

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



GENERAL

T/PV 290
9 June 1950

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT
ENGLISH
MASTER

12 JUN 1950

Seventh Session

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Friday, 9 June 1950, at 2 p.m.

President: Mr. Max HENRIQUEZ-URENA (Dominican Republic)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.290 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA, YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 1949 (T/471)(discussion continued)

On the invitation of the President, Mr. S. A. Lonergan, Special Representative for New Guinea under Australian Administration, took his place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): In our discussion of the annual report on the trust territory of New Guinea, we are now concerned with questions relating to the social field. The representative of China has indicated that he wished to put questions relating to this subject.

Mr. LIU (China): In section 119, page 53 of the Report, it is stated that war damages amounting to £ 323,221 had been paid. I wonder how much of this was paid to indigenous inhabitants. This is in reference to a previous reply which the Special Representative gave yesterday to a question put by another representative. In that reply the Special Representative stated that most of the money was spent on articles which were not strictly required. In other words, a lot of money was wasted, and he did not say what had been done by the Administering Authority regarding the rehabilitation of the indigenous population.

Five years have now already elapsed since the cessation of hostilities, and it would seem that it would be extremely difficult for the indigenous inhabitants if they came back to the Territory to find no houses in which they could live.

Thus, I wonder what steps have been taken by the Administering Authority, or what steps the Administering Authority intends to take for the rehabilitation of the indigenous inhabitants.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The amounts of money recorded on page 53 in paragraph 119 were paid directly to the indigenous inhabitants. Actually, there has been a large increase in the payments made since that date. The amount now stands at more than £6,000,000, and there remains to be paid in the territory about £300,000. That war damage was in respect of the personal effects and possessions of the indigenous people. The payment was designed to replace these personal effects and possessions with similar or substituted goods.

In regard to the rehabilitation and re-settlement of the people, as I mentioned yesterday in this Council, that task has been completed. All the native people throughout the whole of the Territory are again housed, resettled in their former communities, and are living in a way comparable to -- perhaps better than -- the way they lived before the war. All housing in villages is thoroughly completed; sanitation measures are all instituted; provisions have been made by the Government of the Administering Authority for the supply of seeds from which to produce new foods; for vital assessments; and, in addition, distribution of pigs, goats and other cattle is continuing.

The natives are quite thoroughly rehabilitated. That work is finished.

Mr. LIU (China): In relation to the question of immigration, I find that section 41 of the Immigration Ordinance, 1932 to 1940, provides that "any person who fails to pass a dictation test, that is to say, who, when an officer or a person duly authorized by an officer dictates to him not less than 50 words in any language, fails to write them out in that language in the presence of the officer or authorized person" is a prohibited person.

The impression that that provision gives me, especially with regard to the expression "any language" is that immigrants entering into the Territory should be linguists because any one of them is expected to write out 50 words or more, which is dictated by an officer of the Trust Territory, in any language. I am not clear as ^{to} the meaning of the phrase "any language".

Will the Special Representative inform the Council as to how that provision is applied and, in actual practice, what language or languages are employed in such dictation tests?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The provision in the Immigration Ordinance that a person may be required to undergo a dictation test is, to my knowledge, very rarely applied. It was applied quite recently. There were two Australians who took a vessel which did not belong to them at a place called Cairns on the coast of Australia, and decided they would set out to see the Territory, which they did. They travelled along for some weeks at sea. Eventually, we had a report that they had put into a native area. We checked up on them and, after seeing the people, we were not very impressed. We did not feel that they were good people to come into a native country. They did not seem to be the desirable type.

We did not have any way of keeping them out so we applied the dictation test in French. They were not able to speak it, so we sent them back to Australia. That was the purpose of that test.

It does not mean that any person who applies for a permit to enter the Territory has to pass a dictation test. It is there as a provision which may be used to meet very unusual circumstances. To my knowledge it has not been applied in the Territory more than once or twice in 30 years.

Mr. LIU (China): What was the nationality of the persons who were given a test in French?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Both persons were Australians.

Mr. LIU (China): I do not understand the reason for dictating to Australians in French. Are Australians expected to know the French language?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): We did not desire those particular Australians to remain in the Territory. We did not consider that they were proper persons who could assist us in our intention to develop the native people. In other words, we regarded them as undesirable people. We did not want them, and we were able to use that means to send them back to Australia.

