



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Thirty-third Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 21 July 1966,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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 1965:

(b) *New Guinea (concluded)*

General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX) on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (concluded)

Report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea..... 139

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

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: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

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 1965:

(b) *New Guinea (concluded)* (T/1649, T/L.1109 and Add.I)*

*General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX) on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (concluded)**

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON
NEW GUINEA (T/L.1114)

1. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) introduced the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea (T/L.1114). Two amendments should be made in the annex, which contained the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. First, in the second sentence of paragraph 5 the meaning of the passage dealing with the possible union of the two Territories, Papua and New Guinea, should be clarified by deleting the word "eventually" and adding at the end of the sentence the words "rather than as separate countries" after the words "as an entity". Secondly,

in the second sentence of paragraph 7 of the English text, the Drafting Committee wished to delete the word "be" between the words "will" and "spread".

2. Although the text was largely self-explanatory, he wished to draw the Council's attention to certain points. The section on political advancement expressed the Council's satisfaction with the manner in which the House of Assembly was facing the problems of the Territory. It was for the Select Committee on Constitutional Development and the House itself to make detailed recommendations on the extension of the House's powers and on the passing of further responsibilities to institutions providing executive experience.

3. Few reservations had been expressed by Council members about the economic advancement being achieved, particularly in regard to the advances made in promoting the establishment of plantations by New Guineans themselves, and that was reflected in the draft.

4. At the same time, the Drafting Committee had felt that the Under-Secretaries and the House of Assembly in general might play a more active part in both planning and promoting economic development.

5. The statements of Council members illustrated how keenly they were awaiting the recommendations of the Select Committee on the future of the Territory. Consequently, the report recommended that the Administering Authority should give earnest and prompt consideration to the Committee's recommendations on the question of self-determination. Finally, it was suggested that the Council should draw the Administering Authority's attention to the need to keep constantly before the people of New Guinea the choices, including independence, open to them in the future.

6. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider, paragraph by paragraph, the draft conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1114).

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

Paragraph 2

7. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) suggested that in the French text the final wording of the penultimate sentence should read: "franchir l'étape vers un parlement pleinement représentatif et un gouvernement exerçant la plénitude des pouvoirs".

8. The PRESIDENT suggested that the English text should be left unchanged and that the French text should be amended so as to conform.

9. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) thought it would be preferable to begin the last sentence of paragraph 2 with the words "The Council hopes".

*Resumed from the 1286th meeting.

10. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) felt that such a wording would cast doubts on the stated intention of the Administering Authority to give serious consideration to the Select Committee's report.

11. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) explained that he had no intention of casting doubts about the measures to be taken by the Administering Authority, but the Council could not say it was "confident" that the Administering Authority would study all issues raised in the Select Committee's report.

12. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) thought that it would be possible to find a compromise by using an expression such as "The Council has reason to hope".

13. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), supported by Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) and Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), suggested the following wording: "The Council takes note of the statement of the Administering Authority that it will give urgent and positive consideration...".

14. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) pointed out that the last sentence of paragraph 25 used the wording: "The Council... trusts that the Administering Authority will give earnest and prompt consideration to the recommendations of the Committee and the House". The same idea was conveyed by the word "trusts".

15. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) felt that the word "trusts" could be used in the English text.

16. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with Mr. Eastman that the Council could not say it was confident that the Administering Authority would carry out the recommendations which had been addressed to it. A more careful formula should be used, such as "The Council hopes".

17. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt the following formula for the last sentence of paragraph 2: "The Council takes note that the Administering Authority will give urgent and positive consideration...". The English text of the last sentence of paragraph 25 would retain the word "trusts".

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 3

18. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) pointed out that only part of the House of Assembly was elected on the basis of universal suffrage by a single electoral college. The first sentence should therefore read "...the House of Assembly, the majority of which are elected...".

19. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) supported the amendment proposed by the representative of France.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 4

20. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the phrase "the Council will be particularly interested to learn of" was not very felicitous for other matters could be equally well described as deserving the attention of the Council. Consequently, it would be better to replace that phrase with the words: "the Council recommends that these points should be taken into account during the consideration of the Select Committee's recommendations...".

21. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) saw no objection to the amendment proposed by the USSR representative.

22. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) felt that the present wording was a more accurate reflection of the Council's feeling.

23. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) agreed with the representative of China. It was already stated in other paragraphs that the Select Committee's recommendations should be taken into account.

24. The PRESIDENT proposed the following compromise formula: "the Council will be particularly interested to learn of the recommendations of the Select Committee on these issues and recommends that the Administering Authority should take account of them".

25. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) wondered whether the Council should recommend that the Administering Authority should take into account recommendations of which the Council was not yet aware.

26. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said he asked himself the same question. If the formula suggested by the President was voted upon, he would vote against the last part of the sentence.

27. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the various comments that had been made, the report might merely state that the Council hoped that the Select Committee, which was dealing with those matters, would take into account in its recommendations the opinions expressed in the Council and the comments of the Visiting Mission.

28. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) pointed out that for years the United Nations had been urging Administering Authorities to allow the people to express their views freely on their future. The Select Committee was in fact a forum in which the people's views were being freely expressed. Thus, the idea expressed by the USSR needed to be strengthened by recommending that the Administering Authority should give serious consideration to the recommendations of the Select Committee.

29. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) pointed out that in paragraph 2 the Council had already taken note of the fact that the Administering Authority would give urgent and positive consideration to all the recommendations of the Select Committee. Thus, the second recommendation would duplicate the previous one.

30. The PRESIDENT suggested that the present text should be kept but that, in line with the Soviet representative's comments, an additional sentence should be added which might read: "The Council hopes that the views expressed by it and by the Visiting Mission will be taken into account by the Select Committee."

31. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he had expressed willingness to accept the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union representative on the basis of his understanding that the words "recommends that these points should be taken into account during the consideration of the Select Committee's recommendations" referred to the Administering Authority.

However, it seemed to him that the New Zealand representative's suggestion would remove all ambiguity and meet the point originally raised by the Soviet Union representative. Paragraph 4 might therefore be worded as follows:

"Recalling the views previously expressed by the Council and the observations of the 1965 Visiting Mission concerning the extension of the powers of the House of Assembly, the number and size of electorates, and the question of special and official seats in the House of Assembly, the Council recommends that the Administering Authority should take account of the recommendations of the Select Committee on these issues."

32. The PRESIDENT said that that wording did not seem to be fully acceptable to all concerned.

33. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that he would like to suggest a slight sub-amendment to the Australian amendment as follows: "... the Council recommends that serious consideration"—or "the most serious consideration"—"be given to the recommendations of the Select Committee on these issues." He felt that the expression "take account of" was not sufficiently positive.

34. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that he supported the Drafting Committee's original text because, to the best of his knowledge, it reflected the intentions of that Committee and also because the Council had already made such recommendations in the past. If the Council was to repeat those recommendations it should do so not in the terms which had just been proposed but in the terms chosen by the Committee.

35. The PRESIDENT said that he would put to the vote the amendment to the latter part of paragraph 4 proposed by the Soviet Union representative and agreed to by the New Zealand representative. The amendment would read as follows: "... the Council recommends that serious consideration be given to the recommendations of the Select Committee on these issues."

The amendment was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 5

36. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up paragraph 5. He recalled that the New Zealand representative, in introducing the report, had said that the word "eventually" in the second sentence should be deleted and that the words "rather than as separate countries" should be added after the words "as an entity".

37. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) observed that the Select Committee on Constitutional Development was not competent to adopt a national flag or a national anthem. That was a matter for the parliament and, within the limits of its powers, for the Australian Government. He therefore proposed that in the last sentence of the paragraph, the word "recommending" should be added after the word "considering".

With those amendments, paragraph 5 was adopted.

Paragraph 6

38. Mr. EASTMAN suggested that the last part of the paragraph, after the words "21 April 1966", should be replaced by the words "that, subject to certain considerations, the Government would regard transitional steps towards eventual responsible ministerial government as appropriate at this stage". The text would thus take up a comment made by the Minister for Territories and quoted in the Council by the special representative.

39. After an exchange of views between Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) and Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) Mr. McCARTHY said that, as he understood it, the representative of Liberia was concerned that the system of under-secretaries should be made more effective than at present in order to train indigenous people for ministerial government. Since that was also the concern of the Minister for Territories and the Australian Government, he proposed that the last part of the paragraph, after the words "the statement of the Minister for Territories", should be replaced by the words "that it is intended that all possible means of making this system more effective should be taken".

