



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1318
18 July 1967

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED
AND EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 26 June 1967, at 3 p.m.

President: Miss BROOKS (Liberia)

1. Examination of conditions in New Guinea: report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1119 and Add.1; T/L.1124)
2. General Assembly resolutions on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI)) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN NEW GUINEA: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE
(T/L.1119 AND Add.1; T/L.1124)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA
AND THE TERRITORY OF PAPUA (RESOLUTIONS 2112 (XX) AND 2227 (XXI)) (continued)

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): On behalf of the delegations of China and New Zealand I have the honour to present the draft report on the Trust Territory of New Guinea contained in document T/L.1124. The Drafting Committee feels that this report reflects the consensus expressed in the Council on the subject of New Guinea. It does not, however, have any pretensions to infallibility and we will be interested to hear any proposals for amendments which are made.

Having suggested that the Secretariat was lacking in some fields in the last two or three weeks, I would like to make the congratulations of the two delegations on the Committee, known to the two Secretariat members who assisted us in our work -- Mr. Dick Wathen and Mrs. Kelly.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to suggest that we consider the draft conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the report paragraph by paragraph. Are there any objections to this procedure?

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation does not intend to go into detail as to every paragraph. Therefore, we should like to make a general comment on the report now.

The Soviet delegation has carefully studied the proposals of the Drafting Committee submitted to the Trusteeship Council for approval as the conclusions and recommendations on the Trust Territory to the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly, as contained in document T/L.1124. At the very outset, we should like to state that the recommendations contained in the report of the Drafting Committee are unacceptable to us since they ignore the decisions of the United Nations, and in particular the decisions of the last session of the General Assembly contained in resolution 2227 (XXI), which called on the Administering Authority to apply immediately a number of measures directed to the rapid attainment by Papua and New Guinea of independence, and which entirely

rejects the viewpoint of the Administering Authority directed at annexation of the aforementioned Territory.

In the report of the Drafting Committee there is not only no recommendation for the Administering Authority to adopt the necessary measures for the implementation of the aforementioned resolution of the General Assembly, which calls for recognizing the right of the people of New Guinea to independence, but mention is not even made of it. This fact alone is enough to convince us that the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee are unsatisfactory and therefore unacceptable.

The report of the Drafting Committee justifies the election to the House of Assembly in Papua and New Guinea of a special category of person. By so doing, it has openly sided with the Administering Authority. This recommendation is contradictory to resolution 2227 (XXI) of the General Assembly, particularly to operative paragraph 4 thereof, which

"4. Calls upon the administering Power to implement the following measures:

"(a) Removal of all discriminatory electoral qualifications;"

Therefore, it is unacceptable.

The Drafting Committee, although it did so with a reservation, adopted the policy approved by the Administering Authority concerning the introduction of an educational qualification for persons elected to the House of Assembly. This is in fact a significant limitation on the possibility for members of the indigenous population to become candidates for the House of Assembly. In other words, the Drafting Committee has sided with the Administering Authority. With regard to the powers of the House of Assembly, the Drafting Committee came out for the gradual limitation of the rights of the Administering Authority only in a few secondary areas in the field of education, and on an extremely limited scale.

Those parts of the report devoted to economic and social development and educational advancement repeat and approve the policy of the colonial Power. There is not a word mentioned here about the plundering of the natural and human resources of the Territory by international imperialist monopolies and about the very low salary level paid to the indigenous population. The drafters of this report were unable to find the courage to condemn the policy of the

colonial Power with respect to the alienation of land from the indigenous population directed at plundering the natural resources of the Territory and ensuring the acquisition by the Administering Authority of land belonging to the indigenous population. Instead, the authors of the report called on the Trusteeship Council to recommend to the Administering Authority the continuation and strengthening of the exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory by private companies. This was aimed not only at opening the doors to ruthless exploitation and plunder of the natural and human resources of the Territory, but also to create a legal basis for such exploitation.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly fully ignore mention of the frequent decisions of the General Assembly contained in resolution 2105 (XX) and 2189 (XXI), which called on administering Powers to liquidate military bases in colonial territories as well as not to construct new military bases, and resolution 2227 (XXI), in particular paragraph 5 thereof, which called on the Administering Authority

"to refrain from utilizing the Territories" -- in this case Papua and New Guinea -- "for military activities incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations".

It is on the basis of these statements that we oppose the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee and, without going in detail into each paragraph and into each point contained in these recommendations, we shall vote against them.

The Soviet delegation submits to the Trusteeship Council the following draft resolution which is in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations concerning Papua and New Guinea. The draft resolution is as follows:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Having considered the report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of New Guinea for the period 1965-1966,

"Having heard the statements by representatives of members of the Trusteeship Council at its thirty-fourth session concerning conditions in Papua and New Guinea,

"Being guided by the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)),

"Noting with deep regret that the Administering Authority has not yet taken the necessary steps to implement General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI),

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the peoples of Papua and New Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

"2. Condemns the Administering Authority for its refusal to implement General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) of 21 December 1965 and 2227 (XXI) of 20 December 1966;

"3. Urges the Administering Authority to take all necessary steps for the immediate and full implementation of the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI);

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit this resolution to the Administering Authority. (T/L.1127)

In conclusion my delegation stresses that it is resolutely and vigorously opposed to the recommendations of the Drafting Committee on the applicability of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) to Papua and New Guinea since this resolution is not pertinent. It cannot serve as a basic document for consideration of the matters concerned with decolonization, and it cannot serve as a pretext for the Administering Authority to stop sending information concerning the situation in Non-Self-Governing Territories. We object to any reference to this resolution in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly principally because it is used by the colonial Powers as a camouflage for their own annexationist policies with respect to Trust Territories, which is a flagrant contradiction to the goals, spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations and with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My delegation regrets that the representative of the Soviet Union felt it expedient to make his second -- or is it his third -- general debate statement on Papua and New Guinea without first making any use whatsoever of the machinery available in our rules of procedure for amending the report before the Council. This system of having a Drafting Committee draw up a report has been followed for years in the Council. It is a democratic method, I must admit, which may not commend itself to the representative of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless it has been hallowed by practice.

I notice that the representative of the Soviet Union has made no positive suggestions whatsoever to amend the report and that he has instead put before the Council a draft resolution. I listened closely to what he said and I found that there was no mention whatsoever in his draft resolution of the views expressed by the representatives of the people of Papua and New Guinea, whom we heard in this Council. This is quite symptomatic of his whole approach to the problem of the future of Papua and New Guinea.

