



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

Wednesday, 20 July 1966,  
 at 3.25 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

<i>Agenda items 4 and 9:</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 June</i>	
<i>1965:</i>	
<i>(a) Nauru (continued)</i>	
<i>General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX) on the</i>	
<i>question of the Trust Territory of Nauru</i>	
<i>(continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded) . . . . .</i>	133
<i>Appointment of the Drafting Committee on</i>	
<i>Nauru . . . . .</i>	134
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Attainment of self-government or indepen-</i>	
<i>dence by the Trust Territories and the</i>	
<i>situation in Trust Territories with regard</i>	
<i>to the Implementation of the Declaration on</i>	
<i>the Granting of Independence to Colonial</i>	
<i>Countries and Peoples. . . . .</i>	134
<i>Agenda item 11:</i>	
<i>Co-operation with the Special Committee on</i>	
<i>the Situation with regard to the Implemen-</i>	
<i>tation of the Declaration on the Granting</i>	
<i>of Independence to Colonial Countries and</i>	
<i>Peoples . . . . .</i>	137
<i>Agenda item 7:</i>	
<i>Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic</i>	
<i>visiting mission to the Trust Territory of</i>	
<i>the Pacific Islands in 1967 (concluded) . . . .</i>	138

*President:* Mr. Francis D. W. BROWN  
 (United Kingdom of Great Britain  
 and Northern Ireland).

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

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 9

<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering</i>	
<i>Authorities on the administration of Trust Terri-</i>	
<i>tories for the year ended 30 June 1965:</i>	
<i>(a) Nauru (continued) (T/1648, T/L.1108)</i>	
<i>General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX) on the ques-</i>	
<i>tion of the Trust Territory of Nauru (continued)</i>	

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Leydin, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, and Mr. De Roburt and Mr. Detsimea, advisers to the special representative, took places at the Council table.*

1. Mr. LEYDIN (Special Representative) noted with satisfaction that the Council seemed to be agreed that present conditions in Nauru were of a high standard and that the relations between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people were satisfactory.

2. As to the future, the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people were both conscious of the link between economic viability and political capacity; in 1964 they had begun discussions which had already resulted in such important developments as a 475 per cent increase in the Nauruan people's royalties from the phosphate industry and the establishment of the Legislative and Executive Councils on the date chosen by the Nauruan representatives. Political and economic development were thus proceeding hand in hand, creating a stable foundation for any further political changes. The Legislative and Executive Councils were meeting regularly and learning the complex techniques of self-government, and in the meantime the continuing discussions between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan representatives were focused on fundamental economic subjects, i.e., the related questions of resettlement and the restoration of the worked-out land, and arrangements for the future operation of the phosphate industry. The discussions had been facilitated by the increase in royalties and the interim agreement on the rate of production.

3. Some representatives had said or implied that since the Nauruan people had decided to remain on Nauru, further discussion of the question of resettlement was pointless. Others, recalling that the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, and the Council at its thirty-second session had recommended that the idea of resettlement should not be abandoned and that a further effort to find a basis for agreement should be made, had said or implied that they hoped an alternative homeland for the Nauruan people might still be sought and found. The Administering Authority regarded that aspect of the question in the light of the obligations it had assumed under the Trusteeship Agreement, which included the promotion of the economic, social, educational and cultural advancement of the Nauruan people. It was, no doubt, the apparently overwhelming advantages of a homeland near a metropolitan country which had induced the Nauruan people to declare several years previously that they had irrevocably decided on resettlement. Subsequently, however, the Nauruan leaders had found it necessary

to decline the offer of a spacious and fertile island close to several cities on the coast of Queensland because the proposed political arrangements would not, in their view, have guaranteed the preservation of the Nauruans' identity as a distinct people, but would have threatened them with integration and assimilation into a larger country. Mr. De Roburt had told the Council that the essential ingredients for independence were "first, a permanent homeland, on which the Nauruans could survive as an independent community and, secondly, a viable economy" (1285th meeting, para. 47). In those circumstances, the Administering Authority concurred with the unanimous view of the 1965 Visiting Mission that the idea of resettlement should not be abandoned, and held itself ready to pursue actively any proposal which the Nauruan representatives might wish to make.

