

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY
JUL 12 1961
UN/SA COLLECTION



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1167
11 July 1961

ENGLISH

Twenty-seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 11 July 1961, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

U TIN MAUNG

(Burma)

Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories (Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV)) and application to Trust Territories of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)) [8]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1167 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 8

ATTAINMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1369 (XVII) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1413 (XIV)) AND APPLICATION TO TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1514 (XV))

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, we are grateful to you for having given us the opportunity to make a statement concerning the question of the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the application to Trust Territories of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Before reading my statement, I would like to note that in this statement we have summed up the position which was taken by the Soviet delegation at the last session of the Trusteeship Council. We have also summed up the opinions which were voiced by the Soviet delegation on previous occasions. That is why we would ask, Mr. President, that the text of this statement summarizing our point of view appear in extenso in the records and in the report -- I believe it would be in chapter V -- as a statement of the position and the opinions of the Soviet Union.

On 14 December 1960 the General Assembly, after a careful examination of the question put on the agenda by the Soviet Union -- namely, the liquidation of colonialism -- adopted by an overwhelming majority a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people. Thus, all States throughout the world, with the exception of the colonial Powers, among which were the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Union of South Africa, and Australia, spoke in favour of the immediate liquidation of the shameful system of colonialism. In this declaration the General Assembly was aware of the desire of all peoples for independence and solemnly declared the need to put an immediate end to colonialism in all its shapes and forms. The General Assembly declared:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

(General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), paragraph 5)

Having adopted this resolution, the General Assembly determined the course to be followed by the Trusteeship Council when these matters were considered. It is obvious that the General Assembly declaration is completely applicable to all such territories. With this shameful system of colonialism the trusteeship system must disappear as well, since it has not fulfilled all the hopes which were placed in it.

In the statement of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, concerning the declaration of the United Nations regarding the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the following was stated:

"At the present time the essential thing is to see to it that the wishes of the people as expressed in the United Nations resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples become a reality, so that the conditions laid down in that declaration will not remain a dead letter but will be brought into force."

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Various tricks and evasive measures are holding up the implementation of this General Assembly resolution. Thus, by the decision of the United Nations, it is a question of putting an immediate end to colonialism and taking the necessary measures immediately, not delaying by various pretexts. The liquidation of the colonial system in any country must not be delayed and it must not be left a dead letter while the colonial system continues to be maintained. We cannot allow the colonial Powers to reserve their control.

Concerning this great force for liberation during the past few years, we have seen numerous countries escape from colonial slavery, especially certain Trust Territories. However, we must note that the colonial Powers are doing everything possible and using every manoeuvre possible to put a brake on the inevitable process of liberation of colonial peoples. They have made every effort possible to put obstacles in the way of implementation of the General Assembly resolution. In those cases where the colonial Powers for one reason or another are obliged to grant political independence to Trust Territories, they attempt by every means possible, by way of new forms, to keep the control which they formerly had over these territories and to impose upon them various conditions before independence which restrict their sovereignty.

In the opinion of the Soviet delegation it is necessary to take effective measures to the end that all Trust Territories will be granted independence immediately -- an independence which will be authentic and not fictitious. The General Assembly declaration envisages a true liberation of all colonial peoples, and we must speak out against the Belgian action when attempts are made to set up a puppet government in Ruanda-Urundi. In the debate on Ruanda-Urundi in the Trusteeship Council it appeared that the Belgian Government was attempting to sabotage the decision of the General Assembly adopted at its fifteenth session concerning Ruanda-Urundi. The administering Power has not implemented the recommendations of the United Nations that there be created immediately a provisional government based upon a broad foundation which would then be followed by the establishment of a government based upon elections.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

With regard to the general amnesty and the abrogation of the Law of 25 December 1960, these have not been implemented. According to that law, an extraordinary dictatorial and police system was established, and the Council has become aware that, as in the past, the Administering Authority is attempting to impose upon the indigenous population a puppet administration. The delegation of the Soviet Union pointed out that the Administering Authority carried a heavy responsibility if it continued to sabotage the application of the General Assembly resolution concerning Ruanda-Urundi. At this twenty-seventh session of the Council the delegation of the Soviet Union also spoke out against the efforts of the Government of New Zealand to restrict the sovereignty of the future State of Western Samoa and to keep in its hands the principal economic resources, especially the Bank of Western Samoa, as well as to impose upon Samoa what they called a friendship treaty which would mean control from abroad of Samoa under a new form.

The granting of independence to Tanganyika in October 1961 involves the rapid liquidation of the Trusteeship System in that Territory. However, it would be mistaken to congratulate ourselves by believing that the results which we wish for will be achieved rapidly. There must still be a bitter struggle in the area of the Pacific Islands also if that Territory is to be liberated from the colonial yoke. We must struggle for the absolute independence of these Trust Territories without any conditions, reservations or restrictions upon their sovereignty.

The General Assembly has adopted specific decisions providing for the granting of independence in the near future to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, Western Samoa and Ruanda-Urundi. As for the other Trust Territories, the General Assembly has invited the Administering Authorities to fix dates for their independence.

At this session of the Trusteeship Council the Soviet delegation has noted that the Administering Authorities continue to fail to implement the resolution of the Assembly with regard to their Trust Territories and have not established a date for their independence. The Territories of New Guinea, Nauru and the Pacific Islands are no exception. The provisions of the declaration of the Assembly concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples are applicable to these Territories, which must

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

be given their independence immediately. Examination of conditions in these Territories at the twenty-seventh session of the Council has shown that the Administering Authorities have not taken the necessary measures to apply the provisions of the declaration of the General Assembly, but continue to pursue their colonial policies, policies which are in contradiction to the Charter of the United Nations and to the declaration of the Assembly. They have taken no measures to transmit all powers to the people of New Guinea, Nauru and the Pacific Islands without any restrictions for the purpose of giving them an opportunity to enjoy total independence and freedom, although in its declaration the General Assembly demanded that such measures should be taken immediately.

Concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands administered by the United States, we see that neither in the report of the Visiting Mission of 1961 nor in the report submitted by the Administering Authority does there appear any indication that the Administering Authority has taken any measures to implement the provisions of the declaration of the General Assembly. On the contrary, the data show that the policy of the Administering Authority has not changed, that it is not acting in conformity either with the Charter or with the declaration of the Assembly on the granting of independence. The representative of the Administering Authority in the Trusteeship Council avoids by every possible means mentioning independence. He says that this is an objective of the Administering Authority but gives no indication that any date for the Trust Territory's independence has been set. In effect, the United States makes sure that the people of the Trust Territory will not achieve complete independence and will not become an independent State. The Administering Authority makes every effort, under the pretext of self-determination for the Territory and of determining the aspirations of the people, to the end that the Territory will rather be associated directly with the metropolitan country or with Guam. The United States has taken no measures to transfer powers to the people of this Trust Territory. The Administering Authority believes that the Territory of the Pacific Islands is only a strategic military base for the United States; it is not concerned with the political, economic and cultural progress of the Territory. Up to the present time all the powers are in the hands of the United States Administration. In the

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Trust Territory there are no central legislative or executive organs representing the indigenous population. The Inter-District Advisory Council has no power; it is simply an advisory body. The Soviet delegation believes that the provision of the declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples must be fully implemented and applied to the Pacific Islands Trust Territory in spite of the strategic nature of this area. The Administering Authority must elaborate a plan for immediate steps transferring all powers to representative organs of the indigenous people of the Pacific Islands. It must also establish a precise date for the immediate granting of independence to that Trust Territory.

I come now to Nauru. The information available to the Council shows that Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, which constitute the Administering Authority, are not implementing the terms of the declaration on the granting of independence to Nauru. The policy and the action of the Administering Authority are in contradiction to what was set forth in this document of the General Assembly and are contrary to the real interests of the population of Nauru. The Administering Authority refuses to apply this declaration to Nauru, but imposes on the indigenous population of Nauru a plan for the transfer of the inhabitants to Australia. This plan is felt by the indigenous inhabitants of Nauru to be contrary to their national interests, as was clearly pointed out in the Trusteeship Council by one of the members of the Local Government Council of Nauru.

The Administering Authority has taken no measure whatever to transfer power to the representative bodies of the Nauruan population. All powers are in the hands of the Australian Administrator and of the Commissioners who, on the basis of a colonial agreement concluded in 1919, continue to exploit the phosphate resources of the island and are now converting this island into a desert area. It was because this island had phosphate resources that Trusteeship was assumed by Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

It is only these deposits of phosphates that draw the attention of these Powers to Nauru; and as these deposits will only last about thirty or forty years, the Administering Authority over this period of time has the intention of expelling the inhabitants and installing them elsewhere.

As to the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority has conferred on the Council the right to administer all the affairs of the country, and to control all the activities of the BPC, which at the present time in actual fact is the organ that controls the Territory.

The local inhabitants are against this plan for the reinstallation or resettlement of the inhabitants of Nauru in Australia. In the opinion of our delegation, the Trusteeship Council should bear in mind the will of the people of Nauru who desire to maintain their national community, and the Council should not allow for the application of any plan which would entail the liquidation of the population of Nauru. The Soviet delegation considers that the Administering Authority should eliminate this plan for the expulsion of the Nauruan population, and apply the terms of the declaration approved by the Assembly concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

In this connexion the Soviet delegation proposed that in 1961, in the Trust Territory of Nauru, a plebiscite under the supervision of the United Nations should be held in order to ascertain the will and desire of the population of Nauru. The supervision of this referendum would be entrusted to a special mission of the United Nations which would be sent to Nauru for that purpose.

I shall now refer to New Guinea. In none of the statements or declarations of the Administering Authority do we find any information as to the measures taken by the Administering Authority in conformity with the declaration of the General Assembly, and the Administering Authority continues to persist in its colonial policy, which does not envisage the granting of independence to New Guinea. The actual present situation in New Guinea shows that the Australian Government has taken no measure whatsoever in order to transfer the powers to the population of New Guinea, and to implement the declaration of the General Assembly. As in the past, this Territory is in the hands of the Australian authorities. The presumed reforms have not changed the situation at all. As in the past, this so-called Legislative Council is anti-democratic and non-representative. For

(Mr. Oberemko, UESR)

the indigenous population of New Guinea there is only one seat in this Council. Consequently, 1,800,000 inhabitants of New Guinea are represented on the Council by only eleven members, whereas 20,000 foreigners are represented by twenty-six members, and thus have the absolute majority of votes. Furthermore, the Legislative Council, even with its present anti-democratic composition, because it includes officials of the Australian Administration, has no right to take decisions on behalf of the people of New Guinea. In fact, the people of this Trust Territory are fully controlled and in the hands of the Administering Authority. Thus, the colonial regime in this Trust Territory is still in effect, and the indigenous population cannot administer the affairs of its own country.

In the discussions on New Guinea, in the Council, the Soviet delegation had proposed that the Administering Authority should review and radically modify its policy in connexion with this Trust Territory in order to ensure the immediate granting of independence to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, and in order that the Administering Authority should renounce its desire to attach the population of New Guinea to the metropolitan Territory by giving them an apparent local autonomy.

The Soviet delegation had proposed on the basis of the declaration of the General Assembly that a concrete plan be elaborated for the granting of immediate independence to this Territory, with the setting of a time limit for the granting of such independence.

In order to ascertain the will of the population of New Guinea, our delegation had proposed that as soon as possible, a referendum or plebiscite should be held in the Territory in order to determine the future of this Territory.

