



**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL**  
*Thirtieth Session*  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**NEW YORK**

**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (continued):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1962;</i>	
(ii) <i>Petitions concerning the Trust Territory Statement by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization . . . . .</i>	83
<i>Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority . . . . .</i>	83

**President:** Mr. Nathan BARNES (Liberia).

**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: 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 (continued):**

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1962 (T/1607, T/1615, T/L.1957);
- (ii) Petitions concerning the Trust Territory (T/PET.8/L.8, T/PET.8/L.9)

[Agenda items 4 (c) and 5]

**STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

1. Mr. SALSAMENDI (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that his remarks would be based on notes prepared by the Secretariat of UNESCO. The annual report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of New Guinea<sup>1/</sup> brought out a number of facts in respect of which the Australian Government deserved to be commended. Thus, the budget approved for education in 1962 had been almost three times that of 1958. The funds allotted for the construction of school buildings had been considerably increased. With regard to primary education, there had been a noticeable increase in the number of schools, teachers and pupils. A special committee had revised the curriculum of

<sup>1/</sup> Commonwealth of Australia, *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea from 1st July, 1961, to 30th June, 1962* (Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer, 1963). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1607).

the type "T" primary schools attended by indigenous pupils.

2. The following problems, however, remained. Firstly, in the absence of precise statistics, the school enrolment rates could not be known. On the basis of the declaration of 26 October 1961 made by the Australian Minister for Territories and referred in the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 (T/1597 and Add.1), it could be estimated that more than 50 per cent of the children of school age were currently attending school. In consequence, despite the considerable progress mentioned in the annual report under consideration, much remained to be done in the field of primary education. In that connexion he drew attention to the statement on page 140 of the annual report that in most local government council areas a strong feeling had been developing that compulsion should be applied to ensure that children enrolled at school did in fact attend regularly. Inasmuch as the Education Ordinance 1952-1957, which had not yet been implemented, provided for compulsory education in certain areas of the Territory, the time had perhaps come to put it into effect in areas where that would be practicable.

3. Secondly, the annual report indicated that indigenous pupils with the required knowledge and ability could attend the type "A" schools, whose programmes were the same as those of the Australian schools, but that only 136 indigenous pupils were enrolled in those schools. It should be noted, moreover, that the number of schools of that type was too small in relation to the total number of students in the Territory, and that it had undergone practically no increase (thirty-one schools in 1959 compared to thirty-three in 1962). The report indicated, however, that the Administration was aiming at the eventual integration of the two types.

4. Thirdly, a larger number of teachers should be trained, and the qualifications of teachers in service should be improved, if the goals of the Administration in the field of education were to be attained.

5. Finally, with regard to higher education, it would be interesting to know what practical measures had been adopted to encourage pupils to continue their studies beyond the secondary school stage, pursuant to the recommendations made by the Council at its twenty-ninth session (A/5204, p. 28).

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

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. H. L. R. Niall, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place at the Council table.*

6. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) asked the special representatives if he could elaborate on

the problems to be solved in providing for a realistic and rapid rate of political development. The Trusteeship Council would gain a clearer picture of the magnitude of the accomplishments of the Administering Authority and of the inhabitants of the Territory if it was given a more precise idea of the obstacles that had had to be surmounted.

7. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) replied that the main problem was that of increasing the rate of education. A large percentage of the adult population were illiterate. The people also had to be educated in political procedures. The Administering Authority considered that the rate of progress should be determined by the people themselves. In that connexion, it was awaiting the decisions of the House of Assembly to be elected in 1964. Immediately after the election of the current Legislative Council, its members had appointed a committee to investigate what progress was necessary towards self-government. That committee had made recommendations which had been accepted and on which the House of Assembly would be based. In addition, the development of roads and airfields would facilitate contact between the various groups of people. With the extension of the broadcasting system, even people in outlying areas would be able to hear the debates of the Council and become politically conscious.

8. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) asked how the candidates for election to the legislature would be nominated.

9. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) replied that the only nominated members in the House of Assembly would be ten officials who would be there to guide the other members, all of whom would be elected.

10. With regard to the nomination of candidates, the latter nominated themselves for election. Several New Guineans had announced that they would stand for election, and were already setting out their political programmes in the local Press.

11. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) asked the special representative whether he believed that the ratio of one Member of Parliament for each 30,000 voters would assist in overcoming narrow localism and in fostering a broader measure of cohesion among the inhabitants than would have been the case if a smaller ratio, resulting from the originally suggested representation of 100 members, had been adopted.

12. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) recalled that he had said at the previous meeting that the electorates had been based as far as possible on electors having the same tribal affiliation. The number of 30,000 electors was the nearest one could get to a homogeneous group. It would help awaken the national consciousness of the population.

13. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that he had been very much struck by the staggering problems imposed by transport in such difficult terrain. He asked whether the Administering Authority was developing air and sea transport as a means of improving communications.

14. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) replied that the Administration had considerably increased the number of airfields during the past two years. In Sepik District alone, there were now seventy-two airstrips. The Administration was continually building new airstrips, thus enabling regular services to

be established in order to bring the population groups into closer contact with each other. It might even be found possible to close some of the smaller hospitals and to use air services to bring patients to the large hospitals. The two major airlines currently operating in the Territory were increasing their services. The shipping companies were steadily increasing the number of ships in service, as agricultural production, especially of copra and cocoa, was expanding; in addition, the indigenous co-operative societies had purchased some vessels. Altogether, overseas shipping services had almost doubled in the two previous years.

15. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America), noting that the Administering Authority was concerning itself with training indigenous personnel for posts at higher levels, while at the same time recruiting professional personnel to meet immediate needs, asked how the problem of balancing long-term and short-term requirements was being met.

16. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) recalled that a commission had been set up to investigate the possibility of establishing a Territorial university. Since very few indigenous pupils had completed their secondary education, only one or two New Guineans had thus far been able to avail themselves of a university education preparing them for higher positions. The Central Medical School at Suva, in Fiji, had trained some New Guineans in medicine, hygiene and nursing. One of them had taken the place of the Australian District Medical Officer in Manus District.

17. In order to expand its services, the Administration had been recruiting professional staff from overseas on short-term contracts. In its engineering services, it was using engineers from the Australian Department of Works.

18. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Administering Authority considered that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)), in particular paragraph 5, was applicable to the Trust Territory of New Guinea, and whether it intended to implement the provisions of the Declaration.

19. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he saw no contradiction between the intention of resolution 1514 (XV) and the existing situation in the Territory of New Guinea. New Guinea was proceeding very rapidly towards self-government or independence. However, the Administering Authority stressed the fact that it was for the people themselves to set the date for their independence. They would do so, of course, through their elected representatives.

20. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the representative of Australia to clarify whether he admitted that paragraph 5 of the Declaration was applicable to the Territory. If so, he wished to know whether the Administering Authority had held any referendum or inquiry to determine whether the population accepted the method proposed by the Administering Authority or preferred to obtain its independence in accordance with the Declaration.

21. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that no referendum had been held. The Soviet Union delegation was aware that long and patient efforts, whose merit had not escaped the Council, had been needed to bring the very vast Territory under the effective authority of the Administration. It had not been pos-

sible to hold a referendum which, in view of the conditions, would not have been understood by the majority of the population, and there was still no question of holding one. Elections by universal adult suffrage would be held throughout the Territory, and the body to be elected would express the wishes of the people.

22. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Administering Authority had made no attempt to determine the will of the people concerning their future. Since the Administering Authority appeared to have some definite plans for the advance of the Territory towards independence, he asked whether it could indicate when, in its view, the Territory would be able to attain independence.

23. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that the body to be elected and not the Administering Authority would determine the date on which the people of the Territory would attain independence. Paragraph 5 of the Declaration said that peoples should attain independence "in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire".

24. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with satisfaction that the representative of Australia had referred to the Declaration on the granting of independence.

25. He recalled that the Council, at its twenty-ninth session, had urged the Administering Authority "to establish, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life" (A/5204, p. 30). The Administering Authority's annual report did not, however, make any reference to that subject. He asked whether the Administering Authority had taken steps to implement that recommendation and, if so, whether it had established realistic target dates for the political development of the Territory.

26. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative), quoting the text of the Council's recommendation, pointed out that it spoke of establishing "in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic target dates"—in the plural—and made no specific mention of self-determination or independence. The Administering Authority had established March 1964 as the date for the inauguration of the new House of Assembly, in which the majority of the members would be elected by universal adult suffrage. The Administering Authority wanted the people themselves to set the actual target date for the attainment of independence, through the elected body which would be competent to do so.

27. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed the fact that the recommendation of the Trusteeship Council mentioned the need to establish "realistic target dates reflecting the sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life". He also emphasized that the Council had urged the Administering Authority to establish the target dates "in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)".