I would regard his expressed determination to oppose the Drafting Committee's report in toto as in fact a confirmation of the good judgement of the Drafting Committee. One wonders what his motives were in not wishing to vote on individual paragraphs of the Drafting Committee's report.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I do not propose to speak at length on what we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union. In his statement, which was of a very general character, he repeated the tactic with which we have become very familiar in this Council and elsewhere, of simply making general assertions as a propaganda measure. For example, he made certain assertions -- and I take these only as examples -- regarding the alienation of land. The simple fact of the matter is, as examination of comparable circumstance anywhere else will bear out, that the alienation of land, so-called, under that heading in Papua and New Guinea has been the most controlled or certainly one of the most controlled systems of land alienation, if you want to use that term, in the history of any comparable area in comparable circumstances anywhere in the world.

I can only repeat in relation to that particular generalization which he has made that less than 3 per cent of the land in New Guinea has passed from indigenous ownership, and this only after the closest investigation by the Administering

Authority of the needs of the people themselves, not to private owners except through acquisition by the Administering Authority. There is no land shortage in Papua and New Guinea. A good deal of the less than 3 per cent of the land which has passed from indigenous ownership is continually being used to a greater extent for the benefit of the people themselves.

The representative of the Soviet Union has also launched his well-known attack on monopolies, whatever they are, and private companies "plundering" the Territory. I do not know what he means by that. I do not know what his evidence is. The simple fact of the matter is that, as in any comparable area of the world, money is needed for the development of this area. Great sums of money have been made available by the Administering Authority itself. Sums of money are now being made available by United Nations agencies, but these can be no more than a drop in the ultimate ocean of needs among these people. The matter was recognized by the Parliament itself, in which there is an indigenous majority, through the resolution passed by that Parliament, which has been quoted in extenso to this Council.

Thirdly, I could not fail to notice that my colleague from the Soviet Union continued his generalizations regarding the Charter of the United Nations and the Administering Authority acting contrary to that Charter. He knows as well as I that this is not so. He knows that the basis for all the actions carried out by the Administering Authority is the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement made under the authority of that Charter.

I cannot fail to comment that when he had the opportunity, which I gave him earlier in the debate on the subject of Papua and New Guinea, to comment on the position of the Government he represents in relation to the Charter vis-à-vis certain resolutions of the General Assembly, he did not take that opportunity. I further note that having generalized about resolutions of the General Assembly he is very selective in his remarks about and his choice of resolutions of the General Assembly. I hold no particular brief for resolution 1514 (XV) myself. I was not part of the Drafting Committee. But I do not understand why he invokes virtue for one particular resolution and no virtue for another particular resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that we deal with the draft resolution proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union when it is circulated to the Council in the working languages.

I am in the hands of the Council as to whether it should vote upon the annex as a whole or paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation has no choice but to request that the annex be considered paragraph by paragraph. I say this because the manner in which this report is written, I am sorry to say, reflects no view whatsoever that is contrary to what the Administering Authority has said. It only deals with the Council's "appreciation" and uses the word quite loosely. Therefore, we should like to review this annex paragraph by paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: We shall proceed with paragraph 1 of the annex.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): The last sentence in this paragraph states that "The Council is encouraged in this view by evidence of the Territory's increasing degree of self-reliance and growth in the economic field." I should like to refer the Council to document T/L.1119, paragraph 28, which is on the same question. It reads as follows:

"However, the yield of local public revenue, even if supplemented by a growing volume of loan funds raised in the Territory will be far below the level required to finance development in the public sector of the economy, let alone provide for annual administrative needs. The Territory continues, therefore, to rely heavily on the annual grants of the Administering Authority."

In the report, however, that we are to send to the General Assembly, we see that we are encouraged by the degree of self-reliance and growth. This is contradictory and I would like to recommend the deletion of this sentence.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): We are in the hands of the Council, of course, as to the exact phrasing of this report. I do not propose to speak to every amendment. I would just like to note that 90 per cent of the membership of this Organization are dependent to some extent on outside assistance. The Drafting Committee, in giving its expression of the "Territory's increasing degree of self-reliance and growth", bore in mind this assistance. The Committee also bore in mind that its exports had gone up by 11.4 per cent each year in succession over the last five years, which is a good deal more impressive than the record of most of the countries represented in the United Nations.

Secondly, in a period in which the external subvention had gone up by 130 per cent in absolute terms, in proportionate terms the reliance on this external subvention had been reduced from 66 per cent to 58.3 per cent, which in a period of rapid economic growth is a considerable achievement. It was with that factor in mind that the Drafting Committee made this small recognition of what was happening in Papua and New Guinea.

The representative of Liberia referred to the words "appreciation" and "satisfaction" being used in this report. If he can find more than two cases in which the word "appreciation" is used, I shall be very impressed -- indeed, there might have been a more frequent use of it.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Liberia has made a proposal to delete the last sentence of paragraph 1. Are there any objections?

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States): I feel that this sentence should not be deleted. The representative of New Zealand has explained very clearly what is meant by this sentence and why it should be left in the paragraph. It is not an absolute statement; it is a qualified one. He documented what was meant by it. If we are going to vote on it, my delegation would vote against the proposal to delete the sentence.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes to associate itself with what has just been said by the representative of the United States. We consider that this is a qualified statement entirely supported by the evidence brought out by the Administering Authority earlier in our discussions.

The Liberian amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I seem to remember that usually in reports some section is reserved for minority views, and I would like the delegation of Liberia to go on record as basing its disapproval of this sentence on the Secretariat-prepared paper, paragraph 28, stating that the Territory of Papua and New Guinea is still relying very much on the Administering Authority, and we in no way see it as growing to the point specified in this sentence which I proposed to be deleted.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the representative of Liberia that his statement will be in the record of the meeting. I had intended at the end to call the Council's attention to the fact that individual observations will have their place in the report.

Paragraph 1, as a whole, was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I should like to explain the general attitude of my delegation with regard to voting on paragraphs of this report and similar reports -- an attitude which has been manifest in previous years. My delegation does not believe it proper in principle to vote for recommendations for action by its own Government. Therefore, in circumstances such as these, rather than giving advice to our own Government, we prefer to preserve the principle of abstaining in general.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I simply wish to make a comment regarding the French translation of the paragraph on which we just voted. In the third line before the end it refers in the French text to "transfert des fonctions et d'organes d'exécution" to the authorities of New Guinea. The English text refers to "policy-making posts and bodies". So I think the French text should be modified to correspond to the English text, which does not refer to executive bodies. I wonder if you would be kind enough to ask the Secretary of the Council, Madam President, to see to it that this correction is made.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretary has indicated that the correction will be made in the manner suggested by the representative of France.

I should now like to draw the attention of members to paragraph 2.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): To begin with, my delegation is not aware that the Select Committee's report has been fully implemented. The report states that the Council "takes note of the full implementation of the Select Committee's report ...". I have no positive proof that it has, and I am not willing to have my delegation bound by such a categorical statement.