As to the discussion of questions concerned with the Territories in the Pacific Islands, the Soviet delegation had proposed that in 1961 or early in 1962 the United Nations should send to the Pacific Islands, to Nauru and to New Guinea, special missions which would supervise the holding of the plebiscite, and fix the time limits for the granting of independence. The Soviet delegation has observed that the representatives of the colonial Powers in the Council stubbornly resist this offer and refuse to accept proposals which would lead to the immediate implementation of the General Assembly declaration on the granting of

(Mr. Oborenko, USSR)

independence. The colonial Powers have a majority in the Council, and have transformed it into a body that in fact puts a stop to the granting of independence to Trust Territories. They use the Trust Territory to cover up their true intentions in these territories, which consist of exploiting the natural resources and the local populations. They oppose the implementation of the declaration of the General Assembly, and persist in maintaining a colonial regime in these Territories under different guises. Nevertheless, nothing will stop the historic process of national liberation and of elimination of the old colonial Powers.

The colonial and capitalistic effect is extending throughout the world. By virtue of these regimes created by capitalists, they are doomed to absolute failure.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I have listened with admiration, not unmixed with pity, to the statement which has been made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I wish that he had a greater capacity for happiness. We have seen one Trust Territory after another reach the agreed goal. I hope he will be in his place tomorrow when the Prime Minister of Tanganyika is with us -- when we move again towards the happy occasion of the independence of a Trust Territory. But instead of enthusiasm, we find from him only criticism. He seems to disregard the spectacular progress which has been made in bringing Trust Territories to self-government and independence. In fact, as I listened to him this morning I felt that he resembled a missionary full of evangelistic fervour, who discovered to his chagrin on arriving at his destination that most of the people except for perhaps a few children had been converted a long time ago. What we need now is not bad temper, but goodwill; not easy rhetoric, but hard thinking.

I have often in my life remembered a quotation which I should like to make to this Council, if I may. This was said by a great Englishman nearly 200 years ago, but it is very relevant to our work. It is what Edmund Burke had to say.

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

"To make a Government requires no great prudence. Settle the seat of power, teach obedience, and the work is done. To give freedom is still more easy. It is not necessary to guide; it is only necessary to let go the reins. But to form a free Government, to temper together the opposite elements of liberty and restraint in one consistent work requires deep thought, and a powerful and sagacious and refining mind."

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

To form a free Government, to temper together the opposite elements of liberty and restraint -- that is the purpose of the Administering Powers, that is the purpose, I trust and believe, of this Council. And we shall press on with our task, and we have already made in this Council, and the Administering Authorities have made, as I say, spectacular progress.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to deal in detail with all the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union. He speaks a great deal about shame. I should like to tell him that I, having been concerned with the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories all my life, feel no shame. I feel pride, pride that we have been able to bring one people after another to the stage of self-government and independence. But I should like to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that we in the British Commonwealth in the past decade and a half have enfranchised much more than double the population of the Soviet Union.

The representative of the Soviet Union spoke about putting on a brake. On the contrary, I have spent most of my official life putting my foot on the accelerator.

He turns to particular cases. He says of the Belgian Government, that it is seeking to sabotage the resolution of the United Nations. Not at all. We have the report of the representative of Belgium indicating the close co-operation which exists between the Commission of this United Nations and the Administering Authority.

Even in the cases of Western Samoa and Tanganyika, the representative of the Soviet Union casts about for some criticism when surely he should join in the general rejoicing.

As to Nauru, I must make one more protest. He again speaks, in spite of the denials which have been frequently made, about imposing a solution involving the removal of the people of the Island. Not once but repeatedly it has been stated that there is no question of imposing any solution. We consider, even if he does not, that the wishes and the interests of the people must be paramount. And we have made it repeatedly clear that the proposal which has been put forward by the Australian Government on behalf of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand and the United Kingdom can only proceed if the people freely accept it.

I think that it is time when we hear these repetitions that we should answer them. We, the Administering Authorities, and I speak more widely for those who have been responsible for assisting the Non-Self-Governing countries to advance toward the management of their own affairs in self-government and independence, we are the people who have done the work. We see today the results of our work and we shall press on to the completion of our work, leaving the representative of the Soviet Union to explore, like a diligent tourist, the battlefields on which we won the day.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): I did not feel like interrupting the representative of the Soviet Union although I consider that some of his statements were such that any representative could have objected on a point of order.

On behalf of the New Zealand delegation, I should like to repudiate the insinuations and allegations he made about my Government and its policies in respect of Western Samoa, and in so far as it is concerned with the administration of Nauru, with the administration of Nauru.

In a way, I should rather like to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the guided tour he gave us through a dream world which is rather frightening in its crazy consistency but which is completely baseless in fact. It was in fact a statement defying Marxist analysis though perhaps not political or psychoanalysis. But we are much more interested in facts than in fancies and in deeds rather in words. As a very small, retiring imperialist, I should like to give some good advice to a very large and active imperialist and quote an old English motto which says: "one must practise what one preaches." This is apparently a motto which is impossible to translate into Russian.

However, the Administering Members are in the proud position of being able to look at the Territories to which they have granted independence and say, like the mother of the Gracchii: "These are my jewels".

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I should like to begin my brief intervention on this item by quoting what the leader of the Indian delegation said on this subject in part in the plenary Assembly. These are his words:

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

"If I may submit without being misunderstood, one of the most potent resistances, one of the greatest impediments in the way of progress, is not to recognize that progress is being made, because if we do not recognize that progress is being made, we are likely to apply the same remedies, have the same reactions to changed conditions as the condition was previously, and thereby get all our orientation and our policies misrepresented, misunderstood, and misapplied. Similarly, if we do not recognize that progress is being made, it is very likely that those who have been either pressured into progress by the agitations of colonial peoples or liberal sentiments in their own countries are encouraged to fall back and point out to their own peoples, 'We told you so.' So therefore, we have to recognize that some progress has been made."