With that amendment, paragraph 6 was adopted.

40. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) proposed that the insertion of a new paragraph under the heading of "Political advancement" to take into account the view expressed by many that, in order to enable the people to manage their own affairs, local taxes could be turned over to them for budgetary disbursement.

41. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that all taxes raised in the area falling within the jurisdiction of a local government council were used solely by that council; they formed part of the council's revenue and not of the revenue of the Territory as a whole. Taxpayers in a local government area were exempt from the tax payable by individuals residing in non-council areas or by individuals who, for other reasons, did not pay a council tax.

42. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that he was not referring to such local taxes but to taxes paid to the Territory by the New Guinea Company, by Carpenter Holdings Ltd. or by Burns Philp. He proposed the following text:

"The Council takes note of the view expressed that revenue collected locally might be turned over to the House of Assembly for budgetary disbursements, and invites the Administering Authority and the Select Committee to give positive consideration to this proposal."

That paragraph would become paragraph 7 and the present paragraph 7 would become paragraph 8.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, as the special representative had explained, all revenue collected in the Territory was in fact spent in the Territory and none of it went into the Australian budget. All revenue, including all the taxes to which the Liberian representative had referred, was collected in the Territory by the Administration Treasury and formed part of the resources at its disposal. When the budget was submitted, the amounts accruing to the Territory were included in the Territory's budget.

Then the Australian Government, taking into account that amount and the global amount which it considered to be required to cover expenditures in the Territory in the financial year involved, made its own contribution to the Territory's budget. That grant amounted to around \$60 to \$70 million a year. The revenue collected in the Territory, plus the Australian grant, was then allocated by the Australian Government. The budget drawn up on the basis of that total amount (about \$104 million for the present year) was then considered by the House of Assembly, which could amend it. The House did not have the power, however, to add items to the budget for which resources were not available; it could act only within the limits of the amount placed at its disposal.

44. He did not believe that the matter raised by the Liberian representative needed to be dealt with. All revenue available to the Territory remained part of its budget, was considered and allocated by the parliament of the Territory as the latter thought fit, and was spent for the benefit of the inhabitants. He therefore felt that the Liberian amendment was not needed and was based on a misunderstanding.

45. The PRESIDENT asked whether the Liberian representative would in the light of that explanation withdraw his amendment, on the understanding that his statement and the Australian representative's statement would appear in the record.

46. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that he would like to know the views of the members of the Council before withdrawing his amendment. At present, he was reluctant to withdraw it because the House of Assembly did not have the power to make transfers of funds.

47. On the other hand, if the revenue was collected locally, instead of being allocated by Australia, transfers from one item of the budget to another would be possible.

48. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) said that, as he understood it, the Liberian representative was asking that revenues collected locally, including those which were normally made available to the local government councils, should be turned over to the House of Assembly.

49. Since, however, the local government councils levied certain taxes and had their own budgets, the proposed amendment would tend to deprive the councils of their budgetary resources. That would be an unfortunate result, for, if the development of New Guinea was to be promoted, it was necessary to begin at the source by giving the local government councils certain responsibilities, particularly in the budgetary field.

50. He therefore feared that the proposed amendment might give rise to confusion.

51. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) proposed that, to allay the apprehensions of the French representative, his amendment be drafted as follows: "The Council takes note of the view expressed that revenues collected locally, except those of the local government councils, . . ." The councils could maintain the revenue which they collected locally in their budget as they wished, but the revenue collected by the Administration from the large companies could be turned over to the

House of Assembly for disbursement, as the local government councils now had the privilege of disbursing taxes that they collected locally.

52. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that to be a very reasonable proposal. The Council could take account of that idea in its recommendations since the Territory needed extra revenue for its development and since the taxes levied in the Territory should naturally be made available to the local governing bodies. The question primarily concerned the industrial companies active in the Territory: their considerable income should serve to supplement the taxes that could be used for the benefit of the indigenous inhabitants.

53. His delegation therefore considered that the Council could adopt the amendment so clearly presented by the Liberian delegation.

54. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Liberian amendment providing for the insertion of the following new paragraph after paragraph 6:

"The Council takes note of the view expressed that revenues collected locally, except those of the local government councils, might be turned over to the House of Assembly for budgetary disbursement, and invites the Administering Authority and the Select Committee to give positive consideration to this proposal."

A vote was taken on the Liberian amendment.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against, with 2 abstentions.

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

There were 3 votes in favour and 4 against, with 1 abstention. The amendment was not adopted.

Paragraph 7

55. The PRESIDENT recalled that the New Zealand representative, speaking as a member of the Drafting Committee, had stated that the word "be", in the second sentence of the English text, should be deleted.

56. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that his delegation had some difficulty in accepting the wording of the second sentence. It was not clear whether the trend advocated was more important than the need for more money and more powers for the local government councils. It was not clear either, as his delegation had already said, whether the creation and extension of multiracial local government councils would increase the self-confidence of their indigenous members, particularly at the present stage. Since the multiracial bodies were just being established, it might be a little early for the Council to express itself categorically. It went without saying that his delegation stood for multiracial society, but the present question was an entirely different matter.

Paragraph 7 was adopted.

Paragraphs 8 and 9

Paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted.

Paragraph 10

57. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) said that he had been particularly struck by the development of the Administrative College established in the Territory. It was much to the credit of the Administering Authority, and he proposed that the following words be added at the end of paragraph 10: "and the forthcoming extension of the Administrative College".

The French amendment was adopted.

58. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) wondered whether it was really for the Trusteeship Council to recognize the limitations placed on the Administration in recruiting indigenous officers. His delegation was not convinced that the Administration could not, as the Visiting Mission had recommended, simply choose from among the population persons whom it judged qualified to occupy positions of responsibility. He therefore proposed deletion of the first phrase of the paragraph, which would then begin with the words: "While acknowledging the efforts already made in this field, the Council recommends...."

59. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) pointed out that, while the fact that there were few New Guinean secondary school and university graduates did not represent an insurmountable obstacle, it did create a number of difficulties.

60. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) stressed that in the present text of paragraph 10 the indigenous population itself seemed to be held responsible for the fact that there were too few people qualified to hold certain positions in the Administration. Deletion of the first phrase would avoid any reference to the question of responsibility.

61. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that the text made no judgement about responsibility for the situation and was merely intended to point to a practical difficulty which undoubtedly existed.

62. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that it was superfluous to note a fact which was known to all. It would be more useful to emphasize the recommendation proper. His delegation therefore supported the Liberian amendment.

63. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) asked that the intentions of the Drafting Committee should not be misunderstood. It was quite correct to say that the limitations placed on the Administration in recruiting qualified indigenous officers for positions of greater responsibility were due to the fact that there were relatively few secondary school and university graduates available. He would like to see the original text maintained.

64. The PRESIDENT put the Liberian amendment to the vote.

65. Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation would abstain, as it normally did when the draft reports on Territories under Australian administration were being considered, for, while it was true that the difficulties referred to by the Drafting Committee existed, it was also true that the Liberian amendment recognized the efforts made by the Administration of the Territory in that field.

The Liberian amendment was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 10 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 11

66. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. BASDEVANT (France) felt that the reference to indigenous plantings and production in the first sentence was unclear.

67. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) proposed that the phrase be reworded as follows: "... since the publication of the World Bank's report plantings and production by indigenous growers have increased by very significant percentages."

Paragraph 11, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 12

68. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) observed that paragraph 12, as drafted, gave the impression that control of the vital sectors of the economy was already in the hands of the indigenous inhabitants, which was not true. Moreover he did not think that the Administration intended to take the large holdings away from the present owners and turn them over to the indigenous people.

69. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) proposed that the second sentence of paragraph 12 should be amended to read as follows:

"Nevertheless, the Council is in accord with the basic objective of the policy, especially in so far as it results in control of the vital sectors of the economy being retained in the hands of the people of the Territory and ensures that all roads to the political future are kept open."

Paragraph 12, as amended, was adopted.^{1/}

70. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) thought that the text of paragraph 12 would better express the Council's opinion if all reference to the results to be expected from the Administration's general policy was deleted. The essential thing was to say what those results should be.

71. The PRESIDENT said that he must ask the members of the Council whether they wished to reconsider the text of paragraph 12. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to reopen its consideration of paragraph 12.