4. With regard to the proposal to restore the worked-out land, he reminded the Council that at its thirty-second session (1256th meeting) the special representative had provided it with details on the magnitude and cost of such a project, and that the 1962 Visiting Mission had felt that cultivable land could be restored only at prohibitive expense (T/1595 and Add.1, para. 65). In any case, the question had been thoroughly investigated by a Committee of Experts appointed at the request of and in consultation with the Nauruan representatives. The Committee's report was now under consideration, and further comment would therefore be inappropriate at the present stage.

5. Turning to the Liberian representative's comments (1291st meeting) on the Administering Authority's right to work the phosphate deposits, he pointed out that the statement by the Australian Solicitor General had not been prepared to emphasize the legal basis of the British Phosphate Commissioners' operations; it had been prepared in response to the Nauruan representatives' request that the Commissioners' legal position be explained in writing so that they could study it. He could not agree that there was any doubt as to the sound legal basis of the rights exercised by the Commissioners. Of course, the Administering Authority had never relied solely on those rights in its negotiations and relations with the Nauruan people. On the contrary, as the Liberian representative herself had pointed out, it had consulted them throughout the years on such questions as royalty and production rates, the order in which the phosphate lands should be mined, etc.

6. In approaching the question of the future operation of the phosphate industry, now being discussed at Canberra, it should be recalled that Mr. De Roburt had informed the Council at its thirty-second session (1257th meeting) that his delegation had agreed to a production rate of 2 million tons a year, subject to review at the end of two years, and that the Nauruans were glad that the Administering Authority had increased the royalty rates very considerably, although not as much as they had wished. On that occasion Mr. De Roburt had also said (1259th meeting) that he looked forward to further discussions on the proposal for a partnership or joint enterprise arrangement for the operation of the phosphate industry. That complex question would affect the future welfare of

the Nauruan people more than any other. The French representative had referred (1291st meeting) to the capital investment and the management and marketing organization required to maintain efficiency and stability, and had expressed the hope that a solution would be found enabling the Nauruans to participate in management at the various levels, with particular reference to such matters as the production rate and the sale price of phosphate rock.

7. The association between the Australian and Nauruan peoples had made a significant contribution to the strength of the agricultural economies of the administering Governments, and had raised the Nauruan standard of living to a very high level. A continuance of that association held the promise of significant mutual benefits. The countries comprising the Administering Authority would continue to receive an assured supply of phosphate at a fair price, and the Nauruan people would continue to receive the benefits of experienced organization and a stable market for their only export. Both parties to the discussions were aware that no decision which neglected to ensure the continued efficient operation of the phosphate industry could be of long-term benefit to the Nauruan people.

8. The talks on economic questions were continuing, and at the 1285th meeting of the Council Mr. De Roburt had expressed hope in their outcome. In the political sphere, further discussions were to be held at an undetermined date; Mr. De Roburt had expressed the hope that they would be held in 1967, as recommended by the Council, and had said that he expected no difficulties in that regard. The Administering Authority shared Mr. De Roburt's hopes for the future, and was confident that with goodwill and flexibility on both sides arrangements could be made that would safeguard not only the interests of the present Nauruan population but also the welfare of future generations.

9. The PRESIDENT, speaking on behalf of the Council, thanked Mr. Leydin, Mr. De Roburt and Mr. Detsimea for their contribution to the Council's work.

*Mr. Leydin, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, and Mr. De Roburt and Mr. Detsimea, advisers to the special representative, withdrew.*

#### APPOINTMENT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NAURU

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that the representatives of Liberia and the United States should be appointed members of the Drafting Committee on Nauru.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 8

Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

11. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the rate of progress towards self-

government or independence in the Trust Territories was still far from that required by the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Trusteeship System still did not ensure political, economic and social progress for the indigenous peoples of the Territories, as required by Article 76 of the Charter. The legislative bodies set up in the Territories under United States and Australian trusteeship under the pressure of local and world opinion still did not enjoy sufficient powers. In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for example, full power remained in the hands of the High Commissioner and only with his approval could bills passed by the Congress of Micronesia come into force. A similar situation existed in the Territory at New Guinea and Papua, where a considerable number of seats in the House of Assembly were reserved for Australian citizens. Similarly, the Administering Authorities were not exerting enough effort to make the Territories economically independent. From the reports of the Administering Authorities it was evident that the economies of the Territories were largely subordinated to the interests of foreign monopolies, which exploited their human and natural resources. There were also many deficiencies as regards education and public health, particularly in the Pacific Islands and New Guinea. Furthermore, the General Assembly, in resolution 2105 (XX), had requested the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones. That applied all the more to Trust Territories. But his delegation was by no means convinced that the Administering Authorities were complying with that request.

12. The Soviet Union was greatly concerned at the fact that the Administering Authorities had not set a definite target date for the independence of any of the three Territories. According to the Press, United States officials, for example, had named various dates for the independence of the Pacific Islands: a former High Commissioner for the Territory had spoken of 1969 as a reasonable date, while the Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had mentioned 1975. The Administering Authority's report for the past year showed, however, that it was unwilling to set any more or less definite date. The same applied to the Territories of New Guinea and Nauru. In the Soviet delegation's view, the Council should urge the Administering Authorities to comply strictly with the United Nations resolutions relating directly to the granting of self-government or independence to the Trust Territories under consideration.

13. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that it was not true that the majority of the seats in the New Guinea parliament were occupied by Australians. The parliament was elected on a basis of universal suffrage and on a common roll. The result was that thirty-eight of the sixty-four members were indigenous inhabitants. As far as the question of military bases was concerned, under articles 4 and 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Territory of New Guinea the Australian Government had full power to make what defence arrangements it deemed appropriate in New Guinea. Article 7, in particular, stated that the Administering Authority might take all measures in the

Territory which it considered desirable to provide for the defence of the Territory and for maintenance of international peace and security. The Trusteeship Agreement had been approved by the General Assembly with the acquiescence of the Soviet Union. It was difficult to understand, therefore, why the Soviet representative now quoted subsequent General Assembly resolutions as if they in some way superseded the Trusteeship Agreement.

14. The Soviet representative had been right in saying that the Administering Authority had declined to set a date for independence in New Guinea. The date for independence was a matter for the people of the Territory to decide, in consultation with the Administering Authority. That had been made clear by elected members of the indigenous people as well as by representatives of the Administering Authority. The Council would recall, for example, the statement by the Australian Minister for Territories quoted at the 1286th meeting by the special representative. The Minister had said that his Government's basic policy for Papua and New Guinea was self-determination; that the people of the Territory were free to become independent or to remain an Australian Territory for as long as they wished; that if when exercising the right of self-determination they wished to remain in association with Australia, the form of association would require the agreement of the Australian Government of the day; and that the present Government considered it would be inappropriate to make any decision now on the type of association that might then be acceptable. As regards the indigenous people, in June 1964, the Gazelle Local Government Council, representing 42,000 people in the island of New Britain, had passed a motion expressing alarm at the proposal of the Soviet representative to the United Nations that New Guinea be granted independence in 1965 and confidence in the willingness of the Australian Government to grant independence when the people of New Guinea asked for it. The Council had urged the Australian Government to ignore any external pressures to grant independence prematurely, considering that the people of New Guinea were the best judges of the right date. In July 1964, the Fifth Native Local Government Council Conference, representing 922,000 of the 2 million people of Papua and New Guinea, had resolved to ask the Minister for Territories to ensure that people outside Papua and New Guinea did not force the country to have self-government. It had added that the people did not consider themselves ready for self-government yet and would seek the assistance of other countries when they did. In September 1964, the Papua and New Guinea House of Assembly had passed a resolution conveying to the Australian Parliament, the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly the wish of the people that they alone be allowed to decide when they were ripe for self-government and the form that such government should take. The House of Assembly had also expressed the conviction that the road to self-government could best be travelled with the sole guidance of the Administering Authority and that undue pressure from without could lead only to chaos and bloodshed. Finally, in March 1966, the Local Government Council Conference, representing some 1,449,000 of the people of Papua and New Guinea,

had adopted a resolution asking the Australian Government to stop pressure being applied for the Territory to have independence and self-government.

15. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, wished to correct several inaccurate statements made by the Soviet representative with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. First, it was not true that all legislative power remained in the hands of the High Commissioner; the Council had already been informed that any bill passed by the Congress of Micronesia automatically became law without requiring his approval. The High Commissioner did have a limited power of veto, which he had used only once, over certain bills, but the Congress could, if it wished, appeal the veto to the United States Department of the Interior. Secondly, there were no foreign economic interests whatsoever in the Territory. Thirdly, the Territory had been classified as a Strategic Trust Area, and according to article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the United States had the right to establish there such facilities as it might deem necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security. Fourthly, in referring to the question of setting a date for the independence of the Territory, the Soviet representative had quoted the former High Commissioner, who was no longer in a position to make policy in that regard. Mr. Nuuan, who was an elected representative of the Micronesian people and knew their wishes, had twice informed the Council that in his view it was trying to push his people towards independence too fast. In his closing statement, the present High Commissioner, Mr. Norwood, had said that he hoped to see the Micronesian people exercise their right of self-determination during his tenure, thus indicating that the United States was giving the matter active consideration.

16. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that his delegation had expressed its views on the item under discussion during the general debate on the Territories and therefore merely wished to reaffirm its support for all resolutions calling for the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and for the inalienable right of the peoples of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, New Guinea and Nauru to self-determination and independence.

17. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the statements by the representatives of the United States and Australia to the effect that their Trust Territories were still not ready for independence could not but arouse regret in view of the fact that the Territories had been under their Governments' control for several decades, during which time all the necessary steps could have been taken to prepare them for independence. The Australian representative had been mistaken in attributing to him a statement that a majority of the seats in the New Guinea parliament were held by Australians. He had merely said that a considerable number of them were held by Australians and the figures given by the Australian representative showed that to be the case. Australia's policy on the Territory's independence was obviously determined by the views of the Australian Minister for Territories, who, in January 1966, had stated

that Australia did not intend to leave Papua and New Guinea. There was much evidence to show that Australia was not interested in seeing that the Territory made rapid progress towards self-government and independence, and that the people of the Territory were dissatisfied with its policy. For example, a book entitled South Asia Pacific Crisis; National Development and the World Community, published in New York in 1964, stated that everywhere in the region there was a strong undercurrent of anti-colonialism and anti-neo-colonialism. The Pacific Island Monthly of February 1966 had stated that information on the true views of New Guineans about their future development was difficult to obtain, and had explained the reasons for that lack of information. That showed that the Administering Authority was not encouraging the indigenous population to express its views on the subject.

18. The Australian representative had tried to show in his statement that fully competent legislative organs existed in New Guinea. But an Australian student of New Guinea, Osmer White, had said in his book Parliament of a Thousand Tribes that New Guinea did not have central legislative organs and a permanent administration which could be considered effective by European standards, and that in the view of the whites the Territory could not be given independence for another fifty years. As far as the Administering Authority's defence powers were concerned, the Soviet delegation was familiar with the Trusteeship Agreement. The representative of Australia, however, confused defence and attack. Statements by Australian officials showed clearly the purpose of military construction in the Territory. For example, the Australian Minister for Air, speaking of the importance of the base at Barim, had said that the Australian Air Force would use it as an intermediate point for activities north of the Territory, and in particular if it wished to send aircraft to Viet-Nam or Malaysia. That showed that the defence of Australia was not at issue.

19. As regards the United States representative's statement, it might be strictly true that the monopolies operating in the Territory of the Pacific Islands were not foreign, since the United States considered that Territory part of its own. When, however, the United Nations discussed the activities of monopoly capital in dependent Territories, it was concerned not merely with the origin of the monopolies but with the question of whose interests they served and what effect they had on the Territories' progress towards independence. It was a fact that the activities of United States monopolies in the Territory of the Pacific Islands were criticized by the local population. A special resolution had been adopted on the subject by the Congress of Micronesia, resolution No. 1-26 of 4 August 1965, which showed that United States monopolies were operating in the Territory, particularly in the fishing industry, and had more or less monopolized that branch of the economy.

20. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he had not said the people of Papua and New Guinea were not ready for independence. He had merely quoted statements made on the subject by the people themselves and the Australian Minister for Territories.

When the Soviet representative claimed that the Australian Government did not encourage the indigenous people to express their views, he had perhaps forgotten the Select Committee on Constitutional Development now at work in the Territory, whose main task was to ascertain the views of the people so that it could make recommendations to the New Guinea parliament. There might have been a misunderstanding about what the Soviet representative had said concerning the composition of the New Guinea parliament, but the fact was that there was an indigenous majority and that in addition six Australians were elected under universal franchise and on the common roll to represent the indigenous people. The Soviet representative had used the term "whites" in that connexion. In his view, the terms "indigenous" and "non-indigenous" were preferable. Without the efforts and understanding of the non-indigenous people, there would not today be a parliament with an elected indigenous majority in New Guinea. Finally, he wished to state that no defence installations in New Guinea had been used for military efforts by Australia outside the Territory.

21. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America) said that the only United States business operating in Micronesia was the Van Camp Sea Food Corporation, which had established a small fish-canning plant in an attempt to help the people rebuild their own fishing industry, which had been destroyed during the war. When visiting the Territory in 1965, she had discussed the matter with many Micronesians, who had welcomed the presence of the company and had expressed the hope that other United States firms would come and add to the country's economic potential. Although it was hoped that the canning plant would eventually contribute to the productivity of Micronesia, the company was at the moment losing a considerable amount of money.

22. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand), referring to the Soviet representative's remark concerning the existence of foreign bases in the Territory, said that to the best of his knowledge there were no foreign bases in Micronesia. In any event, even if there were military bases there, they had been specifically authorized under the Trusteeship Agreement which had been signed in respect of Micronesia at the end of the Second World War and at the time of the establishment of the United Nations. According to Article 82 of the United Nations Charter, there might be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which might include part or all of the Trust Territory to which the agreement applied. On the basis of that Article, an agreement had been negotiated in the Security Council for the designation of Micronesia as a strategic trusteeship area. His country had taken no part in the negotiation of that agreement, but the Soviet Union had. The Soviet Union could have insisted upon a normal trusteeship agreement; it had not done so and had joined in making the special arrangement.

23. It must be remembered that there were two great Powers which had emerged from the Second World War with increases in territory: the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The United States had placed its additional territory under trusteeship and

that territory was subject to the inspection of the Trusteeship Council. The Soviet Union had chosen not to put its newly acquired territory under trusteeship and had absorbed Sakhalin Island and the Kurile Islands.

24. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, appealed to the President to request the speaker to confine his remarks to the substance of the agenda item before the Trusteeship Council.

25. The PRESIDENT said that it was his impression that certain matters had been mentioned as illustrative of the point actually under discussion. He asked the New Zealand representative to continue, bearing in mind the fact that there should be no substantive discussion of items not on the Council's agenda.

26. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) said that he had been alluding to the other territories in order to point out that there were certain territories which were within the purview of the Council and subject to annual inspection and others which were not. An arrangement had been made, to which the Soviet Union had agreed, for the establishment of a particular régime in connexion with Micronesia. He was merely questioning whether it was proper for a country which had agreed to a certain arrangement to challenge that arrangement year after year.

27. The PRESIDENT said that throughout the examination of conditions in the three remaining Trust Territories with which the Council had been dealing, attention had been directed to the measures being taken to achieve self-government or independence in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. The Council's recommendations on that question, as well as the observations of members on the subject, were being recorded in the appropriate chapter of the Council's report to the General Assembly. He suggested that the Secretariat should be requested to prepare for the approval of the Council a draft along those lines for the relevant chapter of the report.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 11

Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in accordance with the procedure followed in previous years, he should inform the Chairman of the Special Committee by letter<sup>1/</sup> that the Council, at its thirty-third session, had considered conditions in the three remaining Trust Territories and that its conclusions and recommendations, together with the views presented by individual members, would appear in the Council's report to the Security Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and in its report to the General Assembly on the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

*It was so decided.*

<sup>1/</sup> The text of the letter was subsequently circulated as document A/AC.109/191.