(A/PV.944. page 43)

It is perhaps a truism to say that some progress has been made. This is evident from the records of the debates of this Council at this session and at preceeding sessions. Of the eleven Territories which were placed under trust, in about six months or a little longer only three will continue under trust. At this session itself, the Council has recommended to the Assembly to take up the question of the date of the independence of Western Samoa. The Assembly at its resumed session earlier this year took note of a certain date on which Tanganyika is to become independent and that date, we understand, is being advanced. It is obvious, therefore, that considerable progress has been made in the liberation of colonial areas which were placed under trusteeship and, if I may say so, in the application of the principles of the Charter which apply to these Territories.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

One wonders, then, why the Assembly should have felt it necessary to adopt another declaration at its last session. In our view it was because the tempo and the pace of events in 1945-1946, when the Charter was drafted and adopted, was somewhat different from the tempo of our own times. But we do not say -- and this is not the view that we take -- that this declaration is an attempt at a revision of the Charter. It is an attempt -- a needed attempt, a justified attempt -- at focusing the attention of our world of today on the needs of our time. That is to say, that with the changing tempo of the times, with its changing speed, there is a need for acceleration in the pace of development in Trust Territories.

In some of those Territories which are now on the verge of independence or which have become independent we have witnessed such an acceleration. It may well be, and it perhaps is the case, that in the remaining Trust Territories there is need for a further acceleration of the pace of development. But, in recommending that there be such an acceleration, my delegation, certainly with respect to the Trust Territories that remain under Trust or might remain under Trust for a little while longer, does not suggest or insinuate that any deliberate attempt is being made to suppress their freedom or to suppress the movement towards freedom, because it is our belief that in our time such a suppression is out of the question -- it is impossible to achieve.

That is the thought on which this declaration bases itself. In its preambular part, for example, it says: "Believing that the process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible" (resolution 1514 (XV)). Then there are similar expressions to the effect that the people in colonies, Trust Territories, and Non-Self-Governing Territories want their independence and are determined to achieve it. We have no reason to suspect that the Administering Authorities which are responsible for some of these Trust Territories have the intention, the desire or the will to reverse those processes; and we do not believe that, even if they had such a will or desire, they would have the capacity to reverse them. It cannot be done today.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

How, then, do we here in the United Nations fit into this picture? The Assembly, in formulating the phraseology of this declaration, did not assume that the emancipation and liberation that is taking place is solely its own work. The Assembly never presumed that, and rightly. In this declaration there is a preambular paragraph which says:

"Considering the important role of the United Nations in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories". (ibid.)

Our role is that of assisting these movements. These movements are essentially movements in the Territories. We, by highlighting some of the problems that exist, by tendering advice where we feel advice is needed or may be useful, assist in that progress, but we do no more. We can hope to do no more. And in so doing, we can but recognize that these processes are there, that they are taking place in the Territories and that these processes, even though there may be delays and difficulties, are not being hindered and cannot indeed be hindered. It is our duty here to see that such processes are not being hindered.

Now, then, the question is this: What is the relevance of an elaborate discussion of this declaration or of its provisions in the Council? It is more or less universally accepted, I believe, that though there were some members who did not vote for this declaration at the time of its adoption in the plenary Assembly, today feel that it is a declaration which is relevant and acceptable and do, in fact, accept its provisions. We heard words to this effect from the representative of the United States a few days ago when we were discussing the affairs of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I do not think that the Government of Australia, which is the Administering Authority for New Guinea and Nauru, has at any stage stated that the provisions of this declaration do not apply to those Territories. I believe they think that these provisions do in fact apply, as indeed they apply to all other Trust Territories.

Therefore, there is no question of there being any doubt in anybody's mind as to the applicability of the provisions of this declaration to all Trust Territories, especially to those which will remain Trust Territories for a space of six months or a little longer.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

What, in essence, does this declaration say? It speaks of discrimination. It speaks of suppression, of emancipation, of movements towards emancipation and freedom. It speaks of inadequacy of political and social or educational preparedness not being served as a pretext for delaying independence. We believe that, in so far as Trust Territories are concerned, these parts of the declaration are perhaps not strictly relevant because today in this Council no Administering Authority is in a position to suggest -- no one does in fact suggest -- that the inadequacy of economic advancement or social advancement or educational advancement should serve as a pretext for delaying independence. That has not been the position here, even though that might have been the position of certain Administering Powers with respect to certain Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The relevant part of this declaration, therefore, is paragraph 5, which says:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire". (ibid.)

In this Council it is partly our business to see that there be no conditions or reservations in the transfer of power. When the time-table for any particular Territory is brought before this Council, I have no reason to think that we will not be in a position to ensure that there should be no such reservations and no such conditions.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

As regards the taking in Trust Territories of immediate steps for the transfer of powers, naturally India completely and fully supports this. This Council -- and this, too, is nothing completely new -- has in the past been seized with the question of the attainment by Trust Territories of the objectives of the Charter, and has suggested ways and means of proceeding towards that goal as rapidly as possible, for example, through the establishment of intermediate and final target dates for the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the Trust Territories.

However, it is not merely a question of setting targets and dates. The only limitation that my delegation accepts is the time required for a transfer which is both constructive and creative and which leads towards stability. We have therefore taken the view, and we adhere to it, that time tables should be set up, they should be realistic, they should reflect a proper sense of urgency, and within those time tables all possible efforts should be directed to giving the Territories the machinery of administration and the means of administering themselves, the technical, administrative and financial means, so that when they do take over their own affairs they are in a position to work out their own future in independence and in conditions of stability.