The second sentence of paragraph 2 reads that the Council "is virtually assured". Certainly my delegation has no assurance that an absolute majority of indigenous representatives will be elected to the new legislature. I have no assurance of such an occurrence.

Third, "It also appreciates" -- the Council, that is -- "the Select Committee's point of view that a special category of seats was justified ..". Madam President and members of the Council, you know very well that no one justified the new category of seats here except the Australian representative, and it is difficult for my delegation to agree to such a statement being included in the report.

Therefore, I would propose the elimination of the clause in the first sentence which begins with the words "takes note of" and ends with "1966".

I would also propose the deletion of the word "assured" in the second sentence.

Third, I would propose the deletion in the next sentence of "It also appreciates the Select Committee's point of view that a special category of seats was justified ..."

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My distinct impression from reading all the documents and listening to the Special Representative was that the Select Committee's report last year had been fully implemented, but I will leave that for the confirmation of the Administering Authority.

As to this clause "that an absolute majority of indigenous representatives is virtually assured," if in fact no such absolute majority is achieved, this will be

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

because the people of Papua and New Guinea have in open electorates elected other than indigenous people to the House of Assembly, and I, for one, find it very hard to deplore this.

Second, perhaps the representative of Liberia has misunderstood the use of the word "appreciates" in the second line of page 2. I am using "appreciates" not in the sense of commends but in the sense of comprehends or takes note of, and if the representative of Liberia were to read further down the paragraph, he would find in fact that the Drafting Committee makes a recommendation which is in some conflict with that view expressed in the Select Committee's report.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Referring to the observations just made by our colleagues from both Liberia and New Zealand, I would confirm that the report of the Select Committee was in fact, as has been reported to this Council, implemented in toto. It was implemented in toto, and this fact was reported to this Council. That is a fact.

With regard to the use of the term "virtually assured" -- and this is only a brief observation -- I myself from my own experience in New Guinea, from my observation of events there, would not doubt for one moment that this is a reasonable statement of the situation.

Mr. LIN (China): On page 2, by using the word "appreciates" the Committee does not mean to show appreciation, but it might better read "It also notes" or "It was also informed of the Select Committee's point of view ...".

The PRESIDENT: Exactly what formulation do you wish?

Mr. LIN (China): "It also notes" would be simpler, instead of "appreciates", or "was informed of".

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I am prepared to accept that amendment to our report by my fellow member of the Drafting Committee but would merely reiterate what I said before: that we are using the word "appreciates", as I

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

understood it, not in the sense of commendation, but in the sense of comprehension. This is now taken in by the amendment which substitutes the word "notes" for the word "appreciates".

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of Liberia if substituting the word "notes" meets his point of view.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have no quarrel with the word, but I cannot remember any justification coming from the Select Committee to this Council that it was necessary to formulate these special seats or that it was justified.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I should merely like to record that the Drafting Committee took those words from the Select Committee's report with virtually no amendment whatsoever.

The PRESIDENT: We have three amendments submitted by the representative of Liberia, the third being further amended by the representative of China. We will consider the first proposal that the clause in the third line reading "takes note of the full implementation of the Select Committee's report of August 1966" be deleted. The representative of Liberia would like a separate vote on this particular proposal.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In view of the assurance I have just given, in view of the information which was provided here during the general debate, in view of the statements that were made here to this effect by the indigenous representatives who appeared before this Council at its present session, one of whom was a member of the Select Committee, I would like to know whether our colleague from Liberia insists on this amendment of a statement in the report which is doing no more than taking note of an actual fact.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Liberia has not expressed his willingness to forgo his amendment.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have expressed my views, and since the President has assured me that a place will be reserved for them, I will not insist that the clause be deleted. I will accept the word "notes".

The PRESIDENT: I would like to ask the representative of Liberia if he insists on a separate vote on the words "virtually assured".

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Yes, I certainly do.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I think there is still some misunderstanding on the part of either my colleague or myself. My observations were addressed to the first proposal of our colleague from Liberia which related to the section taking note of the full implementation of the Select Committee's report. It was to that that I addressed my explanation.

The PRESIDENT: I have that in mind. But since the representative of Liberia made three proposals and he had spoken to two, I was seeking his opinion with regard to the third. The representative of Liberia insists that there should be a separate vote on the words "virtually assured".

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My understanding was that the representative of Liberia wished us to vote on the deletion of these two words. I think if this is done it is then only reasonable, instead of having the whole report cannibalized like this, that there be an alternative wording provided by the proposer.

The PRESIDENT: I would call the attention of the representative of Liberia to the fact that there is a conflict which will be brought about by eliminating those words without substituting other words for them.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): No, the paragraph says that the "Council recognizes that an absolute majority... is virtually assured". I am not assured of this; my delegation is not assured that an absolute majority will be

(Mr. Eastman, Liberia)

elected to the new legislatures. Now that we have regional seats, I do not know by the time of the next election what new scheme Australia may devise to ensure that the indigenous representatives obtain a majority in the new legislature. So I would go further now and propose the elimination of the sentence, although I know my amendment will be voted down, but just so that the record will reflect that I am not a party to this.

The PRESIDENT: I understand the position of the representative of Liberia better, because if those words are eliminated, it will read "an absolute majority of indigenous representatives in the new legislatures and that as before ...". That will not follow the sense of the first paragraph. So he is now asking for a deletion of that particular sentence. If I hear no further comments, I will put to the vote the proposal of the representative of Liberia for the deletion of this particular sentence. The sentence reads: "The Council recognizes that an absolute majority of indigenous representatives is virtually assured in the new legislatures and that as before the great majority of the members of the House of Assembly will be elected on a basis of a universal adult franchise and a common roll."

