to assume responsibility for their decisions.

33. His delegation had noted with interest the opinions and reactions of the Micronesians on the question of the future of the Territory (T/1658 and Add.1, para. 317). Mr. Salii had claimed for the Micronesians the right to choose the moment when they would wish to make a decision about their future. There was no question of rushing the Micronesians, but they must understand that they had obligations and responsibilities in the world and that they would not always be able to leave matters to the United States. His delegation hoped that Mr. Salii and Mr. Kabua would convey that message to the Congress and people of Micronesia and at the same time reaffirm the Council's interest in the problems of the Territory and its satisfaction at having been able to discuss them with the Territory's elected representatives.

*Mr. Norwood, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Mr. Kabua and Mr. Salii, advisers to the special representative, withdrew.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 12

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General (T/1664)

34. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) announced that the Soviet Mission to the United

Nations had informed the Secretary-General that Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow had offered scholarships to students from Saipan. The problem of education was directly connected with that of the attainment of independence, since the Administering Authority was citing as a pretext for delaying independence the fact that the population was not ready. It was obvious that the Administering Authority was deliberately retarding the intellectual development of the Territory's inhabitants in order to maintain its rule over them, as was also the case in Papua and New Guinea, where only two students had attended universities. It was clear from the report of the Visiting Mission that the Administering Authority was opposing the people's efforts to benefit from the education programme offered by the United Nations.

35. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he wished to reply to the criticism directed at Australia by the Soviet representative, who accused his country of not complying with General Assembly resolutions 557 (VI) and 753 (VIII) on educational advancement in Trust Territories and of preventing the people from benefiting from United Nations assistance. The Soviet representative should be able to find information in the documents submitted to him and in the official documents of the thirty-third session of the Trusteeship Council. He indicated the number of students from Papua and New Guinea who were studying abroad, the subjects they were studying and the countries in which they were studying. He noted that it was mainly through United Nations bodies that the students in question had been able to go abroad.

36. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said he found it surprising that the offers of certain Member States to admit students from Trust Territories to their universities had drawn no response even though the people of those Territories were largely illiterate. In the Territories under Australian administration, for example, there were only two university graduates, and there were probably not many more in the Territory of the Pacific Islands. His delegation urged Australia to permit students from the Territory of Papua and New Guinea to go abroad for university study.

37. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America), replying to the Soviet representative's statements concerning scholarships, said that in the past ten years about forty Micronesian students had studied abroad on United Nations fellowships. As her Government had already stated, its policy was to leave the Micronesians free to decide where they wished to study. It was not surprising that Micronesians did not study in the Soviet Union or the countries of Eastern Europe, where the language barrier was in itself a serious handicap; Micronesians studied English as a second language, and to study in the Soviet Union would force them to learn a third language. Moreover, some scholarships covered only the cost of tuition, while others also provided for travel costs and still others covered housing and food. Thus, there were many factors to be considered in choosing a university, and the student made the choice that was most advantageous for him.

38. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not distorted the facts, as the Australian and United States representatives accused him of doing. He had referred to the Secretary-General's report on the question (T/1664), which stated in paragraph 3 that "No scholarships were ever granted to students from the Territories which at present remain under the Trusteeship System: the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands". He would like to know whether the Australian representative could offer an explanation of that sentence.

39. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that when he accused the Soviet representative of distorting the truth, he meant that the latter took certain sentences out of context in order to draw conclusions which suited him.

40. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the Secretary-General's report on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories (T/1664).

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 13

Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General (T/1665)

41. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that he had previously presented his delegation's views concerning the dissemination of information on the United Nations and the Trusteeship System, requested that the Soviet position on the question should be recorded in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

42. The PRESIDENT said that it would be.

43. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) asked whether the documentation concerning United Nations activities with regard to Trust Territories, and in particular the text of General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI), had been transmitted to the United Nations Information Centre at Port Moresby.

44. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that while he could not give a definite reply on that point without consulting the Office of Public Information, he wished to assure the Liberian representative that all resolutions relating to Trust Territories were sent to the information centres concerned.

45. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that copies of resolution 2227 (XXI) had been distributed in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, and he informed the Council that the library of the University of Papua and New Guinea, which was open to the public, was now the official depository for United Nations documents. Moreover, the Director of the United Nations Information Centre at Port Moresby had visited all the districts in the Territory, where

he had had talks with representatives of the people and had distributed documentation on the United Nations.

46. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said he was disturbed to note that, according to paragraph 23 of the report (T/1665), the Centre relied largely on local newspapers such as the South Pacific Post to keep the people informed of United Nations activities; it was the Centre itself that should perform that function.

47. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he was surprised at the Liberian representative's last observation; the Centre had made use of all available resources, including its Director, to publicize United Nations activities relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories. As to the South Pacific Post, it was a newspaper that could not be accused of subservience to the Administering Authority, which it frequently criticized.

48. He quoted press releases issued by the Information Centre at Port Moresby which contained the texts of resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) and noted the General Assembly's resolution of 20 December 1966 (2227 (XXI)) calling upon Australia to fix an early date for the independence of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. The releases also dealt with United Nations debates and decisions on the questions of South West Africa and apartheid.

49. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that he had merely asked whether the text of resolution 2227 (XXI) had been transmitted to the Information Centre at Port Moresby. The reason he objected to the fact that it had been left to the South Pacific Post to keep the people informed of United Nations activities was that he did not have much confidence in that newspaper, which the Australian representative had defended, and that the people of the Territory still did not know about resolution 1514 (XV), which showed that they were badly informed.

50. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he was not speaking in defence of the South Pacific Post but wished to point out that the Soviet delegation often quoted from that newspaper. It should also be noted that the Secretary-General's report (T/1665) did not state that the South Pacific Post was entrusted with the entire task of providing information on the United Nations.

51. The PRESIDENT said that the Liberian representative's statement would be taken into account by the Office of Public Information. She suggested that the Council should take note of the Secretary-General's report on the dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories (T/1665) and draw the General Assembly's attention to the observations made by members of the Council.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*