We should not be too much preoccupied with the past; many things have gone wrong in the past, but if we consider what has gone wrong then there will remain very little hope for us to pursue, or to help the Territories pursue, the right course in the future. But if suspicions or doubts have arisen in the past, they have come perhaps from certain cases in which an Administering Authority would come to this Council or to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly and say that certain people are not ready to govern themselves and will not be ready for the next five years, and then the same Administering Authority would come back to the Council or the General Assembly the following year and say that now those people were going to receive their independence. It is catastrophic situations of that character which must be avoided. It is that kind of thing which necessitates the establishment of time tables and targets, the development and preparation of plans for political, economic, social and educational advancement. In this respect too, we believe there is hardly a delegation in this Council which does not today accept the necessity for preparing such plans.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

In fact, over the years we have seen that in respect of almost every Territory the principle has been accepted by the Administering Authority. Certain delays may have taken place, and these are as annoying to us as they are, for example, to the representative of the Soviet Union. Such delays should be obviated and we suggest, in fact we are confident, that Administering Authorities which are likely to remain responsible for the conduct of affairs of some of the remaining Trust Territories will, in the very near future -- perhaps by the time this Council convenes again next year -- formulate such plans, set down the targets and bend all their efforts to their fulfilment in the spirit and in the light of this latest declaration by the General Assembly.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I say quite frankly that I have hesitated to make any intervention in this unnecessary discussion, particularly after listening to, may I say, the wise comments of the representative of India. However, I feel it necessary to remove any remote impression that the representative of the Soviet Union or his authorities may have that my Government in any degree acquiesces in the gross perversions of fact that he has seen fit to give to this Council.

It is distressing to me, as a responsible member of the Council and as a representative of my Government, to have to be drawn into any exchange of invective on these matters; I speak with some feeling, because this ought not to be necessary.

On Friday afternoon in this Council we dealt to a certain extent with the item at present under discussion and I had the impression, and so I think had the Council, that we had given proper recognition here to the existence of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and that we had, explicitly or implicitly, accepted that it does apply in a general fashion to all Territories at present under administration. I did not myself think it was necessary to discuss the particular application of that resolution to the Trust Territories, all of which are subject to a particular and special system of supervision by the United Nations.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

I cannot equal the eloquent words which have been used by my colleagues from the United Kingdom, New Zealand and India, but as a matter of history I do not recall that the Soviet Union was present at the long, careful examinations accorded to these Territories by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, but Australia was. Australia has been responsible since the end of the first war with Germany for two Territories which have been mentioned. We paid due regard to our obligations from 1921 onwards right through the League of Nations period. At the end of the second war, when the future of all such Territories again came under discussion, it was my country perhaps as much as any other which brought the idea of trusteeship to discussion in the early days of the United Nations. The idea of trusteeship was to some extent an Australian idea.

It is unbelievable to me that the representative of the Soviet Union can be sincere in trying to give the impression that my country is a kind of culprit in these matters. On the contrary; it was we, among others, who brought exactly this kind of discussion to the United Nations and for a particular reason -- because we recognize the responsibility of trusteeship.

I do not know whether the representative of the Soviet Union is attempting to isolate the Council from himself or to isolate himself from the Council, but I would not think that he can really believe that a useful purpose is served by bringing into this kind of exchange the real future and the real interests of all the indigenous people, of all the inhabitants of these Territories whom we have in mind. I think he has done a great disservice to the work of the Council and I regret very much that I have to say so.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): Frankly, I did not intend to speak on this point, because my delegation has on various occasions in the past made its views amply clear on this question. I think that in the General Assembly we devoted much time to an explanation of our position on this question. As a matter of fact, my delegation was directly concerned with the framing of that declaration which was ultimately adopted by the General Assembly. Furthermore, in the course of our review of conditions in the different Trust Territories this year I attempted to discharge my duty with the view that the declaration was our basic guide. Because of this, I find it somewhat superfluous for me to repeat what my delegation has already stated on various occasions.

Perhaps at this juncture I may add one thing: that we believe that the declaration has in a sense placed our obligations to lead the Trust and the Non-Self-Governing Territories to freedom and independence in a new perspective. I believe the time element has entered the picture. In the past we were perhaps satisfied with the pace of progress. The pace of progress that obtained in the different Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories was admirable a decade ago. But certainly the conscience of mankind as we all recognize it today no longer tolerates that type of progress. It asks that more things be done and that immediate steps be taken to lead the Territories to self-government and to a realization of the objectives of the Charter.

I think we in this Council should all agree, and with great satisfaction, that the Members who are responsible for the administration of Trust Territories have all invariably come before us this year and said that they accepted this declaration and its principles, and that they were doing their utmost and their best to implement its provisions in accordance with the wishes of the peoples concerned. I think we should certainly draw much satisfaction from that statement and bear it in mind. It is certainly a happy augury for the future, and I trust that it will crown our efforts with success.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I do not have very much to add to what has been said by various representatives around this table with regard to the achievement of the Administering Authorities under the Trusteeship System and otherwise. I should like to associate my delegation entirely with the remarks so forcibly expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Bingham, United States)

With regard to the particular charges made by the representative of the Soviet Union against my Government, and with regard to the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I believe that that matter has been adequately dealt with in the general debate, and I do not wish to rehearse the matter. It will come up again for consideration when the report of the Drafting Committee on developments in that Territory, and particularly on the political developments leading toward self-government and independence, is considered by this Council, and I will defer any substantive comments until that time. I do not wish that my silence at this time be interpreted as assent to any of the things that the Soviet representative had to say, of course.

I think all that remains to be said is that the representative of the United Kingdom commented that he felt sorry for the representative of the Soviet Union because he seemed to have so little capacity for happiness and satisfaction over the achievements of the Trusteeship System. I would add to that observation that I feel a certain sense of sympathy for him, because it seems quite obvious from the debate this morning, as indeed from the debate during the entire course of this session of the Council, that the representative of the Soviet Union stands alone in his views.

Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation hesitated in participating in this debate, but since we have this item on our agenda, we should rather prefer to express some views at this time, although they may only be of a general nature. We are going to explain not the position of the Council but merely the position of our own delegation.

On 14 December 1960 the fifteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 1514 (XV) called "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". In paragraph 5 of this resolution Trust Territories are specifically mentioned. The records of that meeting of the General Assembly clearly show the position taken by all Members of the General Assembly on this resolution, but in spite of this I should like to recall how and why we voted on that occasion.