Mr. LIU (China): The Charter has a provision -- and the Trusteeship Agreement also contains the same provision -- that no distinction should be made in the treatment of the inhabitants of a territory as to race, language, religion or colour. Isn't it against the spirit of that provision to discriminate against persons who cannot write a certain language and to refuse them entry on that ground?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The people concerned were not inhabitants of the Territory. They were people who had come from Australia without authority. They desired to immigrate and did not comply with the laws. They did not apply for authority to enter the Territory. They did not have a permit or authority of any description. They broke the law. They committed an offence. We did not put them in jail for committing an offence; at least we did not bring them before the court.

We said to them: "We will subject you to a language test." They did not pass it, so we put them on a ship and sent them back to Australia. They were not inhabitants of the country; they belonged to a different country.

Mr. LIU (China): I know that they were not inhabitants of the country, but I say that in spirit it is against that provision, since no one can be discriminated against on grounds of race or language. Here it is a clear case of discrimination on the ground of language. However, I shall not push that question further except to indicate my delegation's views on that subject again.

In section 145 of the Report the following is stated:

"There are no specific guarantees of a general right of petition, for their right of petition is one which is well understood by all sections of the population."

In view of this statement, could the Special Representative state in how many cases the indigent inhabitants have made use of the right of petition, and in what circumstances?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The cases are very rare indeed of petition having been made by the indigenous people to the Territory. There have been cases where they have not agreed with some action that has been taken by the Government, and they have asked to be heard. They have been heard and the case has either been upheld in their favour or they have been informed of the reasons and circumstances for the decision that was taken. Nothing of a repressive or oppressive nature has been imposed upon the people. They have a perfect right and authority to write in to the Government. They can see the Administrator, the District Commissioners, and they can present any case they wish to present, with perfect freedom. They have always done this and they have always been given the greatest opportunity to do so. It is an accepted right that any person who wishes to say anything or put up any particular case can do so with complete freedom.

Mr. LIU (China): Section 164 of the Report states the following:

"Workers do not leave the Territory in search of employment."

Is there no movement of workers between the Trust Territory and the neighbouring Territory of Papua?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Very little indeed. There have been one or two cases where they have joined a vessel and gone to the neighbouring territory, or they may have gone by aircraft, but they do not go in search of work. There is plenty of work available for them in the Territory. In fact, we could employ in the Territory another 20,000 people. There is no need for them to go, but if they wish to go to the neighbouring territory, of course they can go.

Mr. LIU (China): Section 165 of the Report states:

"The minimum prescribed wage for men and women is the same, that is, 15/- per month plus accommodation, rations, etc."

Does the Administering Authority consider that this wage is sufficient? How does this wage compare with the cost of living in the Territory? What is the price, for instance, of a ticket to the cinema?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The amount of 15/- per month is the right that is paid to a worker, and that is to a probationer on his first employment. There has to be added to that the cost of his accommodation. The employer has to provide him with a house, with a bed, blankets and everything that is necessary to accommodate him, and he has to supply him with all his clothing. He has to supply him with all his food and he has to supply him with medical attention and pay for hospitalization, if that is necessary. The amount of 15/- is only a part of the remuneration which accrues to a person, a native who is employed. The approximate amount at present, that is, the minimum amount, not taking into consideration the accommodation and hospital treatment, but rather considering only rations, is in the vicinity of five pounds per month.

Mr. LIU (China): Section 211 states:

"There is no system of remuneration to a prisoner whilst he is undergoing a sentence of imprisonment."

I wonder if the same system also exists in Australia, if I may ask the question?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I regret very much that I am not aware of the position in Australia.

Mr. LIU (China): I should like to return to the questions dealing with political and economical advancement, inasmuch as we have received only today document T/L.83, containing written replies of the Administering Authority. I would like to ask the Special Representative to provide some further detailed replies to my question 29 of document T/L.83 and, if necessary, to wire for more details if he cannot furnish them at the moment.

