



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fourth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 8 July 1959,
at 2.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa (continued):	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1958;	
(ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, 1959	
Report of the Drafting Committee on Western Samoa (continued)	261
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	
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority.	265

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: 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 Western Samoa (continued):

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1958 (T/1450, T/1455, T/L.908 and Add.1, T/L.915);
- (ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, 1959 (T/1449)

[Agenda items 3 (g) and 5]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON WESTERN SAMOA (T/L.915) (continued)

1. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the amendment to paragraph 7 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.915) which he had submitted orally at the previous meeting. He pointed out that the first two sentences of paragraph 7 dealt with two different questions: the first referred to the system of matai suffrage, which was a social system, and the second, which was in antithesis to the first, as it contained the adverb

"however", referred to the racial basis of the present electoral arrangements. In the opinion of his delegation, the point at issue was whether the present electoral arrangements, under which only the matai enjoyed the right to vote, were to be continued or whether an alternative electoral system, which could only be universal suffrage, was to be adopted. In other words, the sentence referring to racial discrimination should be supplemented by another, in which the Council would express the hope that the Samoans would one day accept the principle of universal suffrage. The sentence his delegation proposed was not meant to be a recommendation to be imposed on the Samoans but rather an expression of principle by the Council.

2. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that he would be unable to vote for the Soviet Union amendment. Since the inception of the Trusteeship System, the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council had been urging the Samoan people to widen their suffrage. The only result had been that the Samoans were, if anything, more strongly attached than ever to their traditional ways. The Samoan people and leaders had agreed to accept universal suffrage for a plebiscite, after discussing the matter with the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, 1959, which had shown that it realized the difficulties raised by the institution of universal suffrage for all elections. If left to themselves, the Samoans would gradually adopt universal suffrage, but if they thought that it was being forced upon them as a principle intrinsically better than their own Samoan ways, their reaction would be hostile.

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

3. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting because, although it endorsed the principle of universal suffrage, it felt that no great service would be rendered to the Samoan people by forcing them to adopt it.

4. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he had abstained because he was confident that in due course the Samoans would adopt universal suffrage of their own volition if they were left to themselves. The Visiting Mission had taken up the matter with the Samoan leaders and people and his delegation did not wish to support a suggestion which went beyond the Mission's recommendations.

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

Paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted unanimously.

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

5. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on each of the two sentences of paragraph 11. He would abstain from voting on the second sentence because, in his

opinion, it was for the Government of Western Samoa to decide what assistance, if any, was needed in the judiciary field. The Trusteeship Council should not express itself in favour of the continuation of the practice of sending New Zealand judges to Western Samoa.

The first sentence of paragraph 11 was adopted unanimously.

The second sentence of paragraph 11 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 11 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "notes with satisfaction the improvement" in the first sentence of paragraph 12 should be amended to read "notes a certain improvement". The Council was not called upon to express satisfaction, regret or displeasure at fluctuations in world prices. Moreover, he did not think that the improvement in the Territory's economic situation could be regarded as a well-established fact.

7. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that he would vote against the deletion of the words "with satisfaction".

8. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) thought that 1958 had been a record year with regard to the increase in the volume of banana and cocoa exports and the rise in the price of copra. That was surely an improvement which the Council could note with satisfaction.

9. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), supported by Mr. KELLY (Australia), recalled that at the twenty-second session certain delegations had expressed concern at the deterioration in the Territory's economic position. As an improvement had taken place, it was fitting and entirely in keeping with the Council's tradition to take note of it with satisfaction. The improvement in the situation was not due merely to a rise in the price of copra or to an increase in the volume of banana and cocoa exports. The fact that the Western Samoa Trust Estates Corporation was now able to make a financial contribution of £30,000 annually to the Territory had also contributed to the improvement.

10. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that those representatives who attached such significance to the first sentence of paragraph 12 should have proposed a clearer text. Before noting anything with satisfaction, it was necessary to know what was satisfactory. Was the Council's satisfaction to oscillate with fluctuations in world prices, which were liable to swing like a pendulum?

11. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union amendment to delete the words "with satisfaction".

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 1.

12. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union amendment to replace the words "the improvement" by the words "a certain improvement".

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

13. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Council should confine itself to noting the present character of the Territory's economy, without prejudging the future. He therefore proposed the deletion of the words "and will continue to be" in the first sentence of paragraph 13.

14. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) thought that, on the contrary, it was the Council's duty in drafting recommendations to bear in mind the probable future nature of the Territory's economy as well as the facts already before it. He would accordingly press for the retention of the original text.

15. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that while it now seemed probable that the basis of the Territory's economy would continue to be agriculture, the possibility could not be excluded of developments which might lead, for instance, to the establishment of industries. He accordingly proposed that the first sentence of the paragraph should be drafted less categorically and should read as follows: "Bearing in mind that agriculture is and is likely to continue to be the basis of the Territory's economy ...".

16. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) supported that proposal.

17. Mr. DORMAN (United States of America) thought that as the report appeared annually the expression "and will continue to be" applied only to the following year. The original wording was therefore quite acceptable.

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

18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, with the adoption of the Indian amendment, his delegation's point had been met and there was no need to put its own amendment to the vote.

19. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) recalled that in previous years the Council had expressed itself categorically concerning the need to encourage the establishment of secondary and other industries in the Territory. The last sentence in paragraph 13 contained a reservation which cast doubt on the possibility of action in that field, although that possibility had been admitted by the Administering Authority itself. In order to remove all room for doubt, he suggested that the phrase "wherever possible" should be replaced by the phrase "as soon as possible".

20. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) supported that proposal.

The Indian amendment was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

21. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "on the basis of equality of rights and strict respect for the independence of Western Samoa" should be added at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 14.

22. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that he had no objection in principle to that amendment, but that he considered it unnecessary. The reference was to a statement by the Administering Authority which, without even having discussed the matter with the

Samoa people, had announced its intention of assisting the Territory, when it became independent, to achieve a faster rate of economic development. Needless to say, it would do so on a basis of strict equality and mutual respect. But the whole question of the Territory's economic future and of its commercial relations with New Zealand and other countries would have to be discussed during the next few years and no blueprint had as yet been prepared. The Council was simply taking note of the statement of the Administering Authority, which was of a very general nature.

23. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that, in those circumstances, it would be premature for the Council to express an opinion on the matter. In paragraph 14, as it read at present, the Council already recognized the need for external assistance and welcomed the Administering Authority's statement that it was willing to continue to assist the future State of Western Samoa not only to develop its economy but more specifically to achieve a faster rate of growth. In view of the explanation which the representative of New Zealand had just given and in view of the fact that no definite plan of action as yet existed, it seemed inappropriate for the Council to express any opinion at that stage and to welcome what was still only a vague intention in the mind of the Administering Authority.

24. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he sympathized with the purpose of the amendment proposed by the Soviet representative. His delegation also had no doubt that the relations which would be established between Western Samoa and New Zealand would be relations between independent countries and that no assistance would be imposed on the future State against its will; that was borne out by the statements which had been made on the subject by the representative of New Zealand. In order to take that situation into account and at the same time to meet the legitimate concern of the representative of the USSR, he proposed that the first sentence of the paragraph should be amended by inserting the words "should independent Western Samoa require such assistance" after the words "future State of Western Samoa".

25. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he would have no difficulty in accepting the amendment proposed by the USSR delegation; he also approved the proposal made by the representative of India.

26. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that he was afraid that there was a contradiction between the statement made at the beginning of the sentence "Considering the Territory's need for external assistance" and the conditional formula proposed by the representative of India. He suggested that that formula might be amended to read: "if it wishes such assistance".

27. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) accepted that suggestion. The essential point was to indicate that whatever might be the views of the Council or even of the indigenous leaders concerning Western Samoa's need for continued economic assistance, such assistance should not be imposed upon the future independent State against its will.

28. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would accept the formula proposed by the representative of India. There still re-

mained, however, a question of principle which his delegation felt should be taken into account. Since paragraph 14 referred to the economic assistance to be given to the future Samoan State, the Council should make it clear forthwith that such assistance should be rendered only on the basis of equality of rights and strict respect for the independence of the future State of Western Samoa. With that in mind, he proposed that the following sentence should be inserted after the first sentence of the paragraph, amended along the lines just proposed by the representative of India: "In the view of the Trusteeship Council, this assistance should be extended on the basis of equality of rights and strict respect for the independence of Western Samoa."

29. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the text proposed seemed to imply an unwarranted reflection on the Government of New Zealand. He had no objection at all to the general principle that any assistance given to the future Samoan State, from whatever source, should be based on equality of rights and a strict respect for the independence of the new State. But his delegation could not accept a formula which seemed to imply, wittingly or unwittingly, that there was a danger involved in the offer of economic assistance from New Zealand, when in fact no member of the Council believed that any such danger existed.

30. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he fully agreed with the representative of Australia on the need to find a general formula which would apply to all States and not merely to New Zealand. His delegation had thought that the Administering Authority would be prepared to accept such an amendment to the statement attributed to it in the first sentence of the paragraph. It was because the representative of that country had refused to do so that the USSR had made a second proposal which would complete the paragraph with a statement for which the Trusteeship Council would assume responsibility.

31. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that the formula proposed by the representative of India, which made it clear that assistance would be granted to Western Samoa only if it so desired, corresponded to the views of the Administering Authority. The Prime Minister of New Zealand had told the Visiting Mission categorically that any assistance which New Zealand would give to Western Samoa would depend completely on the wishes of the population of the Territory; he had added that his country was willing to assist the population of Samoa in the way in which the latter thought best. The formula proposed by the representative of India, therefore, correctly reflected the point of view of the New Zealand Government. Nevertheless, the inclusion of a statement of general principles in a factual report was a practice which should be avoided. For that reason, he considered the amendment of the Soviet Union premature, although it might be acceptable in principle. For the time being, it seemed better to accept the formula proposed by the representative of India and to defer the adoption of a resolution or of a more general text to a later date, when the question of the economic assistance to be given to the future State would assume greater reality.

32. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) proposed that the statement of principle should be phrased as fol-

lows: "This assistance, when extended by Member and non-member States, should be on the basis of equality of rights and strict respect for the independence of Western Samoa." The words "in the view of the Council" were superfluous, because the document under discussion was a Council document.

33. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said he was confident that the future State of Western Samoa would be in a position to ensure that the assistance it received from other States would in no way impair its independence and sovereignty. The Council ought not, two years before Western Samoa's accession to independence, to take any decision concerning the pattern of economic relations between the Territory and countries which might assist it and his delegation could not vote for any text which prejudged the future in that way. He also wished to make it clear that he did not in any way question the intentions of the Administering Authority, since its representatives had categorically stated that the independence of Samoa would be full and complete. He requested, therefore, that a vote should be taken on his original text, reworded to read as follows: "... continue to assist the future independent State of Western Samoa, if it wishes such assistance, to achieve a faster rate of economic development".

34. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although certain provisions which had been recommended by various delegations had been considered premature, commitments had, in fact, been made in regard to the future, since paragraph 14 stated that the Administering Authority was willing to continue to assist the future State of Western Samoa. On the one hand, it was hard to see how it was possible to continue to assist a State which did not exist and, on the other hand, he thought that it was the right and the duty of the Council to state the principles which should govern such assistance. He was therefore in favour of adopting the Indian representative's amendment and of inserting the new sentence proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

35. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first sentence of paragraph 14, as amended by the Indian representative.

The first sentence of paragraph 14, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

36. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the sentence proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Italy, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Against: New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: Italy, Paraguay, Burma, China, Haiti, India.

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

37. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) explained that he had abstained not for reasons of principle but because of the place at which the sentence in question was to have been inserted.

38. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he had abstained because, in his view, the amendment of the United Arab Republic was superfluous and premature, since the Council had taken note of the statements of the Administering Authority, the only country so far to have offered assistance to Western Samoa. In examining the amendment the Council had perhaps encroached upon the prerogatives of the General Assembly, which could, in 1960 or 1961, submit to Member and non-member States the question of assistance to Western Samoa.

39. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) said that he had abstained because it seemed to him that a sentence couched in such general terms as the one proposed had no place in a report which dealt specifically with a Trust Territory.

40. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) felt that an amendment of the type proposed was both premature and unnecessary, since an independent State's relationships, economic or otherwise, were of necessity based on equality and strict respect for independence. Such a sentence, in the context in which it would have been placed, might have been misconstrued. It was much better to examine principles of that kind in relation to practical problems and perhaps in the presence of representatives of Western Samoa.

41. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he had not intended to question the motives of the Administering Authority. The statement the New Zealand representative had just made could very well take the place of the amendment of the United Arab Republic which the Council had rejected.

Paragraph 14 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

42. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Indian amendment to paragraph 16 (T/L.917, para. 2). If there were no objections to the amendment, he would put paragraph 16 as thus amended to the vote.

Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

43. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Indian amendment to the English text of paragraph 17 (T/L.917, para. 3) and said that if there were no objections he would put that text to the vote with the Indian amendment.