On that historic occasion the Paraguayan vote was in the affirmative. The resolution has in its provisions ideas and principles which are enthroned in the constitution and mind of the Paraguayan people and which we have warmly supported throughout our history. My delegation saw then in this document,

(Mr. Solano Lopez, Paraguay)

and continues to see, a lasting expression of concepts and principles that are accepted throughout the world. The undeniable proof of the universality of these principles and concepts can be seen from the number of affirmative votes that were cast for this resolution.

May I also recall that at the plenary meeting held on 27 September 1960 the Foreign Minister of Paraguay and head of the Paraguayan delegation to the fifteenth General Assembly, when referring in the general debate to the recent admission of a large number of formerly dependent States that had become independent and sovereign countries, stated that their admission represented the natural and inalienable right of peoples to self-determination when they had acquired the necessary maturity and competence to exercise the sovereign rights of all States.

The General Assembly resolutions, such as resolution 1514 (XV), are of a recommendatory and not a compulsory nature. Nevertheless, the individual right of each delegation to make every possible constructive and persuasive effort so that the objectives laid down in this resolution be practically applied is obvious.

(Mr. Solano Lopez, Paraguay)

Furthermore, the principles and concepts propounded in resolution 1514 (XV), particularly in the fifth paragraph, must influence all of us when we examine the conditions prevailing in each Trust Territory and Non-Self-Governing Territory. I am referring, of course, to those Territories which are still under the Trusteeship System and not to those which have achieved or are achieving the ultimate objectives of that system. I am referring particularly to the fixing of a target date which will put an end to this process of the evolution of those Trust Territories towards those objectives. Resolution 1514 (XV) has established a very clear mandate which compels the Administering Authorities immediately to deploy efforts to speed up the process of liberation and independence and to give expression to the free will of these people as regards self-determination. It is on the basis of this criterion that my delegation has proceeded and has voted at all times, and we shall continue to do so in the hope that more effective and speedier steps will be taken in order to reduce to a minimum a reasonable period of time at the end of which these peoples will decide for themselves their own national destiny.

The exercise of peoples' rights to self-determination is not and cannot be a consequence of the prior establishment of ideal conditions. People have in themselves a dynamic force which impels them towards the establishment of their own national institutions, the strengthening of their economic structures, the raising of their educational standards, improvement in their standards of living, and progressive evolution of their own cultural values. But above all, people have a passion for freedom and a knowledge which they wish to put at the service of their ideals.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate its faith in the wisdom and the will of these peoples who have been under the Trusteeship System and in their desire to achieve their national objectives as early as possible.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation had not considered it necessary to intervene in this general debate, but I noted that the representative of the Soviet Union felt obliged to come back to the debate on Ruanda-Urundi, thus introducing a subject which, I had thought, was outside this item of the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories.

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

Thus, I must deny once more the offensive allegations of the Soviet Union regarding the situation in Ruanda-Urundi. We have already done so during the debate on that Territory and I shall not repeat here the explanation which I gave in great detail on that occasion.

I shall conclude by saying that, on the general question on our agenda for this meeting -- that is to say, attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) -- my delegation fully supports the views expressed so well by the delegations of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and India.

The PRESIDENT: Once again I would inquire whether any representative wishes to speak on this item 8 of our agenda.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If there are no further speakers, I should like to exercise our right of reply and to make a few comments following the statements which we have heard this morning.

It is characteristic for the representatives of colonial Powers in the Trusteeship Council to say that discussion of this matter and the implementation of the General Assembly resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples is useless, in their opinion. We gain the impression that they do not wish to intervene in this matter, and the representatives of Belgium and Australia have said so in so many words. However, after the statement which we made, those other delegations decided to take the floor. And what did they tell us? They told us that they did not agree, that they refuted the allegations of the Soviet delegation, that they did not like the criticism addressed to them, and so on. But why did the representatives of the colonial Powers, if they have any way of proving that they are implementing the declaration of the General Assembly, not supply the Council with information during the debate? Why could they not give us information on the plans which they have made, on the dates which they have fixed for the granting of independence, etc.? Why do they proceed in this manner? We have heard nothing to that effect from the representatives of the Administering Authorities. We have simply had a rather nervous reaction, and I suppose that there was good reason for that.

(Mr. Oberenko, Soviet Union)

The representative of the United Kingdom told us that brilliant and spectacular progress was taking place throughout the world. I agree with you, Mr. representative of the United Kingdom, to a certain extent. In fact, sensational progress is being made in the world, and we congratulate those who are making this progress. In the Soviet Union, everything is going very well; throughout the rest of the world the colonial system is collapsing. We are happy that we are making a contribution to that collapse. Therefore, if today I could not appear to be joyful about the collapse of the colonial system and if, for his part, the representative of the United Kingdom put a good face on the fact that the colonial system is crumbling, I would say that the two of us are in the same situation. We were at least able to conceal our true feelings here. Both of us have reason to be happy and, at the same time, if the representatives of the colonial Powers had really revealed their feelings as they do sometimes, we should not have seen happy smiles here.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that the colonial Powers had done nothing but work for the liberation of these peoples, that they never had any designs or objectives except the liberation of these peoples. And he told us that a great many countries had been liberated. In that case, if that was the policy of the colonial Powers, why did Mr. Nehru spend long years in jail? And why has Mr. Nkrumah also been in jail? Why did the colonialists kill Mr. Umniobe, Mr. Mounie and Mr. Lumumba? Why are they still keeping hundreds of liberation fighters in prison? Where is Kenyatta now? Is he the Prime Minister of Kenya? We have not yet heard any such statement as that from the representative of the United Kingdom. Perhaps Kenya is an independent country?

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

We are told that colonial Powers are concerned only with the liberation of colonial peoples. We really have to evaluate such assertions, which are far from corresponding to reality, and are refuted by facts.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that when he was administering these Territories, he stepped on the accelerator and sped things up. I do not want to speak of personalities. I want to speak of policies of the Government. If we are going to speak of the brakes and the accelerated pedal, we would say that the colonial Powers used the brake pedal with both feet; and the colonial people aspiring for liberation are attempting to step on the accelerator -- and their effect on the motor will be stronger. The brakes will not hold, and the vehicle will finally take them to their objective -- independence.