## AGENDA ITEM 7

Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1967 (concluded)\* (T/L.1113/Rev.1)

29. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China), introducing draft resolution T/L.1113/Rev.1, said that in connexion with the request contained in operative paragraph 3, it went without saying that the Visiting Mission would also bear in mind the draft resolution on the report of the World Health Organization on its investigation of the complaints contained in a petition concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1112), which had been sponsored by the Liberian delegation and adopted by the Council (1287th meeting).

30. Paragraph 5 was nothing more than the application of rule 95 of the Trusteeship Council's rules of procedure. Almost all previous visiting missions had availed themselves of the valuable assistance of representatives of the local administration. As was known, the Administering Authority was embarking on an expanded programme of economic development in Micronesia. Many previous visiting missions, in particular the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964, had found that there was a need for the assistance of experts in agriculture and economic development. The sponsors of the draft resolution wished to make it quite clear that, in authorizing the 1967 Visiting Mission to secure such expert assistance, the Council fully recognized that the experts would be acting merely in a consultative capacity and would have no independent status.

31. As was known, each Trust Territory had its own special circumstances, and what the sponsors had suggested in the present draft resolution should by no means be taken as a precedent for any subsequent visiting mission.

32. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the composition of the Visiting Mission did not include a representative of the Soviet Union. He had stated in the general debate on the question of the Pacific Islands that the Soviet Union delegation was prepared to participate in such a mission and to include in its delegation competent specialists from the Soviet Union. He protested against the fact that the colonial majority in the Trusteeship Council continued to pursue its policy of isolating the Soviet Union and preventing it from participating in visiting missions dispatched to Trust Territories. The Soviet Union hoped that the time would come when it would become a full-fledged member of the Trusteeship Council and would have an opportunity to participate in the work of visiting missions, which formed an important part of the activity of the Council.

33. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that Australia had participated in four visiting missions—to Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi, the Cameroons and Togoland—and that each of those countries had since become independent. In addition to the Australian participation, the range of membership in those four missions had covered a most interesting geographical

spread and a variety of political attitudes on colonial questions.

34. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the hope that the Territories under Australian administration would soon attain independence in the same way as the countries to which the Australian representative had referred.

35. The PRESIDENT invited the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council to make a statement on the financial implications of the draft resolution under consideration.

36. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would give rise to an additional expenditure of from \$3,000 to \$7,000, depending on whether or not suitable experts could be found in the Secretariat. In any event, the Secretary-General would undertake to meet those additional expenses from within the resources available to him under the regular budget for 1966.

37. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution submitted by China and New Zealand (T/L.1113/Rev.1) to the vote.

*The draft resolution (T/L.1113/Rev.1) was adopted unanimously.*

38. The PRESIDENT recalled that, following informal consultations, he had suggested at a previous meeting (1290th meeting) that it would be in accordance with the wish of the majority of the Council if the Visiting Mission were to be composed of Australia, France, Liberia and the United Kingdom. He suggested that the Council should now formally approve that composition.

*It was so decided.*

39. The PRESIDENT said that he had been informed that the Government of France had nominated Mr. Basdevant as its representative on the Visiting Mission and that the Government of Liberia had nominated Miss Brooks. As Australia and the United Kingdom were not yet in a position to nominate their representatives, he suggested that the Council might decide to approve the nomination of Mr. Basdevant and Miss Brooks and also to approve automatically whoever might be appointed to the Mission by the Governments of the two above-mentioned countries.

*It was so decided.*

40. The PRESIDENT said that, as a result of informed consultations which he had held, it appeared that it would meet the majority view of the Council if he were to appoint Miss Brooks as Chairman of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967. If he heard no objection, he would take it that that was the unanimous view of the Council.

*It was so decided.*

41. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thanked the President and the members of the Council, on behalf of her delegation and of the Government and people of Liberia, for having elected her to head the 1967 Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. She would do her utmost to play an active role in carrying out the functions assigned to the Mission.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

\*Resumed from the 1290th meeting.