



## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fourth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 3 August 1959,  
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (continued):	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1958;	
(ii) Petition raising general questions;	
(iii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959	
Report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea . .	455

**President: Mr. Max H. DORSINVILLE (Haiti).****Present:**

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (continued):\***

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1958 (T/1464 and Add.1, T/1472 and Corr.1, T/L.914 and Add.1, T/L.939);
- (ii) Petition raising general questions (T/PET.GEN/L.3);
- (iii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959 (T/1451)

[Agenda items 3 (c), 4 and 6]

**REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE  
ON NEW GUINEA (T/L.939)**

1. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to examine the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea (T/L.939) and the amendments proposed by the Indian delegation (T/L.941) to the draft conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex.

2. Mr. GUPTA (India) formally introduced the amendments proposed by his delegation. The delegation of India had tabled those changes in the hope of making the Council's recommendations more comprehensive. Some of the amendments were mere drafting changes, while the others either elaborated the recommendations a little further or filled up some of the gaps which existed in the report of the Drafting Committee.

3. Referring to the second amendment (T/L.941, para. 2), which sought the deletion of a few words from paragraph 4 of the annex to document T/L.939, he said that the Indian delegation did not agree with

\*Resumed from the 1018th meeting.

the view that the manifestation of cargo cults was a pathological phenomenon. His delegation could not accept the thesis that there was something basically wrong with the mental health of the indigenous people. The problem was essentially socio-educational and politico-economical.

4. The report of the Drafting Committee contained no recommendation with regard to the development of industry in the Trust Territory. That was an essential aspect of the economic development in the Territory and he felt that the Council must make a recommendation on the subject. Accordingly he had suggested (T/L.941, para. 6) the inclusion of an additional paragraph dealing with that question.

5. The PRESIDENT said he would put the draft conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.939) to the vote paragraph by paragraph, and the Indian amendments would be considered in connexion with the paragraph of the annex to which they referred.

Paragraph 1 of the annex was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

6. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first Indian amendment (T/L.941, para. 1), which concerned paragraph 3 of the annex to the report.

That amendment was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

7. Mr. KELLY (Australia) proposed that the words "with concern" should be deleted from the first sentence of paragraph 4; the Council had no cause to be concerned at sporadic indications of dissatisfaction and frustration in the Territory, as those indications could be an expression of the people's will to progress.

The Australian proposal was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The Indian amendment to paragraph 4 (T/L.941, para. 2) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

8. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) referred to paragraph 4 of the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.939) and proposed the addition, at the end of paragraph 5 of the annex to the report, of the sentence "The Council hopes that the Administering Authority will take up the matter with the religious missions at their next annual meeting."

9. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that his delegation could not support the amendment submitted by Haiti. That amendment was, incidentally, inappropriately worded, since it was not the Administering Authority as such but the Administration of the Trust Territory which held annual meetings with the religious missions.

10. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) pointed out that the Council always addressed its recommendations to the Administering Authority.

11. Mr. KIANG (China) proposed the following wording: "The Council hopes that the Administering Authority will arrange for the Administration to take up the matter with the missions for their consideration at their next annual meeting."

12. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) agreed to that text.

13. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said his delegation would oppose the adoption of paragraph 5 except for the words "In this connexion, the Council hopes that the Administering Authority will keep in mind the views of the Visiting Mission", on which his delegation would request a separate vote.

14. The remaining words of that paragraph seemed to imply that only one religious mission should operate in a given area and that the peoples of New Guinea should not enjoy, in matters of belief, a freedom of choice as wide as that enjoyed by the citizens of Australia. It should be borne in mind that the incidental inconveniences arising out of ideological competition were not of great importance when weighed against the very great good following from the broad practice of toleration. The Council should be alive to the relevance to this question of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In its report (T/1451), the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959, had rightly mentioned its diffidence in expressing comments and the delicate position of the Administering Authority. The Council could rest assured that the discussion which had taken place on the subject would, in the perspective of history, be regarded as useful and that the educational policy of the Administering Authority was designed to ensure that contemporary ideologies were not presented to the people in such a way as to lend themselves to a revival or perpetuation of old tribal feuds.

15. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) felt that the Australian representative had placed a narrowly personal interpretation on paragraph 5. In paragraph 19 of its report the Visiting Mission had felt bound to draw the Council's attention to "a situation which may have in it the seeds of future discord and dissension and where old tribal feuds may well be turned into new molds". The Council could not fail to indicate its concern on that score. It was doing so, moreover, in the mildest terms by confining itself to a request to the Administering Authority to seek a solution, but without recommending any specific course of action.

16. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the Visiting Mission's reference to the possible revival of old tribal feuds was of a purely speculative nature.

17. Even if the matter were not placed on the agenda of the annual meeting of the Administration and the religious missions, the contrary views expressed in the Council's debate would not pass unnoticed, since the official records of the Council were communicated to all the heads of religious missions and to the local government councils.

18. Mr. KIANG (China), speaking as Chairman of the Visiting Mission, referred to paragraph 18 of the Mission's report, and recalled that the multiplicity of religious missions was in fact a matter of some con-

cern to the Territory's Administration, as had been stated by the Administrator in conversations with members of the Visiting Mission at Port Moresby. The Visiting Mission had expressly formulated the recommendation contained in paragraph 19 of its report in the hope that it would facilitate the Administration's task. He hoped that the Council would endorse that recommendation in the same spirit.

19. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) felt that the Council could do no more than take note of the existence of the problem and express the hope that the competent authorities would keep it in mind. He shared the view of the Australian representative that the Council should not recommend that the Administering Authority should limit the fields of activity of the religious missions. There were certainly other ways to overcome the difficulties in question. The Council, which could have complete confidence in the Administering Authority, should refrain from making any specific recommendation on that point.

A vote was taken on the Haitian oral amendment, as amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Chinese representative.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

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

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. The amendment was not adopted.

20. Mr. GUPTA (India), referring to the statement made at the 1005th meeting of the Council by the special representative for New Guinea in reply to a question from the Indian representative, proposed that the following sentence should be added to paragraph 5:

"The Council notes the assurance given by the special representative that he will take steps to place this matter on the agenda of the annual conference of missionary organizations."

21. Mr. KELLY (Australia) stated that the special representative had not given such an assurance; he had merely undertaken to suggest a course of action to the Administering Authority. The Council could be sure, however, that having given such an undertaking, the special representative would abide by it.

22. He again requested the Council to keep in mind the delicate situation in which the Administering Authority was placed and not to take a position which, by adopting the Indian amendment, it might itself come to regret.

23. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked the Australian representative whether the special representative was in a position to know if the question would actually be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the missionary organizations.

24. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he could not prejudice the decisions of the Administering Authority on that or any other question.

A vote was taken on the Indian oral amendment to paragraph 5.

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.

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

There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. The amendment was not adopted.

25. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the words "In this connexion", at the beginning of paragraph 5, incorrectly linked paragraphs 4 and 5; he therefore requested that those words should be voted on separately.

It was decided to retain the words by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

26. Miss TENZER (Belgium) proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 5 should be redrafted to read as follows:

"...the Council hopes that the Administering Authority will keep in mind the views expressed by the Visiting Mission in paragraphs 18 and 19 of its report."

The proposal was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

27. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) did not believe that the Council possessed the necessary criteria to determine whether the situation might create psychological difficulties. His delegation could not support the statement to that effect in the second sentence of paragraph 5 and it consequently requested a separate vote on the words "fears that it may create psychological difficulties" and on the word "therefore".

28. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) pointed out that if those words were not retained, there would have to be some changes in the rest of the paragraph.

29. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the deletion of those words would deprive the sentence of any sense.

30. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked whether it was the intention of the United Kingdom representative to have the words in question deleted.

31. He also pointed out that the word "this" in the last clause of the sentence should be put in the plural.

32. Mr. KELLY (Australia) did not believe that the Visiting Mission had been referring to any specific circumstances in paragraphs 18 and 19 of its report; it was advertising to possible future developments.

33. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) confirmed that he had requested a separate vote in order to express his delegation's position with regard to a statement which he considered unjustified. If the vote resulted in the deletion of that statement, there would then be reason for rewording the text. It would be sufficient in that case, for purposes of clarity and taking into account the Australian representative's comment, to replace the word "this" by the words "these considerations".

34. Mr. KIANG (China) pointed out that as a result of the change in the first sentence by reason of the Belgian amendment, the second sentence of paragraph 5 should be worded as follows: "While noting the view of the Administering Authority that the multiplicity of religious missions has not created any real administrative problems,..."

That proposal was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The United Kingdom proposal to replace the word "this" by the words "these considerations" was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

A separate vote was taken on the words "fears that it may create psychological difficulties" and on the word "therefore".

It was decided to retain the words by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The Indian amendment to paragraph 6 (T/L.941, para. 3) was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

35. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words at the end of the original paragraph 6, beginning with "expresses the earnest hope" should be replaced by the following phrase: "recommends to the Administering Authority that it substantially increase the indigenous membership in the Legislative Council of Papua and New Guinea."

The proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 6, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

36. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he had abstained because he had not wished to prejudge the Administering Authority's decision.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Indian amendment to paragraph 9 (T/L.941, para. 4) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

37. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he would have voted in favour of that paragraph if the Indian amendment had not been adopted.

38. Mr. GUPTA (India) proposed that, by reason of the amendment to paragraph 9, the heading of the paragraph should be "District and town advisory councils".

It was so decided.

39. Mr. KELLY (Australia), while considering that there was no need for the first Indian amendment to paragraph 10 (T/L.941, para. 5 (a)), said that he would not oppose it.

That amendment was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

40. Mr. KELLY (Australia), referring to the second Indian amendment to paragraph 10 (T/L.941, para. 5 (b)), pointed out that by deleting the words "continue to", the Council would give the impression that the Administering Authority had not taken adequate measures to remedy the situation caused by the large number of resignations. He would therefore vote against that amendment. He recalled, as had been pointed out by the special representative, that the persons in question were mainly women leaving their posts to be married and officials resigning because they had reached an advanced age.

41. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) considered that it was not a question of saying that the Administering Authority had not taken any steps, but that the steps taken had not been effective.

42. Mr. GUPTA (India) confirmed the interpretation placed on his amendments by the representative of the United Arab Republic, and pointed out that his second amendment must be considered together with the third (T/L.941, para. 5 (c)).

A vote was taken on the second Indian amendment (T/L.941, para. 5 (b)).

There were 5 votes in favour and 5 against, with 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 amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

43. Mr. GUPTA (India) said he would withdraw his third amendment, which lost its point if the second amendment was not adopted.

44. Mr. KELLY (Australia) asked for a separate vote on each of the sentences in paragraph 10.

The first sentence, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The second sentence was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The third sentence was adopted by 13 votes to none.

Paragraph 10 as a whole was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

45. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained from the vote on the paragraph as a whole because of the passage in which the Council expressed the hope that the Administering Authority would continue to take "adequate" measures to remedy the existing situation, although the first sentence indicated that the measures taken up to the present had not been adequate.

46. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) regretted that the second and third Indian amendments had not been put to the vote together, since the second amendment had no point unless the third amendment was adopted. That was why he had abstained from the vote on the second amendment.

47. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he had voted for the second sentence on the basis of the words "qui s'imposent" in the French text.

48. Mr. KELLY (Australia) asked for a separate vote on each of the sentences in paragraph 11.

The first sentence was adopted unanimously.

The second sentence was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

49. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that he had abstained because he could not express an opinion on a matter which it was for his Government to decide.

50. MR. GUPTA (India), referring to paragraph 12, proposed that the words "long-term economic de-

velopment plans" should be replaced by the words "long-term economic planning". He further proposed the substitution of the article "the" for the word "any" between the words "secure" and "additional funds" in the last clause of paragraph 12.

Those proposals were adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

51. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the first part of paragraph 12, from "The Council commends the Administering Authority" to "an acceleration of the rate of progress, and in this connexion,".

52. The PRESIDENT put the first sentence of paragraph 12 to the vote.

The first sentence was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

53. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) had understood that the Council was voting on only the first clause of the first sentence. His delegation emphatically did not approve the part of the sentence that began "and notes with satisfaction". He requested that in future the President read the whole of each text put to the vote.

54. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he too would have voted against the second part of the first sentence if it had been put to the vote separately.

55. Mr. SALOMON (Haiti) asked that all the texts put to the vote should be clearly indicated, since they were often punctuated differently in the various languages.

56. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the second sentence from "It hopes" to "an acceleration of the rate of progress, and in this connexion," inclusive.

That part of the second sentence was adopted by 11 votes to 2.

The remainder of the second sentence was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 12 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

57. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "United Nations" should be substituted for the words "international community" at the end of paragraph 13.

58. Mr. GUPTA (India) suggested that the words "particularly UNESCO, WHO and FAO" should be added at the end of the paragraph.

59. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) did not see any reason for singling out individual agencies in that way. He supported the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union.

60. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he would not press his proposal if the one made by the representative of the Soviet Union was accepted.

61. Mr. KELLY (Australia) pointed out that if the words "United Nations" replaced the words "international community", the text would no longer cover such organizations as the South Pacific Commission and the Colombo Plan.

62. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) thought that the difficulty could be overcome by adding the words "and other international bodies" after the words "United Nations".

63. Miss TENZER (Belgium) explained that the Drafting Committee had used the wording contained in the Visiting Mission's report.

64. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked for further information on the views of the Visiting Mission cited in paragraph 13.

65. Mr. KIANG (China), Chairman of the Visiting Mission, replied that the wording proposed by the Drafting Committee correctly reflected the views of the Visiting Mission.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.