The Soviet delegation at this meeting presented certain facts during the discussion of the various Territories. We have brought out many facts confirming our confusion that the colonial Powers are not implementing the General Assembly declaration. They are not transferring all powers to the people, as the General Assembly wished, and furthermore, in certain cases the Administering Authority seems to have no intention to do so. We hear protests from the colonial Powers. They say that these assertions are not in conformity with reality, and that they do not agree with the Soviet Union. What does this mean? Why do the colonial Powers put a period after that? Why do they not go on? Why do they not say that the Soviet delegation is wrong when the Soviet delegation says that the colonial Powers do not intend to implement the declaration? Why do not the colonial Powers say "we are ready to transfer all these powers."?

The question arises as to when they are going to transfer these powers. The General Assembly in its declaration asked for immediate steps to be taken. We have not heard one single word from any colonial Power telling us that any immediate steps were in mind for the transfer of full powers to the indigenous people of these Trust Territories. No such statement was made. If there had been such a statement we would have been very happy.

The Soviet delegation says that the Administering Authorities in these Trust Territories -- the Pacific Islands, Nauru and New Guinea -- that they have not established any date for the attainment of independence. Once again the colonial representatives tell us that that is not true; that they do not agree with the

Soviet delegation. Fine -- but where is the difference? To establish a date is to fix a date, and we would like to have a statement. If the United States does not establish a date for the attainment of full independence for the Pacific Islands, and if Australia would establish a date, and if this would be in conformity with the wishes of the General Assembly in its declaration, then establish that date. That is what we would like to hear you do -- announce it. Up to the present time, we have not heard any well-founded reply. We have only heard cries of protest addressed to the Soviet delegation. New Zealand did that this morning, for instance.

We have general denials given by the colonial Powers. The representative of the United Kingdom spoke of Tanganyika.. I must recall to the United Kingdom -- I think he was not here at the last part of the session -- I would say that the Soviet delegation was among the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in which the Assembly expressed its satisfaction over the future independence of Tanganyika in December 1961. We were a co-sponsor of that resolution. We extended our congratulations. We will personally welcome Mr. Nyerere, the Prime Minister -- and so forth.

We are also very happy, according to the official and unofficial statements, with the fact that the date will be brought forward. We are very happy to hear this. This is not criticism. We have no criticism at all now. We think that is fine. We welcome that measure fervently. At least you have not refuted our congratulations. When we say we want a date established for the other three Trust Territories in the Pacific region, we are only criticized -- but still no date is ever fixed.

Since we are speaking of Tanganyika, let us be frank. Did the United Kingdom come to the Trusteeship Council to indicate to the Council the date of the proclamation of the independence of Tanganyika? Did the Trusteeship Council adopt a resolution recommending that the Administering Authority give independence to Tanganyika in 1961? No. Thus, when we speak of independence of Tanganyika, this is an achievement of the people of Tanganyika. It was the efforts and the struggle of the people of Tanganyika that led to the independence of Tanganyika.

The representative of Australia, as well as the representative of the United States, attempted to assert that they speak more or less on behalf of all the members of the Trusteeship Council, and that the Soviet delegation stands alone, isolated. It is obvious that Australia and the United States take their wishes as being realities. We must say that neither the representative of Australia nor the representative of the United States have any rights. They have not been authorized to speak on behalf of the Council. It would be preferable that they speak on their own behalf.

With regard to the votes here in the Council, there is no secret that the colonial Powers here have a majority. The non-administering countries are in the minority. No resolution which displeases in one way or another the colonial Powers can be passed here. This is an elementary truth. The Trusteeship Council, fortunately, is not the whole world. It is not the centre of the universe, and it is not here that the future of all peoples are determined. If it was only for the Trusteeship Council and the colonial Powers to determine the destiny of the world, we could very well say that there would be no Trust Territories progressing towards their independence.

Isolation was mentioned here. Let us speak about facts. At the last session of the General Assembly we adopted the declaration for the immediate liquidation of colonialism. Where was the Soviet Union and where was the United States? They were on different sides of the fence.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Eighty-nine voted in favour of the Declaration. The Soviet Union brought up the question of the Declaration, and the Soviet Union struggled to have it adopted. We voted, along with eighty-eight other Member States, for that Declaration which had been presented by forty-three countries of Asia and Africa. Did States like the United States, the United Kingdom and other colonial Powers vote for that Declaration or not? Nine colonial Powers abstained, among them the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Belgium, France, Portugal and Spain -- and their close friend, the Union of South Africa. And then we are told that those countries supposedly expressed the opinion of the majority of the United Nations whereas the Soviet Union is isolated. No, Mr. Representative of the United States, it is the colonial Powers that are isolated, it is the colonial Powers who are alone, and the vote on resolution 1514 shows this very clearly.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has always been on the side of the colonial peoples and has struggled for the liberation and independence of these peoples. We will always make every possible effort in order to put an end as soon as possible to this shameful system -- I say shameful.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that no other member wishes to speak on this item.

As I was saying a moment ago, the representative of the Soviet Union at the commencement of his statement said and proposed that the text of the statement which was made by him should be included in the relevant chapter in extenso. However, I should like to remind the members of the Council that at the meeting held on Friday the Council has already taken the position:

"that the procedure be followed as laid down in Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and that each separate chapter in the Council's report to the General Assembly be expanded to include conclusions and recommendations of the Council and observations of members of the Council representing their individual opinions only." (T/PV.1166, pp. 2-20)

(The President)

The Soviet representative's proposal is to the effect that the statement made by him should be included in extenso. The Chair does not take any position in this matter. It is up to the Council to decide whether it has any objection to the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union or whether it wants to take any decisions in any other way that the Council decides to do. If the Soviet proposal is accepted, of course, in all fairness to all the members of the Council, the statements made by the representatives on this item will be included in the relevant chapter in extenso.