The PRESIDENT: The result is as follows: 1 in favour, 6 against, 1 member not participating. Therefore, the proposal is lost.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I think it would not be accurate to describe me as you did: "not participating". The Soviet delegation very clearly stated that the report is unacceptable to it as a whole and therefore we do not intend to go into any discussion of separate sentences. We consider that in principle we vote against the entire report. Therefore, to classify this as non-participation would be incorrect, I believe.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his correction. I would read the result, therefore, as 1 in favour, 6 against, and no abstentions. The proposal is lost, and we will put the whole of the paragraph to a vote.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): My delegation has some reservations about the last sentence of this paragraph and the second part of the penultimate sentence beginning with the words "and that early consideration should be given to moving toward a House of Assembly made up completely of members elected from open electorates". As we understand the position, the recommendations of the Select Committee have indeed been implemented in the sense that they have been accepted and given effect legally. But as we understand it, elections under these new arrangements have yet to take place and are not, I think, due to take place until the end of the year or early 1968. If that is so, and if the newly constituted House of Assembly on this new basis of expanded membership has still to be elected, it seems to my delegation somewhat premature to express views about moving on from there to yet a further stage where the House of Assembly would be composed entirely of members elected from open electorates. I would propose that that passage of this paragraph might end with the words "should be regarded as a transitional phase only", and to omit the second half of that same sentence and the subsequent sentence.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I recognize that there is some validity to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, in that elections under this present system are to be held in March next year. However, the words used in this sentence are "early consideration". These two words are a slight qualification of the absolute statement, and the words "moving toward" are a further qualification. Therefore, my delegation will vote for the text as it stands at present.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of the United Kingdom if he insists on his proposal.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I would be prepared to submit a further proposal to omit the word "early" and to consider the words "in due course" for insertion in the second half of that penultimate sentence.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the United Kingdom read it, then.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I understand you wish me to read it as amended, Madam President: "The Council expresses the opinion, however, that the retention of such special educational qualifications for candidates, as well as the retention of official members in the House, should be regarded as a transitional phase only and that consideration should be given in due course towards a House of Assembly made up completely of members elected from open electorates." The last sentence would remain as it stands at the moment.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal of the United Kingdom is to delete the word "early" in line 8 on page 2, as well as the words "to moving", and have it read "that consideration should be given in due course", so that in effect the word "early" and the words "to moving" would be deleted, and the words "in due course" would be substituted for the words "to moving". I would like to know if members of the Council fully understand the proposal of the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I apologize if I omitted the word "moving". My proposal, in effect, consists solely of the omission of the word "early" and the insertion of the words "in due course", which are the changes involved.

The PRESIDENT: "In due course" would then come after the word "given"?

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): Yes.

The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 1 vote to none, with 5 abstentions. Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I just wish, for the sake of my own delegation's records, that we could have a description of how it will be recorded that various people voted in the Council. The representative of the Soviet Union said in his opening statement that he was going to vote for the report in toto and was not going to participate otherwise. He is not voting on amendments, but he is voting on paragraphs. He says that he should not be recorded as not participating; therefore, one can only assume, looking at the record, that he is absent. I wonder if you could tell me how I could record this, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT: As far as the rules of procedure are concerned, there is no rule applicable to this situation. At the time when the vote is taken, it is the practice to list representatives as voting "for", "against", or "abstaining".

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think that the President has correctly reflected the situation. Normally, people vote for or against and the vote is recorded in the corresponding document. I simply wish to say that I do not care to participate in the comedy which is being played out here. What happens? What happens is that people abstain on whether "duly" should replace something else, and some pretend that they do not agree with "duly" and then the amendment is accepted and voted upon. Is that not a sort of comedy? Obviously, it is a comedy. Therefore, as I said, the Soviet delegation will not participate in such votes. But the general vote of the Soviet delegation should be recorded in the report which, on the basis of what we have said, we shall vote upon as a whole. This is my answer to the representative of New Zealand: that we are present, but we shall cast our vote when a vote is taken on the report as a whole.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I should like to thank you, Madam President, and the representative of the Soviet Union for that clarification of the position.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 3?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Before proceeding to paragraph 3, I should like to say that my experience in this Council has been that when members submit a draft, modesty dictates that members of the Council should have an opportunity to deliberate before approving such a draft. But I see that the representative of New Zealand insists that we completely accept what he writes. For a moment I thought he was about to question the way I have voted; he has made it his concern. I do not understand his attitude at all, but, preparing again for his defence, I must say that I disagree with paragraph 3 for the following reasons.

My delegation, as well as several others, expressed the view that we disapproved of the power of the Governor-General in Canberra to disallow legislation in the House of Assembly, the power to veto, as he wishes, without the people of the territory having any recourse to any other action. We see that the "one field" in which he exercises the power of veto is actually in all fields.

I would propose that the third line of this paragraph, after the word "Territory", should read: "... the Council is of the opinion that consideration should be given to the progressive reduction of the power of disallowance".

Then in the last sentence of the paragraph I would propose that the word "learn" should be eliminated. The sentence would then read: "... only by transferring greater legislative powers to the House of Assembly can the members of the House exercise full responsibility". After the disallowance is removed, then the members of the House will be able to exercise full responsibility in the House of Assembly. With the elimination of the word "learn" the paragraph would make sense.

The PRESIDENT: Will you please re-read your proposal?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): This is how the paragraph would read if my amendment were accepted:

"While appreciating that until the exercise of self-determination and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement Australia retains final legislative and administrative responsibilities in the Territory, the Council is of the opinion that consideration should be given to the progressive reduction of the power of disallowance. It advocates this in the conviction that only by transferring greater legislative powers to the House of Assembly can the members of the House exercise full responsibility."

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I said, in introducing this report of the Drafting Committee, that the Drafting Committee had no pretensions to infallibility. My concern in intervening has been only to correct errors of fact or to reply to rather trenchant criticism of the phraseology which we agreed upon. If that is immodest in the view of the representative of Liberia, then I plead guilty to immodesty.

With regard to the two suggestions which the representative of Liberia has made -- in the first place, that "consideration should be given to the progressive reduction of the power of disallowance"-- I fail to see how you can progressively reduce a power unless you do it field by field. It is not a thing you can do piecemeal; and I see a basic illogicality in his position. As a matter of fact, for the information of the representative of Liberia, we had a formulation similar to his in the first place and we changed it to this because of the illogicality of that original position.

He would then have us delete the word "learn". There would then be a statement of the obvious, that only by "transferring greater legislative powers can the House exercise full responsibility in this field". That seems to me to be a statement of the obvious which, if his earlier amendment is approved, would then not need to follow.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Apparently the representative of New Zealand was not listening. I did say that I wished the paragraph to end with "responsibility", and "in this field" would therefore be eliminated. I am convinced that there is logic in my proposal, but if he wishes me to be clearer I can say "elimination of disallowance". But I think it would arouse his wrath if I dared to suggest that the Governor-General should cease to disallow. Therefore, to appease him, I have suggested eliminating the words "in this field".

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the proposal of the representative of Liberia.

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

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

The proposal was rejected by 2 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I am sorry, but I should like to make one comment concerning the French translation at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 3, which reads in English: "... consideration should be given to the progressive reduction of the number of fields in which the power to disallow legislation may be exercised". In the French translation there is mention of the number of fields in which local authorities may not exercise power or legislation. This is not quite correct. I believe it concerns only those fields in which the Administering Authority may exercise its veto right; in other words, the cancellation of anything that might be adopted by the House of Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat will take due note of the remarks of the representative of France concerning the French translation of the text.

Does anyone wish to make any comments on paragraph 4?

