



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Thirty-first Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 17 June 1964,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| <i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1963 (concluded)</i> | |
| <i>Report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea</i> | 97 |
| <i>Request for the inclusion of minority views on New Guinea in the Report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly.</i> | 101 |

President: Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand).

Present:

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

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

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1963 (T/L.1621, T/L.1071 and Add.1) (concluded)

[Agenda item 4 (a)]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NEW GUINEA (T/L.1074, T/L.1075, T/L.1076)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, before the Council began its consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea (T/L.1074), he would call upon the USSR representative to introduce the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (T/L.1076).

2. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) summarized the provisions of his delegation's draft resolution (T/L.1076), which was fully in keeping with the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The Administering Authority's contention that the Territory was not yet economically prepared for independence was contrary to the provisions of the Declaration, which stated that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence and that immediate steps should be taken, without any conditions or reservations, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories which had not yet attained independence. Since the representatives of the Administering Authority and of other colonial Powers proclaimed their readiness to meet the aspirations of the peoples under their administration, they should have no objection to the USSR draft resolution.

3. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the amendments submitted by the USSR delegation (T/L.1075) to the draft conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1074). He suggested that the Council should consider those draft conclusions and recommendations paragraph by paragraph, together with the relevant amendments submitted by the USSR delegation.

4. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that the words "the Trusteeship Agreement" should be inserted after the words "the United Nations Charter" in the new paragraph called for in the first USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 1).

5. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to the Liberian sub-amendment.

6. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, since the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement were the basic documents defining the responsibilities of the Administering Authority in relation to the Trust Territory, they should be the only ones referred to; he was making that statement without prejudice to the substance of the Declaration.

7. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he disagreed with the Australian representative, who was suggesting that the Declaration was not one of the main documents relating to Trust Territories. The Declaration specifically referred to Trust Territories and to the immediate transfer of all powers to the peoples of the Trust Territories. Since its adoption in 1960, its application to the Trust Territory of New Guinea had frequently been acknowledged by the representatives of Australia.

The USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 1), as orally revised, was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

8. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the second USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 2) calling for the deletion of the words "with approval" from paragraph 1 of the draft conclusions and recommendations.

The first part of the second USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 2) was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

9. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the second part of the second USSR amendment, which called for the deletion from paragraph 1 of the words "in accordance with its previous recommendations to the Administering Authority", pointed out that in the recommendations adopted at its thirtieth session the Council had noted that the new House of Assembly in New Guinea would "have full powers of legislation for the Trust Territory" (A/5504, para. 51). In fact, however, the powers of the House of Assembly remained extremely limited; under Australian legislation, the Governor-General and the Australian Government retained full control over the Territory and could veto any law passed by the Assembly.

10. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the Australian Government had to retain certain residual powers in the Territory, if only in order to be able to discharge its international obligations with regard to the Territory. Those powers were purely negative, for the House of Assembly was the Territory's law-making body and no legislation could be enacted without the support of a majority of its members.

The second part of the second USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 2) was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention

Paragraph 1 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

The third USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 3) which concerned paragraph 2 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

11. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) referred to the fourth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 4), which also concerned paragraph 2, and proposed that the words "as a matter of urgency" should be deleted.

12. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, since the adoption of the Declaration more than three and a half years earlier, no radical political changes had occurred in the Territory and the Declaration remained unfulfilled in the case of New Guinea. His delegation was, however, prepared to agree to the Liberian sub-amendment, in a spirit of co-operation with the work of the Council.

13. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) asked the Soviet representative whether he did not feel that the creation of the House of Assembly, with an indigenous majority elected on the basis of a common roll and a system of universal adult suffrage, represented a significant advance.

14. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the election of a House of Assembly in its present form and with its present powers was but a small step towards the establishment of a representative parliament. There was a great difference between the efforts made by individual Australian officers serving in the Territory and the policy actually pursued by the Administering Authority. The House of Assembly did not have all the powers of a true parliament; its composition was discriminatory in nature, since a great many of its seats were set aside for representatives of the Administering Authority.

15. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote against the USSR amendment, since it felt that the creation of the House of Assembly was one of the most significant political advances that had taken place in the Trust Territory. The House of Assembly provided an instrument through which arrangements for the transfer of power could be discussed by the elected representatives of the people; it would thus be possible to ensure that the transfer took place in accordance with the people's wishes and at the pace they desired.

16. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that the Australian officers in the Territory were carrying out the policy of the Administering Authority, which was based on legislation enacted by the Australian Parliament. Furthermore, it was not true that nearly half of the members of the House of Assembly were Australian. There were thirty-eight elected indigenous

members and twenty-six non-indigenous members, of whom sixteen were elected on the basis of the common roll and universal adult suffrage.

The fourth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 4), as orally revised was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The fifth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 5), which also concerned paragraph 2 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

Paragraph 2 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 (T/L.1074, annex) were adopted unanimously.

17. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), referring to the sixth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 6), which concerned paragraph 5 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, said it was untrue that all decisions of the local government councils were subject to approval by local representatives of the Administering Authority. In fact, the councils were autonomous in many respects.

18. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation would support the USSR amendment, since it had certain reservations concerning the powers of the local government councils.

The sixth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 6) was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

The seventh USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 7), which concerned paragraph 6 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

19. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), referring to the second sentence in paragraph 6, said that his delegation could see no reason to discriminate in favour of women in the matter of voting age. He pointed out that the representative of Liberia was under some misapprehension concerning the statutory ages for men and women for marriage. He therefore reserved the position of his delegation with regard to the second sentence of paragraph 6.

20. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the first sentence of paragraph 6.

The first sentence of paragraph 6 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

Paragraph 6 (T/L.1074, annex) as a whole was adopted unanimously.

21. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the eighth Soviet amendment (T/L.1075, para. 8), which concerned paragraph 7 of the draft conclusions and recommendations the word "higher" should read "key".

The eighth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 8) as orally revised, was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the ninth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 9), calling for the deletion of the words "as quickly as practicable" from the second sentence of paragraph 7 of the draft conclusions and recommendations.

The first part of the ninth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 9) was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

23. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the second part of the ninth USSR amendment, calling for the deletion of the words "while recognizing the difficulties of recruitment" from the second sentence of paragraph 7.

The second part of the ninth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 9) was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 7 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

24. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said, with regard to the tenth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 10), which concerned paragraph 8 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, that she favoured retention of the first sentence but could not accept the second. She therefore asked that the two sentences of the amendment should be put to the vote separately.

25. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) recalled that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had undertaken a survey relating to the whole problem of economic development in the Territory. He therefore suggested that the USSR amendment should not be pressed pending submission of the Bank's report.

26. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that since the Council had not yet been advised of the Bank's recommendations, it could not rely on the report to cover all the points it regarded as important. Moreover, recent United States press reports concerning the formation of the Australian-New Guinea Corporation confirmed the USSR view that the Administering Authority had no intention of developing manufacturing or processing industries in the Territory and that it was continuing to pursue a policy of restricting the economic role of the Territory to that of a source of raw materials, cheap labour and a market for Australian goods.

27. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that he would vote against the first sentence of the USSR amendment because it seemed to suggest that nothing had been done or was being done to encourage diversification and the development of manufacturing industries. The statements of the special representative and the Australian representative indicated that the assertion was untrue. It should at least be amended by replacing the words "take immediate steps" by "continue its efforts", thus recognizing that the Administering Authority had already accomplished a great deal and at the same time stressing the importance which the Council attached to the economic development of the Territory. He would vote against the second sentence of the USSR amendment because it was contrary to the facts.

28. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he had no objection to the New Zealand sub-amendment of the first sentence. On the other hand, he strongly objected to the second sentence as a distortion of the facts and to the USSR representative's unquestioning acceptance of certain press reports as accurate representations of the true situation in the Territory.

29. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the only manufacturing industry established by the Administering Authority during the period under review was the filter cigarette industry. He did not regard that accomplishment as a great stride in the

diversification of the Territory's economy. He therefore could not accept the New Zealand sub-amendment.

30. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) cited, as further examples of the diversification of the Territory's economy, the thriving cattle industry and the expansion of the timber industry to such an extent that it had become second to copra as the greatest export-earner in the Territory. He would further note that the rise in timber production was very much in conflict with the development of industry in Australia.

31. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) favoured retention of the text of paragraph 8 of the draft conclusions and recommendations as submitted by the Drafting Committee (T/L.1074, annex). He would welcome some explanation from a member of that Committee concerning the basis for the statement in paragraph 8 that the Council appreciated the "efforts being made to expand and diversify the cash economy and to develop the Territory's economic infrastructure".

32. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the Drafting Committee's conclusion had been based on the statements made by the representatives of the Administering Authority. Indeed, the first sentence fully covered the points made in the first sentence of the USSR amendment.

33. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) agreed with that interpretation and consequently withdrew his sub-amendment.

The first sentence of the tenth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 10) was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second sentence of the tenth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 10) was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

34. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the present text of paragraph 8 (T/L.1074, annex), not because it objected to the substance, but because the matter involved policy decisions by the Australian Government mainly in connexion with the grant of additional funds to the Territory for development purposes.

Paragraph 8 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

35. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) suggested the insertion of the word "further" between "will" and "encourage" in the second sentence of paragraph 9 of the draft conclusions and recommendations.

That amendment was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 9 (T/L.1074, annex) as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 10 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 11 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

36. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the first sentence of paragraph 12 (T/L.1074, annex).

37. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) proposed insertion of the word "fully" between "possess" and "trained" at the end of the second sentence.

38. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the Drafting Committee had deliberately referred to trained in-

indigenous doctors as a future development because it had found no evidence of their existence in the Territory at the present time.

39. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) explained that there were a number of trained medical practitioners in the Territory who had completed a five-year course of study at the Central Medical School of Suva in Fiji. The course was not the equivalent of a full university course in Australia, but it did produce skilful and well-trained medical practitioners. Indeed, on the basis of the experience with the Suva Medical School, the Administering Authority had established the Papuan Medical College, which was associated with the Port Moresby General Hospital. It also provided a five-year course of training for assistant medical officers with special emphasis on the health problems of the Territory. The first students from the Territory were expected to graduate in December 1964. The College would ultimately become a component part of the future university of the Territory. The graduates, like those of the Suva Medical School, were classified as assistant medical practitioners.

The first sentence of paragraph 12 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The United States amendment to the second sentence of paragraph 12 was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

The second sentence of paragraph 12, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 13 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 14 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted unanimously.

40. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out, with regard to the eleventh USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 11), which concerned paragraph 15 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, that a number of indigenous inhabitants of the Territory had a higher education or had completed courses which were the equivalent of university courses although they might not have been given by tertiary educational institutions which were called universities. Such institutions included medical schools and agricultural colleges, for example. To the best of his knowledge, there was one indigenous graduate who had completed a tertiary education in the Territory.

41. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) suggested that the eleventh USSR amendment should be redrafted to read: ". . . a single inhabitant possessing a university degree".

42. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that his amendment should be reworded accordingly.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said, with regard to the amendment under discussion, that the Council was not empowered to reach conclusions regarding Papua which, although joined to the Trust Territory of New Guinea in an administrative union, was not itself a Trust Territory.

44. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Council, in considering his delegation's first amendment (T/L.1075, para. 1), had already examined the situation in both New Guinea and Papua. He therefore maintained his amendment, as orally revised.

The eleventh USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 11) as orally revised, was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

45. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that in the English text of the twelfth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 12), which also concerned paragraph 15 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, the words "opportunity for" should be replaced by "utilization by", and the words "of opportunities" should be inserted after the words "New Guinea".

The twelfth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 12) as orally revised in the English text, was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The thirteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1075, para. 13) which concerned paragraph 16 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 16 (T/L.1074, annex) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

46. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the recommendations contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1074) should be put to the vote.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 4 (T/L.1074) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 5 (T/L.1074) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

47. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 6 of the draft conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the Drafting Committee's report, he wished to place on record a reservation regarding the last sentence, because of the aspects of government policy involved. His delegation's abstention on paragraph 15 had been due to its awareness of the intense efforts the Australian Government was making in the sphere of higher education, and it did not reflect any disagreement with the view expressed in the last sentence of that paragraph.

48. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the refusal of the colonialist majority of the members of the Council to support his delegation's amendments (T/L.1075) to the Drafting Committee's report, especially paragraph 1 of the amendments, was yet another indication of the Administering Authorities' attitude towards the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and of their desire to conceal from the General Assembly the true conditions prevailing in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. His delegation had no illusions concerning the slight possibilities of effective action by the Trusteeship Council, in whose work it participated solely with a view to defending, even in that organ, the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories.

49. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) remarked that the principal document before the Council at the current meeting had been, not the USSR amendments, but the report of the Drafting Committee which the Council itself had set up and which, in his view, had produced a well-balanced and praiseworthy report.

50. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation, although generally opposed to the establishment of drafting committees by the Trusteeship Council, had supported a number of recommendations contained in the report, and it appreciated the Committee's work.

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1076).

52. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that the words "the necessary steps" in the fourth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the words "sufficient steps". In operative paragraph 2, the words "Papua and" should be deleted, the word "soon" should be replaced by "promptly", and the last phrase beginning with the words "and in any case" should be deleted.

53. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) noted that the practice of the Council in the past had been to adopt a series of conclusions and recommendations for submission to the Administering Authority. His delegation would regret any departure from that procedure, which had produced very marked results in previous years. Moreover, the Soviet draft resolution was inaccurate on vital points.

54. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that at the beginning of the meeting, his delegation had explained its reasons for submitting the draft resolution. As far as procedure was concerned, the Council had in the past adopted resolutions as well as recommendations, and the rules of procedure—notably rule 58—clearly envisaged the submission of draft resolutions.

55. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that the adoption of the draft resolution would place the Council in a very difficult situation, since it covered the whole field of political, educational, economic and social development, which was precisely the subject of the detailed conclusions and recommendations already adopted. The text of the draft resolution conflicted with the conclusions and recommendations on a number of points, and any attempt to adopt a resolution on questions already disposed of would appear to be a waste of effort.

The Liberian oral amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph of the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1076) was adopted by 1 vote to none, with 6 abstentions.

The Liberian oral amendment calling for the deletion of the words "Papua and" in operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Liberian oral amendment calling for the replacement of the word "soon" by "promptly" in operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 1 vote to none, with 6 abstentions.

The Liberian oral amendment calling for the deletion of the last phrase of operative paragraph 2, beginning with the words "and in any case", was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The USSR draft resolution (T/L.1096) as a whole, as amended, was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

56. Mr. DOISE (France), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that it reflected his country's general outlook on the question of decolonization. While France had given ample proof of its support for the principle of the emancipation of dependent territories, it nevertheless considered that sufficient time must be allowed for the establishment of the sound constitutional and administrative structures which were vital if a new State was to survive, especially in the case of a poor and materially backward country like New Guinea.

Request for the inclusion of minority views on New Guinea in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly.

57. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to rule 64 of the rules of procedure, and requested that the text of the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1076) should be included, as a minority view, at the end of the Council's recommendations on the question of political advancement.

58. The PRESIDENT said he assumed that the statement of minority views requested by the Soviet representative could be included, as in previous years, in that section of the report which normally contained a summary of the views of members of the Council.

59. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the form in which the Council normally drafted its report was simply a matter of tradition, and it could be changed at any time. The section of the report to which the President had referred did not indicate the views of minority members, and thus the minority was deprived of the opportunity of having its views on a specific subject set out in the report, although it had the right to do so in accordance with rule 64 of the rules of procedure. A very serious matter—the rights of delegations—was at stake, and no matter what the Council might decide, the right to have a delegation's views expressed in the form it chose was guaranteed in the rules of procedure, which the Council was obliged to be guided by.

60. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand), supported by Mr. Chiping H. C. KLANG (China) and Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), agreed that the Soviet delegation was fully entitled to have its views reflected in the report. As he had already stated, however, the USSR draft resolution covered a much wider field than that of political advancement, and the logical course would be to devote a separate section of the Council's report to the draft resolution and the debate on it. Certainly, if the text of the draft resolution were to be included, the statements of those members opposing its consideration and adoption must be included also.

61. The PRESIDENT suggested that an account of the discussion on the USSR draft resolution, including the text of the latter, should be drafted and submitted to the Council at a future meeting, when a decision could be taken concerning the place it should occupy in the Council's report.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.