It was so decided.

72. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) proposed that the last sentence should read as follows:

"Nevertheless, the Council is in accord with the basic objective of the policy that control of the vital sectors of the economy should be retained in the hands of the people of the Territory and that all roads to the political future be kept open."

The Chinese amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 12, as amended, was adopted.

^{1/} Later amended; see paragraph 72.

Paragraph 13

Paragraph 13 was adopted.

Paragraph 14

73. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "with the proviso that this does not conflict with the interests of the indigenous inhabitants" should be inserted at the end of the first sentence.

The USSR amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 14, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 15

74. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that, since the international assistance referred to in paragraph 15 was essentially that provided by specialized agencies, the text should be amended, in the interests of clarity, to read as follows: "The Council welcomes the acceptance of assistance from the specialized agencies in the development of the Territory and feels that these agencies of the United Nations...".

75. The PRESIDENT thought that, if the text referred explicitly to the specialized agencies, it might seem to exclude assistance from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other institutions. He therefore suggested that the second sentence should be combined with the first, so that the paragraph would begin as follows: "The Council welcomes the acceptance of international assistance in the development of the Territory, and it feels that the specialized agencies...".

It was so decided.

Paragraph 15, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 16, 17, 18 and 19

Paragraphs 16, 17, 18 and 19 were adopted.

Paragraph 20

76. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) observed that the wording of paragraph 20 gave the impression that racial discrimination no longer existed in the Territory. He therefore proposed that the paragraph should be amended to begin as follows: "The Council, recognizing that the Administering Authority has legislation outlawing racial discrimination in the Territory, calls upon...". It would also be desirable to replace the word "continue" by the word "intensify". The paragraph as a whole would then read as follows:

"The Council, recognizing that the Administering Authority has legislation outlawing racial discrimination in the Territory, calls upon it to intensify its efforts to stamp out any discriminatory practices which may still exist."

The Liberian amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 20, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 21

77. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 21 should be replaced by the following text: "The Council notes the efforts made by the Administering Authority in the sphere of public health".

78. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) observed that, progress having been made in that sphere, the Administering Authority should be commended for it.

79. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, even if progress had been made, much nevertheless remained to be done. In his view, the text of paragraph 21 should be amended.

80. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) thought that, by commending the Administering Authority for the progress achieved, the Council would encourage it to continue its efforts. He therefore proposed that the present wording of the paragraph should be retained.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 21 was adopted.

Paragraphs 22 and 23

Paragraphs 22 and 23 were adopted.

Paragraph 24

81. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) reminded the Council that, when he had asked Mr. Abal, a member of the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea, whether he was familiar with General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX), Mr. Abal had been unable to reply and had referred him to the special representative. That proved that the resolution in question had not been given sufficient publicity. He therefore proposed that at the beginning of the paragraph the words "with satisfaction" should be replaced by the words "the report of the Administering Authority".

82. Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia) explained that the reason why Mr. Abal had been unable to reply to the question put by the Liberian representative was that, unlike those who were closely associated with the work of the United Nations, the inhabitants of the Territory were not in the habit of referring to resolutions by number. That did not mean that they were not familiar with all the General Assembly resolutions which affected them.

A vote was taken on the Liberian amendment.

There were 2 votes in favour and 2 against, with 4 abstentions.

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

There were 2 votes in favour and 2 against, with 4 abstentions. The amendment was not adopted.

83. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation had voted in favour of the Liberian amendment because it considered that the dissemination of information on the United Nations was of the greatest importance to the people of the Territory. The debate had shown, however, that the inhabitants of the Territory were still insufficiently informed with regard to the political progress in question. He therefore regretted that the Council had decided to reject the amendment.

84. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that his delegation was in favour of the widest possible dissemination of information on the United Nations, in-

cluding the important resolutions referred to in paragraph 24. There had been serious deficiencies in that matter in the past, but his delegation considered that the explanation given by the special representative concerning the steps taken to translate those resolutions into the major languages of the Territory and to have them distributed widely should be noted with satisfaction. For that reason New Zealand had voted against the amendment proposed by Liberia.

85. Mr. MAIN (United Kingdom) associated himself with the New Zealand representative's observations.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 25

Paragraph 25 was adopted.