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): My delegation would suggest an amendment to the final sentence of paragraph 4 which reads at present:

"... the Council expresses the firm opinion that significant steps toward a responsible ministerial system -- particularly through raising the status of the Under-Secretaries and substantially extending their responsibilities and powers -- should be taken at this time by the House of Assembly and the Administering Authority."

Given that the present situation, as noted in the second sentence of this paragraph, is that the findings of the Select Committee on this question of reform in the executive field are still being awaited and are still unknown,

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

it seems to my delegation that the language used in the last sentence of the paragraph goes a little too far. The amendment which I would wish to suggest is that with the words beginning "the Council expresses", the sentence should read: "... the Council expresses the hope that it will be possible to take significant steps towards the introduction of a responsible ministerial system -- particularly through raising the status of the Under-Secretaries and substantially extending their responsibilities and powers", omitting the rest of that sentence. It seems to my delegation that that wording would be more consistent with the situation in which unknown recommendations are still awaited on this whole matter from the Select Committee.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I am interested in this observation by the representative of the United Kingdom, particularly since I recall that two years ago the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom regretted the fact that a half-way house was being dallied at in this field of the transfer of responsibility. However, might I must say that the fact that the recommendations of the Select Committee are not known has not in the past precluded and does not now preclude the Trusteeship Council from expressing a firm opinion. In fact, this is little more than a development of what we said last year, and only a slight development at that.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): In the opinion of my delegation it would still be undesirable to go as far as the present draft in prejudging recommendations recommendations which have still to be reported to this Council and considered.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The amendment was adopted by 1 vote to none, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I propose that paragraph 4 should end with the words "considerable interest" and that a new paragraph 5 should begin with the words "in the interim". I make this proposal because the paragraph tends to be misleading. It gives the impression that the Under-Secretaries are now in policy-making positions and are technically part of the Administration.

This is not so; they are duly elected members, as we have been so constantly reminded here. I should like to have these two paragraphs separated. If that is accepted, I would propose that the words "the Council reiterates" should replace the words "The Council expresses", for the simple reason that the last Visiting Mission made a concrete recommendation to the Council that steps should be taken quickly towards a ministerial system of government. Therefore, that expression only reiterates what was said before.

The PRESIDENT: Would you please state again the exact words of your proposal?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Paragraph 4 would end with the words "considerable interest". Paragraph 5 would begin: "In the interim".

The PRESIDENT: After we have completed our consideration of paragraph 4, the suggestion of the representative of Liberia will be considered when we take up paragraph 5.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have proposed a new paragraph 5, to begin with the words "In the interim".

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Liberia has proposed that paragraph 4 should end with the word "interest" in the sixth line of the paragraph. His second proposal is that a new paragraph 5 should begin with the words "In the interim".

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In taking the floor at this stage, I am not opposing the proposal made by the representative of Liberia, but I must confess that I am at a loss to understand its significance. It seemed to me, just as a matter of drafting, that the words "In the interim" and the words that follow do follow logically as part of the previous paragraph. I am at a loss to understand the basis for this proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to ask the representative of Liberia whether the new paragraph that he proposes beginning with the words "In the interim" would be joined to the present paragraph 5, or whether it would be a separate paragraph 5 and the present paragraph 5 then become paragraph 6.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Your understanding is correct, Madam President. The present paragraph 5 would become paragraph 6. I should like, however, to clarify the point raised by the representative of Australia. He said that he did not understand why I made my suggestion. As the paragraph now stands, we are talking about indigenous people being in policy-making and executive positions. Then in the same paragraph mention is made of Under-Secretaries and their functions and how well they are functioning. In my opinion, the matter of having indigenous people in policy-making and executive positions is so paramount that nothing should be attached to it. As the paragraph stands at present, it gives the impression to any layman not familiar with the work of this Council or with our deliberations that the Under-Secretaries are definitely members of the Administration, which is not so. The Under-Secretaries are members of the House of Assembly who have been selected to work in what are called Under-Secretary posts. They are actually, as you know, Madam President, acting as a liaison between the Administration and the population, as one of them has stated here to us. So I do not think that the two should be placed together. That is why I propose this separation in paragraph 5.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I thank the representative of Liberia for his explanation. I think I can understand something of his difficulty, but it is not in fact a difficulty to one versed in the processes of which this forms a part. In the system of government with which we are familiar and which we practise ourselves, there are two distinct entities; one is a policy-making entity which is represented by the elected members of the people; the other is the entity which gives effect to the policy decisions which are made by the elected representatives of the people.

To explain it more clearly perhaps, by reference to the Australian system, we have a Minister responsible for the field of administration, and we have a public servant as what might be called a permanent head of the department in relation to the policy for which the Minister is responsible.

To the best of my understanding it is true that New Guineans are progressively being more associated with the policy-making functions of the Administration, and not only -- and this should not be disregarded -- through this elected Parliament which is a most important policy-making body in itself, apart from the individual responsibilities which may be discharged by Ministers or Under-Secretaries. Then from that larger policy-making body -- that is, the Parliament -- there is this system of Under-Secretaries by which the elected members of the New Guinea Parliament are associated with the policy-making functions of the Administration.

It is true that the Under-Secretary system has not worked as effectively as it was hoped it would work when it was put into effect. We did hear one of the New Guinean representatives who came before this Council say that, but he qualified his statement by adding that more recently more positive attempts had been made to streamline the system, and indeed both he and his New Guinea colleague, as Under-Secretaries, were intimately associated with the policy-making functions of the Government.

It is also true that to an increasing extent New Guineans are progressing to higher positions in the Administration, as distinct from the policy-making arm of the Government.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that the representative of Australia is opposing the proposal of the representative of Liberia.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): No.

The PRESIDENT: It was just an explanation?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): It was just an explanation at this stage. I have no wish unnecessarily to oppose the representative of Liberia or any other representative around this table. It was just an explanation which I made to make the position clearer to him if he did not appreciate these factors in relation to his own proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I asked because I wanted to expedite the work of the Council, and if there are no objections, then we can proceed to vote on the paragraph as suggested by the representative of Liberia.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): On a point of clarification: If there are no objections, then my proposal is adopted.

The PRESIDENT: It is adopted, and we shall now vote on the paragraph to the end of the second sentence.

The first part of paragraph 4 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: There will now be a new paragraph 5, starting with the words "In the interim" to the end of what was formerly paragraph 4, as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. EASTMAN: (Liberia): Madam President, I did not hear you mention my proposal that we use the word "reiterates" instead of "expresses".

The PRESIDENT: The paragraph was amended by the United Kingdom representative, and if we use the word "reiterates" the phrase would read "reiterates the hope".