28. His delegation attached fundamental importance to the application of the Declaration to the Territory of New Guinea. He asked whether the Administering Authority had taken steps to familiarize the people of the Territory with the provisions of the Declaration, what methods it had used for that purpose, whether it had made use of the Press and radio, and whether the Declaration was studied in the schools.

29. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that resolution 1514 (XV) had been widely disseminated in New Guinea and Papua. The Administering Authority had taken extraordinary measures to give wide publicity not only to resolution 1514 (XV) but also to the entire work of the United Nations by all possible means, including radio, schools, Native local government councils and so on.

30. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed that reply. He asked whether the special representative could indicate how many copies of the Declaration had been distributed in the Territory. He also wondered, since a large part of the adult population was still illiterate, whether the Administering Authority had made any efforts to explain the purport of the document.

31. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he would try to supply information on the number of copies of the Declaration which had been distributed. The Administration was meeting with numerous difficulties in its efforts to explain the Declaration. It was difficult for people with little education and no experience of the outside world to understand the Declaration. The problem was complicated by the fact that there were 700 different languages in the Territory and that it was very difficult in most of the languages to find terms to express the abstract concepts contained in the Declaration. The Administration was working hard to solve the problem, not only with regard to the Declaration but also with regard to other United Nations documents.

32. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the importance of establishing a parliament in the Territory and noted that the Legislative Council was to become a House of Assembly. The most important change could not be the change of title but the change in the powers enjoyed. He asked whether the House of Assembly would be an authentic parliament, representative of the Territory. The existing Legislative Council, in addition to having an anti-democratic structure, had no real power, and none of its bills had been enacted without the permission of the Administration. No indication had been given in the annual report or by the special representative concerning the powers of the new body, a question which was very important.

33. The United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962, had recommended the creation of a parliament composed of 100 members, for reasons which undoubtedly carried weight. He wondered why the Administering Authority had reduced that number to a mere sixty-four.

34. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) recalled that the figure of sixty-four had been chosen by the Select Committee on Political Development, which had been established by the Legislative Council. The Committee had visited all parts of the Territory and interviewed the people everywhere. It had taken into account the wishes of the people when it had recom-

mended that the parliament should be composed of sixty-four members. The people interviewed had felt that, if there were more members, the deliberations would be interminable. They had thought that with one representative for 30,000 voters the population would be suitably represented.

35. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that a parliament composed of 100 members would have a more representative character.

36. With regard to the Australians who would be members of the House of Assembly, he asked whether the Administering Authority could quote at least one statement by a representative of the indigenous population in favour of such an excessive number of Australians in the parliament.

37. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that the Select Committee of the Legislative Council had stated in its report that there was a universal and very strongly expressed view that there must be non-indigenous inhabitants on the Council, and that many people were in favour of a one-to-one ratio between indigenous and non-indigenous representatives. The Committee had made recommendations which were in advance of the wishes of the people, and the Legislative Council and the Australian Government had accepted them. Mr. Vin Tobaining, who had been a member of the Select Committee and was present at the Trusteeship Council's debate might, if the Council so wished, reply at greater length to the USSR representative's question and explain why the people were strongly in favour of having Australians in the parliament of the Territory.

38. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, in accordance with the reform of the Legislative Council, the new parliament would be composed of forty-four representatives of the indigenous population, ten representatives of the non-indigenous population, and ten officials who would be *ex officio* members; the indigenous inhabitants, however, numbered a million and a half and the non-indigenous only 15,000. That meant that in the House of Assembly the indigenous population would have one seat for every 33,000 persons, whereas the non-indigenous population would have one seat for every 1,500 persons. The proposed distribution of seats would therefore give the indigenous people of the Trust Territory a representation that was twenty-two times smaller than that of the non-indigenous inhabitants.

39. With regard to the setting up of a House of Assembly, the special representative had said in his opening statement (1214th meeting) that the Administering Authority had accepted the report of the Select Committee with minor reservations; the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to know what those reservations were.

40. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) felt that the representative of the Soviet Union had overlooked two main points with regard to the House of Assembly. First, the inclusion of ten non-indigenous representatives had been decided upon at the express wish of the people and he had given six of the main reasons for it in his opening address. Secondly, the representative of the Soviet Union had overlooked the fact that those ten representatives would be elected, not by the 15,000 non-indigenous inhabitants of the Territory but by all the people on a common roll. Each indigenous voter, no matter where he lived, would

have two votes at the elections, one of which would be for the ten reserved seats.

41. Regarding the question asked by the representative of the Soviet Union, he would reply at a later date, after checking. The reservations had been so minor that he could not recall them.

42. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that the special representative had been speaking not only from thirty-six years' experience in New Guinea but also from his experience as a member of the Legislative Council. The points which the special representative had made were most significant.

43. There was another important point which the USSR representative had overlooked; whatever the representation ratio, forty-four of the sixty-four seats in the House of Assembly would be for indigenous representatives. It would therefore be a body in which the indigenous inhabitants could impose their will by exercising their voting power.

44. As the special representative had pointed out, the Administration had been astonished by the insistence of the indigenous inhabitants that there should be seats reserved for non-indigenous representatives. The Select Committee had said in its report that when the inhabitants of Papua and New Guinea had realized that as a result of the elections on a common roll only a small number of Australians would be elected, they had all argued that there must be elected Australian members, over and above the ten official members.

45. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked in what way the functions and powers of the House of Assembly would differ from those of the Legislative Council. In particular, he would like to know whether the assent of the Administrator would still be necessary for the decisions of the House of Assembly to become law.

46. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that the ordinances adopted by the House of Assembly would have to receive the assent of the Administrator, and in certain cases that of the Governor-General of Australia. One of the reasons for retaining that arrangement was that two-thirds of the revenue of the Territory was still provided by grants-in-aid from the Administering Authority.

47. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) added that although the assent of the Administrator would be necessary in certain cases and that of the Governor-General in others, no law could be adopted in the Territory unless it had been voted by the House of Assembly. Only the House of Assembly, in which the forty-four indigenous members would have the majority, would have the power to make laws.

48. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt it was strange that an organ which was intended to lead the Territory to independence should still be subject to representatives of the Administering Authority. In spite of the extension of the legislative organ and the increase in its membership, the situation would remain unchanged, since the prerogatives of the Administrator and of the Administrator's Council would remain the same. That was not what the delegation of the Soviet Union understood by political progress.

49. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that on the contrary the situation would be completely different from what it had been hitherto. As he had already said, the

legislative organ would have a majority of indigenous members elected by universal suffrage on a common roll. If the Administrator or anyone else wished a law to be adopted in the Territory, he would have to obtain the support of the majority of the elected members of the Council. The situation would therefore be radically different.

50. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) disagreed with the Australian representative. An organ might be given a larger number of seats and a larger proportion of elected indigenous members, but that did not mean that it would be more democratic. If that organ was not given unlimited powers which would not be restricted by being subject to approval by a higher authority, all such changes would be pointless.

51. In order to give the Trusteeship Council a clearer picture of the situation, the delegation of the Soviet Union would like the Administering Authority to communicate to the Council the first and second reports of the Select Committee and copies of the laws governing the changes in the legislative organ.

52. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that the interim report and the supplementary report were public documents and were available. He had only one or two copies, but he was ready to give them to the Secretariat for mimeographing.

53. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not quite understand the fifth reason given by the special representative in his opening statement as a justification for the creation of reserved seats in the House of Assembly: what had he meant by his statement that the Select Committee had often heard the fear expressed that recent happenings in Territories similar to Papua and New Guinea might be repeated there and that Papua and New Guinea might be left to fend for themselves?

54. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that that had been a quotation from the Select Committee's report. The sentence quoted by the USSR representative meant that the people of Papua and New Guinea were aware of the trouble in some of the African countries that had recently attained independence, the Congo (Leopoldville) in particular, and they were afraid that if they were left to their own resources, similar trouble or even civil war might break out between the 700 different tribes living in the Territory, which only a few years earlier had been in a state of war with one another. They would therefore prefer not to be granted full independence until they asked for it themselves.

55. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the present situation in Papua and New Guinea was likely to lead to events similar to those in the Congo, the indigenous inhabitants had reason to be concerned.

56. Regarding the Territory's political development, the special representative, in his opening statement, had said that the Administering Authority was planning to introduce a bill to give wider functions to the Administrator's Council, which so far had been—and still was—an advisory body. He asked for clarification on three specific points. First, in what field would the Administrator's Council be given wider functions? Secondly, when would the under-secretaries be able to replace the official members of the Council? Lastly, could the Administering Authority

make copies of the bill available to the members of the Trusteeship Council?

57. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) replied that the number of members of the Administrator's Council would be increased from seven to eleven. It would consist of the Administrator, three official members and seven elected members of the House of Assembly. The majority of the members of the Administrator's Council would thus be elected.

58. The bill to be presented to the New Guinea Legislative Council had not yet been completed and would not come before it until its next session in September or October 1963.