I should like to remind the members that the past practice is this: that the individual opinions only of the members representing their respective Governments in this Council are summarized. I should like to invite the comments of the members of the Council.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): With regard to the suggestion -- I take it to be not yet a formal proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union -- that these remarks, including his, should be given in extenso in the records, I feel that this would be regrettable. I feel that it would not be in the best interests of the Council itself nor in the best interests of the United Nations and all the objectives that we presumably share together. Could it not be left, as it has been in the past, to the Secretariat to formulate the record in the normal discretion which it uses?

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am not fully aware of your procedures, but it seems to me unnecessary to repeat in another record what is already on the record. It seems to me that it would be sufficient to leave what has been said this morning on the record, which is made in the usual way.

If, however, the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union are to be included, then clearly the comments of the rest of us must be included. I myself would prefer that we stick to the standard method of record.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): The French Delegation has always in the past, and in the present as well, insisted that all opinions of Council members be reproduced in the Council's report. This is a traditional procedure, namely, to summarize the opinions of each member of the Council. Consequently, I do not think that we should depart from the procedures of the Council. In spite of the great esteem which I hold for the representative of the Soviet Union, I do not see why preferential treatment should be given him in the present case. However, if the Council decides to depart from its traditional procedures, then it is obvious that all other opinions voiced here should be reproduced in extenso. But I really do not see why we should depart from our customary procedure on this occasion.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I admit that I do not understand this procedural debate nor the cause that has given rise to it. We said that the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted the text of its statement in order for it to be included in the report of the Council. In this statement, as we said, we have summed up the views of the Soviet delegation on this question. It was not our desire to make a fifty-page statement in order that it should be summed up in ten pages.

We know that the Secretariat is overloaded with work. We know full well that sometimes the Secretariat does not reflect the true views of all delegations or the essential views. That is why we have done this ourselves. We have summed up the views of our delegation in this statement and in the statement which we will submit to the Secretariat so that it may be translated and incorporated in the report since it briefly sets out our views on this question.

If other members of the Council want their views to be reflected in extenso in the report because they consider this to be an important question, nobody will object. I fully agree with the representative of the United Kingdom on this point; although I am in disagreement in substance, nevertheless I agree with what he said as to the procedure to be followed; that is to say, that the points of view expressed by delegations on this question should be clearly and fully reflected. We think that in this matter the Council need not start a procedural debate because in any case the views of the Soviet delegation should be reflected in the report.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

If the Secretariat presumes to reflect these views better than we ourselves, then we shall see the results of their efforts. If the members of the Council insist that the text which will appear in the report of the Trusteeship Council should be shorter than the statement we have made before the Council, then we shall reserve the right to intervene again. We have a great deal of information and documentation, and we have a lot to say on this point.

The PRESIDENT: As is customary, the points of view expressed individually by members of the Council will be fully and clearly reflected in the report of the Council to the General Assembly.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): I am in a slight dilemma here. I think we have reached the position where it is fairly clear that the representative of the Soviet Union feels that his statement this morning was a summary which must appear completely under this heading "Observations by Individual Members Reflecting their Personal Views". On the other hand, no one else has made the same claim for their statement. We could find ourselves in the position where the Soviet statement appears in full and the other statements are summarized.

I think this would be very unfortunate, because some of the statements made today, especially the one by the representative of India, appear to me to have considerable value. It would be a pity if they suffered by being diminished in relation to the, perhaps from my point of view, less helpful statement of the Soviet Union.

I think that, if we are going to have the Soviet statement reproduced in full, it is not a question of having their opinions reflected but that it is a question of having to put in everything in full; and that is the position at which we have arrived.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I will suffer no heartbreak if I see only an adequate summary of what I stated this morning reflected in the report. I have no reason to suggest that we should depart from past practice in this matter. If a representative suggests that he should like to see his own text reproduced in extenso, I have nothing to say. However, so far as my own statement of this morning is concerned, a reasonably good summary will do.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps we could solve this problem in the following manner. The various delegations will study the summary records of today's meeting and decide as to which observations they want reproduced in the report. Perhaps the representative of India will want his statement reproduced in full. The representative of New Zealand, or any other representative, could ask that his statement be reproduced in full if he thinks it necessary.

If we are not in agreement in substance with the representative of New Zealand, this does not mean that in connexion with procedural matters we shall disagree with everyone and that we shall object to his observations, with which we are not in agreement, being reproduced in full. We want all the cards laid out on the table. The report which is sent to the General Assembly should clearly reflect what has been stated in the Council.

Naturally, no matter how long we sit, we shall never come to an agreement on the substance of the question; but as to procedural matters, I think we can easily come to an agreement. Since we are all in favour of freedom of speech, we all want what delegations have said to be clearly reflected in the report.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

However, I cannot but reply to the last comment made by the representative of New Zealand. It seems to me that at the present session the representatives of the colonial Powers have been congratulating the representative of India far too often. Their attitude is rather obvious and I do not know whether the representative of India himself feels happy about it. I do not think he will be too amused, and I do not think we should overdo this kind of thing.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I would like to bring the subject to a close by congratulating the representative of the Soviet Union for being a partisan of freedom of speech.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Just two words in reply to the representative of France -- as always.

The PRESIDENT: I think we can dispose of this item very quickly. As I have said, the observations of members of the Council representing their individual opinions only will be clearly and fully reflected in the report to the General Assembly, and of course it is up to the representatives concerned to read carefully the summaries prepared by the Secretariat and, if they disagree with these, to point out the fact to the Council. May I presume that this item is disposed of, except for our consideration of the relevant chapter on this item in the Council's report to the General Assembly. This can only be prepared by the Secretariat after the adoption by the Council of the reports of the Drafting Committees on New Guinea and Nauru. If I hear no objection, it is so decided.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I do not know what may be in the President's mind, but on behalf of my delegation I would request adjournment at this point. We are not in a frame of mind to give proper consideration to the reports of the Drafting Committees.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.