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): A note was brought to me stating that I was needed on the telephone, and I did not hear the proposal made by the United Kingdom representative, but, for the sake of the record, permit me to say that the Liberian delegation thought that the word "expresses" should not have been used because the Council has heard from the members present here and from the Visiting Mission that it is time for the Administration to initiate a ministerial system of government.

The second part of paragraph 4 (now paragraph 5) was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to paragraph 5, which will become paragraph 6.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I should like to make a suggestion regarding the procedure that we are following. While I am aware that this is the procedure which the Council usually has followed, it seems to me that this is rather a cumbersome process. I wonder whether it might not be more efficient and better for all of us if the amendments which are proposed by any delegation could be submitted in writing tomorrow or at our next meeting. In this way, the Drafting Committee and all of us would have a chance to see all the amendments in their total context, and possibly the Drafting Committee could accept quite a number of them. It is much easier to understand what is going on if we can see the amendments in writing than by receiving them bit by bit. I was wondering whether this might not be a suggestion that the Council would agree to consider.

The PRESIDENT: In answer to the United States representative, the Council is the master of its own procedure. We have commenced voting on the report, but if the members of the Council consider that we should at this stage discontinue the voting and wait for the amendments, I am in the hands of the Council.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I appreciate the point made by our colleague from the United States, but I am doubtful whether this in fact would expedite our procedure. I think we are all anxious to get through this item as quickly as possible, and to adjourn consideration of this report on which voting has already commenced might not have the effect that she understandably hopes for. Indeed, it might have the opposite effect, and we would start by losing a day, which I think we can ill afford to lose.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): Now that we are well on our way through the Drafting Committee's report on New Guinea by a process of paragraph by paragraph consideration and voting, I wonder whether we might not complete the work we have started. But I would say that I can see merit in the suggestion made by the United States representative in relation to the other two reports, one of which is already in our hands. I believe that it would help to eliminate some of the time taken in explanations and discussions. Clearly it would not eliminate all discussion, but I think it would eliminate a lot of the, to some extent, mechanical features of our discussion this afternoon if delegations were asked within a given time limit -- and I suppose there must be a time limit since we have only a few days left -- to submit their amendments, and then we could discuss the report. In short, I wonder whether we should not complete the present report and consider adopting the new procedure in relation to the other two reports, on the Pacific Islands and Nauru, if that is possible within the time scale we have set ourselves for completing our work at this session.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I merely wished to put this suggestion before the members of the Council, and it is for the Council to decide whether it wishes to do it this way. I can see that there is merit in continuing in the way we started. But I should like to point out to the members of the Council that we have now reached the top of page 3, and we have been here for about one and a half hours. At the rate we are going, we shall hardly get finished today.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My delegation has no strong views on this matter, but we feel that it would perhaps be delaying our work unduly if in fact we were to put comprehensively in writing all the amendments which we might wish to make to further reports. Perhaps we could delay a decision on this particular question with a possibility of submitting in writing only those

amendments which are substantive in nature. Since we have begun the voting on this report, my delegation feels that it will probably be necessary for us to proceed.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I do not wish to press my suggestion.

Paragraph 5 (6) was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 (7) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 7 (8) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 (9) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 9 (10) was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We will now turn to paragraph 10, which will become paragraph 11.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I again have a question of translation. The last words of the paragraph in the French text are "of the most crucial importance". I do not think this is very good phrasing, and I would suggest that a more appropriate wording in the French text would be "of capital importance" or "of extreme importance". I do not think the form of words in the French text is very appropriate.

Paragraph 10 (11) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 11 (12) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to paragraph 12, which will become paragraph 13.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I have a textual query, not a point of opinion, to raise here. It is the understanding of my delegation that the assistance provided by the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies, as well as the financial assistance provided by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, are provided not at the initiative of UNDP, the agencies or the International Bank, but in response to specific requests from the Governments of Territories. In other words, it is not within the competence of the agencies, UNDP or IBRD themselves to take the initiative in extending aid to the Trust Territory, and procedurally it is only possible for them to deal with

applications for help which have been initiated by the Government of the Trust Territory. This, I believe, is a world-wide procedure in the multilateral aid field and on that basis my delegation would suggest that the second sentence of the paragraph should be amended to read as follows:

"It urges the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies to respond as rapidly as possible to requests for assistance from the Territory, expresses the hope that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) will find it possible to respond favourably to requests from the Territory and encourages the Administering Authority to seek increasingly assistance of this sort."

I would repeat that the sole purpose of this amendment is to bring it into line with the actual procedures, and that it is not intended to modify the general substance.

Mr. McDCWELL (New Zealand): I see the point which the United Kingdom representative has raised very clearly. I see that it is only one of procedure, and I had thought that perhaps it was implicit in this present phrasing. But I am wondering about his suggested amendment. The emphasis, instead of being on "expanding as rapidly as possible" would be on "responding as rapidly as possible". I am not sure that the speed of response is necessarily more important than the generosity of response, and I am trying to think of a replacement for the word "rapidly" and would welcome suggestions from the Council on this.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): One possibility I would put forward is to use the word "fully" in place of "rapidly". I do not know if this would be acceptable to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections to the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom representative, we will proceed to vote on the paragraph as amended. Since I hear no objection, the paragraph will be voted upon as amended by the United Kingdom delegation.

Paragraph 12 (13) as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 13 (14) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 14-17 (15-18) were adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 18 (19) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraphs 19-21 (20-22) were adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraphs 22 (23) and 23 (24) were adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to paragraph 24, which will become paragraph 25.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I should like to propose a new paragraph 25, to read as follows:

"The Council notes with regret that the administering Authority did not make a report on constitutional advancement as requested by resolution 2112(XX)."

The PRESIDENT: Would that paragraph be a substitute for the present paragraph?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): It would be a new paragraph 25, and paragraph 25 would become paragraph 26.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I dispute the alleged basis of fact in the proposed new paragraph. The Administering Authority did in fact make a very full report on constitutional advancement in the territory of Papua and New Guinea. Not only was this report made, and made in detail, by the Australian representative and the Special Representative in various ways, but also by the indigenous members of the New Guinea Parliament who were present at this table. So the proposed amendment is simply not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I regret that I do not have a copy of the resolution here, but if my memory serves me correctly, the Administering Authority was required to fix an early date for independence. It was required to remove all discriminatory legislative practices in the social, economic and other fields and to report to the present session of the Council as to what it had done specifically to implement these recommendations by the General Assembly. If there is such a report, and if the record reflects this, I stand corrected. If not, I beg to differ with the Australian representative.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand):The representative of Liberia referred to resolution 2112 (XX) which was adopted on 21 December 1965, that is, eighteen months ago. In that resolution, the administering Power was required to report to the thirty-third session of the Trusteeship Council, which was held last year. There was no requirement in that resolution to report to the thirty-fourth session. However, if the representative of Liberia is referring to resolution 2227 (XXI), which was passed on 20 December 1966, that is, last year, there was no requirement in that resolution for the Administering Authority to report on the implementation of that resolution. The requirement in operative paragraph 3 of that resolution reads:

"Calls upon the administering Power to implement fully resolution 1514 (XV) and to inform the Trusteeship Council..."