59. He could give no additional information on the powers of the Administrator's Council in view of the fact that the drafting of the bill had not yet been completed. As far as he knew at present, the Council would act in an advisory capacity with the same powers as the present Council, or with similar but enlarged powers.

60. Regarding the under-secretaries, it was only after the elections, when the number of the elected members who were literate was known and the under-secretaries had been chosen, that it would be possible to say when they would be able to take over the government of the country.

61. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Administrator's Council had remained unchanged so far and that he had been unable to get information on the future functions of the Council. His delegation was therefore frankly dissatisfied with the situation.

62. With reference to the elected members of the House of Assembly, he hoped that the people of Papua and New Guinea would put their trust in the persons most worthy to represent them. Even the illiterate elected members would be able to carry out certain functions, perhaps even better than persons who had had an extensive education.

63. In his opening statement the special representative had said that the under-secretaries would receive political and administrative training which would enable them eventually to replace some or all of the official members of the Council. He wished to know whether the Administering Authority had any specific plans in that connexion and when it intended to carry them out.

64. The special representative had also said, with regard to local administration, that a new Local Government Council Ordinance was being prepared. The Soviet delegation would like to know when the new Ordinance would be passed. Further, reference had been made to a considerable expansion of the powers and functions of the local government councils. What exactly would the expansion entail?

65. Lastly, could the special representative make available to the Council the text of the resolutions adopted by the Conference of local government councils which had met at Lae in April of the current year.

66. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) stressed that the bill must go before the Legislative Council before it could come into effect. The bill would provide for the establishment of local government councils by proclamation of the Administrator, who would define the area over which a given council had au-

thority and the persons or classes of persons who would be under its jurisdiction. The bill would further specify a wide range of powers and functions, and contain provision for the limitation of the powers of any particular council. It would also provide for the appointment of a commissioner for local government, who would have to submit an annual report to the Legislative Council on the operation of the various councils and who would have some supervisory control over them. The bill was designed to cover a variety of local government councils, ranging from the newly formed ones to others that were well established, such as the one in the Rabaul area. The councils would have a wide range of functions in relation to agriculture, forestry, education, extension services, public works, health and building. They would be empowered to organize, finance, engage or assist in any business enterprise; they could carry out all kinds of works for the benefit of the area concerned and co-operate with any department of the Administration in any public or social service. The rules of the local councils would be subject to cancellation by the Legislative Council and all new rules must be laid before the Legislative Council or the House of Assembly within six months after they had been drafted. The bill would also give power to the councils to levy taxes, including the right to tax property and to set fees for different services.

67. The conference of local government councils held at Lae had dealt with an agenda of some thirty items. One of the resolutions passed urged the Australian Government to retain the trusteeship over the Territory. He had not the texts of all the resolutions adopted at the conference, but thought he could obtain them within a few days.

68. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the slow progress of the Territory towards independence, he wished to know what was the relationship between the Territory of New Guinea and neighbouring territories, both Trust and Non-Self-Governing. In an interview with the Australian Television Service, which had later been published in part in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 12 March 1963, a member of the Legislative Council had stated, in reply to a question, that according to the newspapers that he had read, the inhabitants of the Territory wished to remain on friendly terms with West Irian after it had been incorporated, according to its own wishes, in Indonesia. The representative of Indonesia, speaking in the Fourth Committee (1428th meeting) at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, had said that his country attached great importance to the development of New Guinea and hoped for close and friendly co-operation with the people of the Trust Territory after it had attained independence. What measures was the Administering Authority taking to establish or strengthen good neighbourly relations between the people of New Guinea and adjacent countries and territories, in particular West Irian? The two parts of the island had certain problems in common and could only gain from joint solutions. He referred, in that connexion, to the recent cholera epidemic in West New Guinea and wished to know whether the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory had taken part in the fight to prevent the spread of the disease.

69. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that Australia and Indonesia had friendly relations with each other and would, he was certain, continue to be good neighbours.

70. With regard to the question asked by the Soviet representative, he would observe that since Indonesia had been administering West Irian for only about a month it was a little early to ask what plans the two Governments concerned had made for the settlement of problems of common interest. He had no knowledge of the details of such planning; that was a matter to be settled between the new Government of West Irian and the Government of Australia.

71. Australia had given substantial assistance to the authorities in the western part of the island in combating the cholera epidemic to which the Soviet representative had referred. He had no details on the matter but could state that combined and concerted efforts had been made by the responsible authorities on both sides of the border.

72. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Australian representative for his reply; he, too, hoped that good-neighbourly relations would continue to exist between the two parts of the island.

73. The Australian representative had said that he had no knowledge of the relations between the two parts of the island. That was astonishing, considering that the peoples concerned were neighbours and that Australia should therefore concern itself with the question of the relations existing between them.

74. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) recalled that the Indonesian Government had not assumed responsibility for administering the western part of New Guinea until 1 May 1963. As far as administrative and governmental relations between the two parts of the island were concerned, that was a matter for the two Governments concerned to settle by negotiation. Those Governments were friendly and would doubtless address themselves through the proper channels to matters of common concern requiring settlement.

75. He would ask the Soviet representative not to read groundless implications into what he had said.

76. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), reverting to his original question, asked if the Administering Authority had taken steps to strengthen the good-neighbourly relations existing between the two parts of the island.

77. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he did not intend to add to the reply which he had already given. He would only repeat that the Australian authorities had co-operated in combating the cholera epidemic which had broken out on the western side of the border between the two parts of the island, furnishing drugs, medical personnel and helicopters. He recalled, however, that that had occurred before 1 May when the Territory had still been under the authority of the United Nations.

78. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Australian representative for his reply concerning the joint effort to combat the cholera epidemic and the aid furnished by the Administration of the eastern part of New Guinea to the Administration of the western part. His question had, however, referred to the present, not the past.

79. Turning to another matter, he recalled that at a previous session of the Trusteeship Council his delegation had raised the question of the meetings which the parties to the Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America (ANZUS) held regularly at Wellington. His delegation regarded those meetings as a highly important matter,



since the Trust Territory of New Guinea was situated, geographically at least, within the Treaty's sphere of influence. He would like to know if the activities of the members of ANZUS extended to the Trust Territory and, if so, what form those activities took and what the Administering Authority itself was doing in that connexion. He would also like to know what decisions concerning New Guinea had been taken at the most recent session of the members of ANZUS.

80. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that there was nothing new in the Administering Authority's position concerning the defence of the territories under its administration or its responsibilities in relation to them. With regard to the question of defence and of Australia's responsibility for the indigenous people and for the Australian people themselves both in the Trust Territory and in Australia's other dependent territories, the Minister for Territories had stated in September 1962 that the role of the United Nations and that of Australia in relation to the Trust Territory had been defined in the Trusteeship Agreement concluded between the United Nations General Assembly and Australia. He read out articles 4 and 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement, which set forth the conditions governing the Australian Government's right to maintain order in the Territory, ensure its defence and take measures to maintain international peace and security. In his statement, the Minister for Territories had also affirmed that Australia's right to administer and defend the Trust Territory was equally valid in the Territory of Papua, which was an Australian possession. None of those recognized Australian rights, which had been clearly confirmed by international treaties such as the United Nations Charter, was currently in dispute and the Minister had stated that if, in violation of international agreements, they were challenged, Australia would maintain them. From the standpoint of defence, his Government regarded Papua and New Guinea in the same way as it regarded the territory of Australia itself, and it would defend them in the same way. Furthermore, the Territories of Papua and New Guinea were regarded in the same way as any other Australian territory for the purposes of ANZUS, which assured Australia of powerful allies in case of aggression against its territory. Article 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement also covered situations of that kind.

81. Addressing himself to the same problem, the Prime Minister of Australia had stated on 22 May that the area of immediate strategic concern to Australia could not be said to have entered a period of stability and that Australia would defend Papua and New Guinea in the same way as it would the territory of Australia itself.

82. In the communiqué issued after the recent ANZUS meeting, the participating Powers had reaffirmed the obligations of mutual assistance which they had undertaken and the ministers attending the meeting had recalled that those obligations applied in the event of armed attack not only upon the metropolitan territory of any of the parties but also on any of their island territories. They had also confirmed their intention to move steadily forward with plans for the economic and social welfare of the territories and their progressive development towards the stage at which their inhabitants would have the opportunity to choose for themselves their future form of government and their future international relationships.

83. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Administering Authority should realize that by including the Trust Territory within the sphere of a military agreement it was linking its own security with that of the people of the Territory and involving those people in a dangerous game. The indigenous inhabitants of the Territory surely had no desire to be placed in such a dangerous position.

84. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the United Nations had always been aware of the obligation to defend the people of the Trust Territories and that their defence and protection was no less a part of the Administering Authority's responsibility than was the peaceful promotion of their economic, social and political advancement. The Administering Authority had already had occasion to protect those people and had done so at the cost of 15,000 Australian lives.

85. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the documents submitted to the Council and the reports of the Administering Authority he had unfortunately not found a single word about what the Administering Authority was doing to ensure the defence of the Trust Territory. Recalling that, at the 1210th meeting, during the discussion of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, he had drawn the Council's attention to the statement made in Australia on 3 June 1963 by Mr. Averell Harriman, United States Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs, he asked if that statement, which also related to New Guinea, had been made at the request of the Administering Authority.

86. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he was surprised at that question, which was based on a press report and which he could not answer, since he did not know what had been in Mr. Harriman's mind.

87. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had asked the question because the existence of ANZUS implied that the defence of the Territory was the responsibility, not of the State to which the trusteeship had been granted, but of a whole group of States, some of which had received no mandate from the United Nations in the matter.

88. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that article 7 of the Trusteeship Agreement gave the Administering Authority the right to take all measures which it considered desirable to provide for the defence of the Territory.

89. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not agree with the interpretation which the Administering Authority placed on the Agreement. The granting of any rights over the Trust Territory to other States, whatever ties they might have with Australia, went beyond the framework of the Agreement.

90. With regard to the question of economic conditions in the Territory, he would like to know the rate of interest on loans granted to the inhabitants for the economic development of the Territory.

91. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said he assumed that the Soviet representative's question referred to the rate of interest on Native loans, which was 4.5 per cent for loans payable within fifteen years and 5 per cent for those repayable within twenty-five years.

92. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what percentage of exports was produced on land belonging to the indigenous population. That

information would make it possible to estimate the extent to which the indigenous population participated in the Territory's economic life.

93. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) thought that the figure was about 30 per cent. In many cases, a plantation owner purchased the products from the indigenous people of the area, and they were then exported in the name of the plantation where they had been processed.

94. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the foreign companies registered in the Territory and listed on pages 57 to 59 of the annual report, asked on what terms those companies were allowed to operate in the Territory and what system of taxation applied to them. In replying, the representative of the Administering Authority might perhaps take one or two foreign companies, such as the Esso Standard Oil (Australia) Proprietary Limited, as examples.

95. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) explained that all foreign companies operating in the Territory must be registered and must pay a registration fee. Both the companies and their employees were subject to taxation under the Administering Authority's tax law. There were two rates, just as in Australia: a personal taxation rate and a company taxation rate. The law in question had been enacted by the Legislative Council of the Territory. It was difficult to give a reply with respect to a particular company, since that would require a great deal of research. However, all tax revenue went to the Territory of New Guinea. Although Esso Standard Oil was registered in New Guinea, it had never operated there.

96. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the tax revenue from companies in New Guinea went to the organs of the Administering Authority or to those of the indigenous population. He would be grateful if the special representative would take another company as an example to show how foreign companies operated in the Territory.

97. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that, except for trust funds, all revenue received by the Administration went into the Territory's exchequer. Revenue from taxes on companies and from fees for the last financial year had amounted to approximately £8 million. That money went towards the Territory's budget, and the Administering Authority added a very large grant-in-aid.

98. The Standard-Vacuum Proprietary Limited had large installations throughout the Territory; it supplied petrol to the public and operated in the same way as any branch of a large company in other parts of the world.

99. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he wished to point out a fact mentioned on page 45 of the annual report: all money derived from income taxes or other charges levied in the Territory was spent in the Territory itself, as provided in the Papua and New Guinea Act. Thus, the Territory's budget for the current financial year had amounted to some £25 million, of which approximately £7 million had come from Territory revenue, the rest being provided directly by the Australian grant-in-aid from taxes paid by the Australian taxpayer.

100. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to ask two questions concerning the social conditions of the indigenous popu-

lation. He would like to know, first of all, whether there was any racial discrimination in the Territory as far as wages were concerned.

101. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) replied that workers were paid according to their skills, and in most cases, the non-indigenous inhabitants were more skilled because they had had better training in Australia than the indigenous workers or those of mixed race. There was no discrimination on the basis of race. However, what were called Territorial allowances were paid as an inducement to workers coming in from outside.

102. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was the resulting difference between the wages of indigenous persons and those of workers from outside.

103. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said that, while he could not give exact figures, he believed that the difference amounted to £175 per year. The basic wage was the same for indigenous and non-indigenous persons doing the same work. There was no difference in the basic rates on the basis of race.

104. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) quoted from articles in the Melbourne Herald of 23 April 1962 and the magazine Pacific Islands Monthly of July 1962, noting a disparity between the wages paid to white and indigenous workers.

105. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that nothing in the figures quoted was at variance with what the special representative had said. An Australian working in the Territory received an expatriate allowance; there was nothing unusual about that.

106. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the figures he had quoted indicated a much greater difference than was to be expected merely from a Territorial allowance. The sizable difference in remuneration was nothing but a manifestation of racial discrimination.

107. His second question was whether segregation was practised against the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory.

108. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said he would like to explain that the figures quoted by the Soviet representative did not include the various benefits provided for indigenous workers.

109. With regard to the second question, he wished to assure the Soviet representative that there was at present no discrimination in public places. The regulations which had permitted discrimination had been rescinded about a year ago. Moreover, the Legislative Council of the Territory had recently passed an ordinance strictly prohibiting any form of racial discrimination and providing that establishments permitting such discrimination should be fined and lose their licences.

110. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with satisfaction the measures taken by the Administering Authority to eliminate racial discrimination. However, the actual situation must be rather different from what the Administering Authority would wish it to be.

111. He asked what role the representatives of the indigenous population had played at the conferences enumerated in sub-paragraphs (a), (c), (f), (g) and



(h) on page 1 of the supplementary report for 1961-1962.<sup>2/</sup>

112. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) said he did not think any indigenous inhabitant had attended the United Nations Coffee Conference, 1962 (sub-para. (a)). As for the Fourth Asian Malaria Conference (sub-para. (c)), it had been attended by Dr. Taureka, an indigenous inhabitant of Papua. With regard to the meetings of the FAO Cocoa Study Group held in Rome in November 1962 and in Trinidad in December 1962 (sub-paras. (f) and (g)), it was unlikely that any indigenous inhabitants had been present since no Guineans held degrees in agriculture. Nor did he know of any indigenous inhabitant who had attended the WHO meeting on communicable diseases held in Geneva in December 1962 (sub-para. (h)).

113. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) added that an Australian delegation had attended the Coffee Conference, and at that Conference the wishes and views of the coffee planters of Papua and New Guinea had been taken into account by the Administration. Furthermore, representatives of the indigenous population had taken part in the work of the South Pacific Study Group on Small-Scale Business Enterprises, which had met at Honiara.

114. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Territory thus had no experts on certain matters which were of vital importance to the Territory and which had been discussed at those conferences.

115. Turning to education, he said that in his opinion the indigenous population should have its own cadres, and he asked what had been the results of the work of the commission on tertiary education referred to in the annual report and in the supplementary report, and whether the Administering Authority intended to set up a university in New Guinea in the near future. It should be recalled in that connexion that the Indonesian representative had stated in the Fourth Committee (1428th meeting), at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, that steps had been taken to set up a university in West Irian within three months of the transfer of the Territory's administration to the United Nations.

116. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) recalled that he had stated that the commission on tertiary education had not yet finished its work or submitted its report.

117. He did not think that it was the Council's business to examine conditions in an Indonesian territory.

118. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that his question had not been fully answered. Furthermore, a comparison with the Indonesian part of the island of New Guinea might have been useful and have served as a stimulus to a better approach to the development of higher education in the Trust Territory.

119. He then asked how many inhabitants of New Guinea and Papua had benefited from the United Nations fellowship programme in the last ten years.

120. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) explained that so far no New Guinean had held a United Nations fellowship. At present all those who wished to have an education which could not be given to them in the Territory were able to attend institutions of higher learning in Australia. Not only did Australia welcome students from the Territory, but under the Colombo Plan it was providing free university and technical education to many students from Asian countries. At that very moment, more than eighty New Guinean students were studying at universities and other establishments in Australia.

121. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether those eighty students were taking courses of university standard and whether they would receive the same final degrees as other students.

122. Mr. NIALL (Special Representative) explained that not all of those students were attending recognized universities. Those who were doing so would receive their degree at the end of the course. Other students were attending teacher-training colleges, where they would obtain teachers' certificates. Still others were taking trade courses, at the end of which they would receive certificates of competency. So far only a small number of New Guineans had reached university entrance standard. Those who so wished had every facility for continuing their education at university level, and they were entitled to comprehensive scholarships from the Administration for that purpose.

123. The PRESIDENT felt that it would not be possible for the Secretariat to have the report of the Select Committee on Political Development, which had been referred to, reproduced and translated. He suggested that the members of the Council who wished to read the report should apply to the Secretariat, which would supply a copy of it.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

<sup>2/</sup> Distributed by the delegation of Australia to members of the Council only.