Paragraph 26

86. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the following sentence should be added to paragraph 26: "The Council recommends that the Administering Authority should make immediate arrangements to set a date for the granting of independence to the Territory, taking into account the wishes of the indigenous population."

87. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that the United States delegation could not accept that amendment, which was inconsistent with the first part of the paragraph.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2.

88. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that he had voted in favour of the USSR amendment because he considered it wholly consistent with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

89. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) referred the members of the Council, for the explanation of Australia's vote, to the whole of the information furnished by his delegation in the course of discussion.

90. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that, by rejecting the addition proposed by his delegation, the Council might find itself accused of unwillingness to promote the advancement of the Territory's inhabitants towards self-government and independence. The General Assembly had adopted several resolutions on the subject, including resolution 2105 (XX) in which it recommended the setting of a deadline for the accession to independence of each Territory in accordance with the wishes of the people. The Powers which had rejected the Soviet proposal had not merely acted contrary to the provisions of that resolution; they had also proved that the Administering Authority was not really giving wide publicity to information on the activity of the United Nations; if, as those Powers asserted, the inhabitants of the Territory were not yet demanding self-government or independence, that showed that the Administering Authority had done nothing to prepare them for it. The purpose of disseminating information was to put the Territory's inhabitants in a position to exercise their right to self-determination. The Administering Authority should make greater efforts in that direction in the future.

91. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, refuted the allegation by the Soviet Union representative that information on the United Nations had not been disseminated in the Territory by the Administering Authority. With regard to the amendment, the Territory's inhabitants had made it clear that they would express themselves on the subject of independence when they were ready to do so.

92. Mr. BASDEVANT (France) explained that France had abstained from voting on the amendment because, in its opinion, United Nations organs frequently exceeded the powers conferred upon them by the Charter.

93. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) observed for the Soviet representative's information that, in all the resolutions adopted, there was a provision that a target date for the attainment of independence should be fixed "in accordance with the views of the people". The New Guineans had stated their views on the subject unequivocally, as paragraph 26 showed. It would have meant disregarding their views, therefore, for the Council to have adopted the Soviet amendment. In his opinion New Guinea might ultimately choose independence, but that was not for his delegation or the Council to decide.

94. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) proposed that the beginning of paragraph 26 should read as follows:

"The Council has taken note in this regard both of the statement made before the Council by a member of the House of Assembly, Mr. Tei Abal, that the people of Papua and New Guinea were not asking for self-government or independence at this stage, nor wished to be hurried...."

That wording would be more in keeping with the statement made by Mr. Abal.

95. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) observed that, according to the record of the 1286th meeting, Mr. Tei Abal had in fact said that the people of Papua and New Guinea were not ready for self-government. He therefore proposed the following text:

"The Council has taken note in this regard both of the statement made before the Council by a member of the House of Assembly, Mr. Tei Abal, that the people of Papua and New Guinea were not ready for self-government at this stage nor did they wish to be hurried...."

The New Zealand amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 26, as amended, was adopted.

96. Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if paragraph 26 had been put to the vote, his delegation would have abstained.

Paragraphs 27, 28 and 29

Paragraphs 27, 28 and 29 were adopted.

97. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation made in paragraph 4 of the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.114) that the Council should adopt the revised working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (T/L.1109 and Add.1) as the basic text for the chapter on conditions in that

Territory to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly.

The recommendation in paragraph 4 was adopted unanimously.

98. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation made in paragraph 5 of the Drafting Committee's report that the Council should adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex to the report and include them at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter.

99. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, as a matter of principle, his delegation would abstain from voting on that paragraph.

The recommendation in paragraph 5 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

100. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that the General Assembly, in resolution 2112 (XX), had called upon the Administering Authority "to fix an early date for independence in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people" and had requested it "to report to the Trusteeship Council

at its thirty-third session... on the implementation" of the resolution. The Assembly had also requested the Trusteeship Council "to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-first session". The Council had considered that agenda item (General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX) on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua) together with its examination of the Administering Authority's annual report on the Territory.

101. He therefore suggested that in part I, chapter V, of its report to the Assembly, entitled "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", the Council should inform the General Assembly of the action it had taken on the subject and of the observations which had been made in the course of the discussion.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.