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I did say resolution 2112, and I am grateful to the representative of New Zealand for correcting me. I should have said resolution 2227 (XXI).

If he insists that the Assembly did not request the Administering Authority to submit a report, what about General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which the Administration is called upon to implement? That resolution calls for the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. What definite steps has the Administration taken towards its implementation?

Besides, paragraph 4 of resolution 2227 (XXI) specifically calls for certain things to be done. The representative of the Administration has not told us a single thing that has been done in that direction. What has been done about the removal of discriminatory electoral qualifications for the regional seats? Nothing. Instead, he states that his Government thinks such discriminatory qualifications must continue to exist.

In the educational field, the two school systems still exist. In the economic field, the non-indigenous people continue to control the economy. In the social field -- I do not intend to open debate on this, but I am just explaining my point -- a paragraph is included here on discriminatory practices with regard to race and colour. What definite step has the administration taken to abolish these things? This is why I say we must note with regret that no report has been made to this Council concerning this.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I simply wish to raise a point of order. I understood we were considering an amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia referring to a report which, it was claimed, the Administering Authority had omitted to submit, as required by resolution 2227 (XXI); and it has been accepted by the representative of Liberia that the only obligation to report or to inform this Council relates to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). But the representative of Liberia appears now to be calling in question the whole position of the administering Power, not in relation to this one-out-of-many features of resolution 2227 (XXI), but the performance of the Administering Authority on the whole resolution. That is not what I think was

the purport of the amendment he suggested. And I am not clear what proposal we have under consideration, from the point of view of the report of this Council on New Guinea, which is what we are discussing at the moment, as I understand it.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I can only explain again -- and I am quite confident that any reference to the records will bear this out -- that not only have all these matters been reported upon, as I said, during the course of the debate and the questioning period which has taken place on this subject in this Council, but they have been reported upon by me personally. And if my colleague from Liberia will take the trouble to study the records, he will find that, in a statement I made, I took each one of those paragraphs in the very resolution that he refers to and spoke to each one of those paragraphs separately. So I can only repeat that what he has said is just not in accordance with what has been said during the debate in this Council; and I suggest that reference to the records will bear me out.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation wishes to support the proposal made by the representative of Liberia because we find it completely in order. We know that in resolution 2112 (XX) the General Assembly recommended that a report be submitted to the Trusteeship Council on the interpretation of resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

That recommendation of the Assembly, as we know, was not implemented. The General Assembly, in resolution 2227 (XXI), in paragraph 3 thereof, calls upon the administering Power to implement fully resolution 1514 (XV) and to inform the Trusteeship Council at its thirty-fourth session and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the action taken in this regard.

Thus, at the last session, the General Assembly recommended that the Administering Authority should submit a report to the thirty-fourth session of the Trusteeship Council on this point. However, as we know, such a report

has not been submitted. The representative of Australia stated a great deal here about the conditions in the Territory; but a report based on the direct recommendation of the General Assembly was not submitted. For this reason, my delegation fully supports the proposal made by the representative of Liberia.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I have had occasion to observe before that the mere assertion by our colleague from the Soviet Union -- or, for that matter, by any one of us -- that a fact is a fact does not constitute it as a fact.

Now, having said that -- and he knows perfectly well that what I am saying is correct, because I can quote words of his that were expressed when this very subject was under discussion -- I would point out that I myself spoke, not once but on a number of occasions, directly to this resolution, and, on at least one occasion, spoke to every paragraph in it.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of Liberia to re-read his proposal.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): "The Council notes with regret that the Administering Authority did not make a report on constitutional advancement as requested by resolution 2227 (XXI)."

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the new paragraph proposed by Liberia.

The paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to vote upon the present paragraph 25, I call on the representative of Liberia.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Madam President, if you will recall, when we listened to the two representatives of the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea, my delegation asked you for clarification as to their status here.

(Mr. Eastman, Liberia)

Now, paragraph 25 gives the impression that those two gentlemen came here speaking on behalf of the entire people of Papua and New Guinea when, in fact, they came here as selected members of the Australian delegation. When they spoke here, they spoke as members of the Australian delegation, as a part of the Administration. This is the point I was trying to establish on the day I asked you in what categories we should consider them. So it is with this in mind that I am now proposing that this new paragraph 25 should read as follows:

"The Council takes note of the statements made before it by the two representatives of the House of Assembly as members of the Australian delegation, expressing reservations about an immediate move to independence."

I make this proposal because my delegation is not convinced that when these two gentlemen spoke here they echoed the feeling of the entire Papua and New Guinea population; and although they are members of the House, since they were here as members of the Australian delegation speaking from Australia's seat in the Council, I want the records to reflect that they did speak as members of the Australian delegation when they declared that they want no immediate move to independence.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The statements made by the two indigenous representatives in this delegation were made entirely at their own request and for their own reasons. I used the expression during the debate on New Guinea that whatever these people said here, they were responsible to the people who had put them here, and that it was in full knowledge of that responsibility that these representatives spoke here.

I cannot help but notice that my colleague from Liberia did not raise the same point in connexion with the Head Chief of Nauru; and when the question of a plebiscite was discussed before this Council he did not question in what capacity the indigenous Nauruan representatives were speaking.

The representatives of the New Guinea Parliament came here, it is true, as members of the Australian delegation. Now, the person who has the right to sit at this table and speak for Australia is the Australian representative -- in this case, myself. There is no right vested in this Council, as I understand it,

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

to have the advisers to the Special Representative, or anybody else, sitting at this table. The seating of these advisers at this table was a courtesy to this Council so that the Council might inform itself as fully as possible, by reference to these people as elected members of the New Guinea Parliament, of their understanding of the views of the people whom they represent.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I am happy about the explanation. In fact, it was a confirmation of my views, because the representative of Australia has just stated to the Council that the two indigenous members who sat there were members of his delegation. All I am asking for, quite simply, is an indication that they spoke as members of the Australian delegation.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I accept what the representative of Liberia says as factually correct: that the two representatives of the House of Assembly were in fact members of the Australian delegation; and so does the representative of the Administering Authority.

However, the purpose of the representative of Liberia in inserting this is to suggest that they thereby spoke as spokesmen for Australia. My delegation, for one, is not prepared to accept that implication.