Paragraph 17, as amended in the English text, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraphs 18 and 19 were adopted unanimously.

44. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 20 because it was at variance with what the New Zealand representative had said about the opposition of the Samoans to any measure imposed upon them from abroad.

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 20 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraphs 21 and 22 were adopted unanimously.

45. The PRESIDENT recalled that it had been decided to postpone consideration of paragraph 23.

46. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the second sentence of paragraph 24 should be amended to state that a plebiscite would show whether the population desired the abrogation of the Trusteeship Agreement and the accession of the Territory to independence, and that any reference to the signing of a treaty of friendship with New Zealand should be deleted, because that was a question that would have to be decided by the independent State of Western Samoa. He accepted the Indian amendment (T/L.917, para. 5), provided that the words "at its fifteenth session" were inserted after "the General Assembly".

47. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand), referring to the second Soviet Union amendment, said that in the tentative time-table drawn up by the New Zealand Government (T/1449, para. 174) it had been suggested that the Trusteeship Council would be asked in 1960 to recommend that the item "Question of Western Samoa" should be placed on the agenda of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. It had not been presumed that the Council would think itself in a position at the current session to make a definite commitment of that sort. That decision could well be taken by the Council in 1960.

48. With respect to the first Soviet Union amendment, the authors of the draft report had merely included a provision in which the Council welcomed the resolution adopted by the Fautua and the members of the Legislative Assembly recommending that a plebiscite should be held. The Samoans had recognized that the questions to be put to the inhabitants would have to be determined by the General Assembly in consultation with the Administering Authority but had felt that the population should be consulted on the following points: the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, the enactment of the constitution and the signing of a treaty with New Zealand. It was therefore appropriate to mention the suggestions they had made, while at the same time specifying that the exact form of the questions to be asked in the plebiscite should be determined at the appropriate time by the General Assembly.

49. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should leave section VI, comprising paragraphs 23 to 25, until it had taken a decision on paragraph 23. After all, the whole of section VI was based on that paragraph.

50. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) supported the President's suggestion. He hoped that the USSR representative would submit his proposed amendments in writing.

51. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed the President's suggestion. He would comply with the United Kingdom representative's request.

52. The PRESIDENT proposed that the discussion of section VI should be deferred.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.55 p.m.

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);

(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]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jones, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place at the Council table.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY

Political advancement

53. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) referred to paragraphs 13 et seq. of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959 (T/1451) and asked whether the special representative would comment on the Mission's findings with respect to the cargo cult.

54. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that during the year under review there had been only two manifestations of that cult. There was still, however, a legacy of it in the minds of some of the people, which had been manifested in statements opposing the Administration.

55. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) asked whether the Administering Authority had drawn up any plan for educating the inhabitants on that question.

56. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administration had taken several steps, including education in citizenship, informing the indigenous inhabitants of their social and economic status in relation to other peoples, assuring them of the role they would be called upon to play in New Guinea, and pointing out the advantages of land ownership, economic independence and so forth. Moreover, organized parties of indigenous inhabitants were sent to Australia where they were shown around factories and mines and taken into the rural areas. The best results were achieved by sending groups of indigenous teachers on those conducted tours. There had been two tours during 1958, there had already been one in 1959 and others were being planned.

57. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that the plan described by the special representative did not seem to him sufficiently vigorous to combat such a serious state of mind. A more elaborate plan should be envisaged in order to dispel such restlessness and frustration.

58. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that although some of the facts mentioned by the Visiting Mission were an aftermath of the cargo cult, the cult itself was not at present a serious problem. The Administering Authority was confident that the steps it was taking throughout the Territory at the present time were adequate.

59. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) noted that in paragraph 18 of its report the Visiting Mission stated that the Administrator had said that the multiplicity of religious missions had not created any real administrative problems. He was therefore surprised that there had been complaints about the interference by religious missions in the establishment of local government councils and their opposition to educational supervision by the Administration, in particular to the introduction of English into the curriculum of primary schools.

60. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the complaints made to the 1959 Visiting Mission and to previous missions had been investigated, but there was no concrete evidence of the interference of religious missions in the establishment of local government councils or of any opposition on their part to supervision. Some missions had adopted an indigenous language and had asked that English should be introduced only gradually, so that they could adjust themselves to the change. In one or two areas the missions were trying to arrange that no council schools should be opened where there already was a mission school and some missions, without offering any active opposition, had suggested that the councils should not enter into certain branches of commercial activity and that it was not the councils' responsibility to provide schools. All those matters had been discussed with the missions concerned and had been more or less settled.

61. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) asked the Chairman of the Visiting Mission why the Mission had made the following statement in paragraph 19 of its report: "The Mission thus finds a certain diffidence in expressing any comments."

62. Mr. KIANG (China), Chairman of the Visiting Mission, said that in private conversations with members of the Visiting Mission some heads of religious missions had said that they had some difficulty in their work in the Territory owing to the multiplicity of religious missions. The Administrator had told the Visiting Mission that the problem was one that the Administration had in mind, but that it would be very difficult to restrict the various religious missions to certain areas, since the Administration was obliged to respect the principle of religious freedom, and that to refuse to allow any further religious missions to enter the Territory would be a violation of that principle. The Visiting Mission had, however, had the impression that with each religious mission defending its own cause a certain confusion was created in the minds of the people. That was the idea the Visiting Mission had wished to express in its report.

63. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that, although religious freedom should be respected, neither the United Nations Charter nor the Trusteeship Agreement provided for competition in winning converts at the expense of the cultural and social advancement of the people. He asked whether the Administering Authority was mindful of the danger inherent in confusing the minds of the people.

64. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the multiplicity of religious missions had not created any real administrative problems. The existence side by side of various religious groups was essential to religious freedom. If there was some confusion in the minds of the people, it was because they were less advanced than people in more developed countries and

hence found it difficult to choose between the various religions. Social life was not, however, seriously disrupted, for most of the members belonging to one group, or speaking one dialect, usually practised the same religion. The Administering Authority was keeping a close watch on the situation and if any administrative problem really arose, would take the necessary steps.

65. Mr. KELLY (Australia) added that it should not be forgotten that all the missions were Christian missions which basically shared a common ideology. While the competitive co-existence of contemporary ideologies was not in itself to be discouraged, tribal groups could be criticized for seizing on different ideologies only for the purpose of perpetuating old tribal feuds.

66. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he was glad to hear that the Administering Authority was giving the matter its close attention, for he felt that the people could be all the more easily confused in view of the fact that they had so far had no religion.

67. Referring to paragraphs 49, 50 and 51 of the Visiting Mission's report, he asked whether the Administering Authority was taking any steps to combat the feeling against the Administration, for misunderstanding between the people and the Administration could not but be harmful to the Territory's advancement.

68. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority was taking all the necessary steps to dissipate the bad feeling which had been brought to light by the Navuneram incident. Steps had been taken to meet the new needs of the people in the more developed areas and a review of the structure and functions of the Department of Native Affairs was being carried out. To bring the Navuneram incident into true perspective it should be pointed out that in the whole Raluana area, with a population of 37,000, only the 3,000 inhabitants of Navuneram had caused trouble and as early as 1951 had opposed the introduction of a local government council. As the result of that local incident, however, the Administering Authority was making every effort to establish closer contacts with the people.

69. When the local government councils had been established the system of luluai had been abolished and the Administering Authority had begun to deal more and more through the councils. The Administering Authority was at present reappraising its policy in that respect and in particular was looking into the question whether it had been placing too much reliance on the new councils and whether the members, although elected, truly represented the people. That, too, was a question of establishing closer contacts with the people and of gaining their confidence.

70. Mr. KIANG (China), Chairman of the Visiting Mission, said that it was not really possible to speak of anti-Administration feeling. The Navuneram incident had demonstrated how, under the pretext of opposing tax collection, the people had really opposed the establishment of local government councils. To put that incident in its proper perspective reference should also be made to the report of the Commission of Inquiry about Navuneram.

71. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) asked whether at the present stage of the Territory's evolution the Administering Authority was considering establishing

tentative intermediate target dates for the attainment of self-government or independence.

72. Mr. KELLY (Australia) observed that the Administering Authority had repeatedly stated its position on that subject and that its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement had determined its realistic attitude.

73. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) asked whether the Administering Authority was considering enacting any legislation providing for a nationality for the inhabitants of the Territory.

74. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that no measure of that kind was at present envisaged, for although the people of the Territory were of a common stock they were still divided into separate tribes and their degree of development varied considerably from one area to another. When a stage of development had been reached at which they could all be brought together as one people, they would then be able to express their views on the matter and the Administering Authority would give those views its full consideration.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.