We will therefore vote against the insertion of what we regard as this slur against the representatives of the people of Papua and New Guinea.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Not for the first time, the representative of Liberia has twisted what I said. I said they came here to New York, to the United Nations, as members of the Australian delegation. I said they sat at this Council as a courtesy to this Council, as elected members of the New Guinea Parliament, to speak as they thought they should speak, in expression of the views of their people. In agreeing to the wishes of this Council that they should sit here, I -- or any other member of the Australian delegation -- could place no restriction on the questions to be asked of them, and could place no restriction on the answers which they might give as elected members of the New Guinea Parliament -- which is, in fact, what happened.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to state, as far as procedure is concerned, that it has been the procedure of the Council, and of the Fourth Committee in particular, that advisers are attached to the delegations of Member States which are Administering Authorities. An invitation has been extended to these people to take their seats at the Council table. They spoke with the expectation that they would throw some light on the conditions in the Territory. In the past it has been accepted that they spoke to shed some light on the conditions in the Territory from which they came.

In view of that procedure and the explanation given by the representative of Australia and the representative of New Zealand, would the representative of Liberia insist on his proposal?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I think it was last year, in the Fourth Committee, that the same question was raised; and I think members insisted that the Chairman ask the Australian representative to vacate his seat and to permit his adviser -- or in whatever capacity he served -- to assume his seat, and then let him speak from behind the Australian label, because the Fourth Committee wanted to be sure in what capacity he spoke. I think members who were on the Committee will remember that from last year.

To have this statement as it presently exists sent to the Fourth Committee for consideration -- that two members of the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea told the Council they want no immediate move to independence -- would be misleading because they did not come here in that capacity, although they are members of the House of Assembly. They came here as members of the Australian delegation, and Australia could have refused to let them speak, or could have consented, as they did.

When this report is reviewed downstairs, I want members to be clear and to know that these people did not come here independently and say, "we do not want any immediate move to independence", because it is far from the truth. These people were not designated by their people, as far as my recollection goes, to come and tell this Council that they do not want any move to independence. And the only way this point can be reflected is by the adoption of my proposal that it be indicated that they spoke as members of the Australian delegation.

The PRESIDENT: My question to the representative of Liberia was: Did he insist on his proposal? That is all I asked.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I think I will have to.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I do not wish to prolong this obviously aimless debate. But I cannot fail to note with interest the curious attitude of our colleague from Liberia, who has not voted on a large section of the Trusteeship Council's reports. He has not signified non-participation; he has not signified participation; he has not in many cases signified either opposition or a favourable attitude. Nevertheless --

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): The Liberian delegation resents the statement just made by the Australian representative. He has no right to question how Liberia votes, when Liberia votes, or in what manner Liberia votes. Liberia votes when it wants to, and it should not be a matter of question here.

I wish, Madam President, you would instruct the representative of Australia to refrain from such comments on the manner in which Liberia conducts itself here,, especially if it is not offensive to him. It is not his right to question how Liberia votes or when it votes.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I am not questioning anything. But it is my right to take note of things that go on in this Council.

Now, having established my right to note things, I shall proceed.

I do not know how our colleague from Liberia knows what instructions these members of Parliament did or did not get, or may or may not have gotten from their electorate. But I do know that one of them was a member of the Committee of Constitutional Review, which travelled extensively throughout the Territory, and can claim to be one of the people most closely in touch with the wishes of the people on this and other matters referred to it.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I think it is true that the representative of Liberia has one matter of substance, and that is that the two members of the House of Assembly were, in fact, not designated by their fellow members of the House of Assembly as their representatives. In view of that, I would suggest -- and I have to check this with my fellow drafter from the delegation of China -- that, in the first line after the "by", we delete the word "the"; and then, in the second line, after the word "representatives", we substitute the word "from" for "of". The sentence would now read:

"The Council takes note of the statements made before it by two representatives from the House of Assembly expressing reservations ..."
and so on.

In the view of my delegation, this covers the point of substance made by the representative of Liberia.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): That does not at all reflect my point of view, and I will have to press my original proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia.

The amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the representative of New Zealand if he wishes to retain the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I feel, in the interest of accuracy, that this proposal, made by the two members of the Drafting Committee, could perhaps be adopted without objection.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal, having been accepted by the members of the Drafting Committee, will become part of the draft.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

Paragraph 24 (25), as orally revised, was adopted by 6 votes to 1 with no abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up paragraph 25, which becomes paragraph 26.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have a question concerning this paragraph. Paragraph 25 reads:

"The Council accepts these freely stated views, ...".

I should like to know what "freely stated views" -- that there should be no immediate move to independence? Are those the stated views the drafters have reference to?

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I am not sure how the representative of Liberia is confused by this. It refers directly to the preceding paragraph, where certain views were expressed. We accept them as views..

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Liberia wants to go on record as not associating itself with those members of the the Council who accept the view that there should be no immediate move to independence.

The PRESIDENT: I would again inform the representative of Liberia that his observations will be reflected in the appropriate chapters of the report.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I feel that, if the representative of Liberia wishes to make that statement, then my delegation also wishes it to be stated that we accept the freely expressed views of the people as required by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat will take note of those remarks.

Paragraph 25 (26) was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I should like the record to reflect that the French delegation abstained from the vote on resolution 1514 (XV), as well as on resolution 1541 (XV).

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat will take note of that observation.

We now come to paragraph 26, which becomes paragraph 27. Are there any observations on this paragraph?

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): Could the representative of New Zealand perhaps clarify the word "qualifies", which appears on the fourth line of paragraph 26?

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): The word should be "qualities".

Paragraph 26 (27) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Unless any member has any observations to make on it, I shall now put to the vote the last paragraph, paragraph 28.

Paragraph 27 (28) was adopted by 6 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 4 on page 1 of document T/L.1124, the Drafting Committee has recommended that the Council adopt the revised working paper on conditions in New Guinea, document T/L.1119 and Add.1, as the basic text for the chapter on conditions in the Territory to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly. I shall now put this recommendation to the vote.

The recommendation was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 5 on page 1 of document T/L.1124, the Drafting Committee has recommended that the Trusteeship Council adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex and include them at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter. I shall put this recommendation also to the vote.

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

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft report as a whole, with the changes and modifications that have been made by the Council and as amended.

The draft report on conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea, as a whole, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The chapter on New Guinea in the Council's report to the General Assembly will be completed by the observations of members of the Council, which will be their individual observations only. Summaries of these observations concerning New Guinea will be circulated among members.

The draft resolution of the Soviet Union will be circulated, and I suggest that tomorrow we take up that draft resolution.

The Council will meet tomorrow at 3 p.m. to take up the draft resolution on New Guinea. I understand that the report on the Pacific Islands also will be ready, and we shall proceed with that too.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.