The question has to do with the differences in revenue. There are very remarkable differences that can be seen in one of the tables. What accounts for these differences in the two years covered by the two Reports?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The difference in the figures of revenue for the two years, 1947-1948 and 1948-1949, are accounted for, as I did endeavour to present in my answer, by the increased trade and development in the Territory over the period. In 1947-1948 we ^{had not} proceeded very far along the path of resettlement after the war. For instance, taking one of the figures, in 1947-1948 the import duties were £335,000. In 1948-1949 they were £424,000. That was accounted for by the fact that more people had come into the Territory and had been resettled, and that we had imported machinery, motor transport, and all items necessary to maintain the community. All the food supplies come from Australia. We get import duty on those. That was the reason. For the year 1948-1949, it increased considerably, as can be seen. When the next report is presented, it will also be seen that there have been further increases. We are not back yet to pre-war trade figures by any means. The total revenue for the Territory -- and I am speaking only of internal receipts at the moment -- was £849,000.

Immediately prior to the war in 1942, the value of the internal receipts was something like three and a half million pounds, so we have a long way to go, and there will be an appreciable increase in every item in every succeeding year until we get to a peak. If there is any particular item on which the representative of China would like me to comment further, I could.

For instance, the sale^{price} of stamps in 1947-1948 was fourteen thousand pounds. In 1948-1949 it was seventeen thousand pounds. Next year it should be twenty-five thousand pounds, and so it continues.

Mr. LIU (China): With reference to my question 38, I am referred to the answer to question 37 which is not an answer to my question because I asked "... what is the participation of the indigenous population in this Production Control Board, if any? Answer 37 only says:

"The interests of the indigenous producers of copra are represented on the Production Control Board by two officers of the Administration". I wanted to know how far the indigenous inhabitants themselves participate in the Control Board.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The Production Control Board was an instrumentality which was set up during the war. All trade and commerce of the Territory had completely ended as a result of the invasion, and as we had returned to us part of the Territory, we had to re-establish trade and commerce. There were no private interests in the Territory. They had all been evacuated by the military authorities, and under the control of the military authorities there was set up an organization to develop and work the plantations in the Territory. They called it the Production Control Board, and that Board took members of the military forces onto the plantations and worked them, and the produce was thus secured for the prosecution of the war. At the end of the war the commercial interests took some time to re-establish themselves, and it was their wish that the Board should continue for the time being. It had an organization which was functioning. It had functioned for some years to market copra. Now the only function of the Board, as the name implies, is for production control. It was under the military regime of the Production Control Board, but in fact it is no longer a Production Control Board. It is an instrumentality which is continued on to cover a period until private enterprise was prepared to take over the work. The only thing it does is to receive at the place of shipment in the Territory the copra produced by any

person whatever, either indigenous or non-indigenous. It pays for that copra at the point of delivery. It then takes over the work of marketing the copra; it sells the copra, and if it did happen to sell on a market lower than the price it had paid the producer it would carry that loss. However, with the stabilization of the price of copra, no such loss has been incurred. The Board is purely a marketing authority. It is nothing else. There are no indigenous inhabitants on the Board, but the indigenous producers get exactly the same return for their product delivered to the Board's stores as a non-indigenous person gets.

Mr. LIU (China): Are the two officers of the administration who represent the interests of the indigenous producers elected or nominated?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): They are nominated by the administrator.

Mr. LIU (China): According to question 50, I do not think the answer given by the Special Representative is a complete one. I should say that it is a rather vague reply, stating that:

"There have been rare cases only where natives have neglected to plant food crops for their own sustenance".

I should like to know what the expression "rare cases" means? What would happen if the indigenous inhabitants would not comply with the instructions? Have all of them complied with these instructions?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The answer is that the native people are quite used to providing for themselves. That is what they did before we arrived, and they have not lost that art. The country provides almost everything they want. Many of the things are there growing, but there are certain crops and plants which will improve their nutrition, and they have been ^{fre} advised to plant these for their own provisions. The administration distributes/ the supply of seeds. Generally speaking, the whole of the people work their gardens and provide their sustenance without any requirements by the administration at all. It is, as I said, only in very rare cases where it may have been that a number of natives in excess of the real man-power may have left the village to go to work, and those who were loafing and not doing their job might have

been advised to get on with the work of planting their gardens. However, there is no compulsion exercised; it is purely advice.

Mr. LIU (China): The Special Representative stated ^{yesterday} that the Administrator, by a simple administrative act, is free to exile a man from a Territory without actual recourse to a court. He also said that this ruling needs review, and that that review is being undertaken. I hope that in the next annual report we shall have the report on the steps taken in this matter. I should like to ask the Special Representative whether the Administrator is empowered to exile a man only from ^{the} district or also from the Trust Territory to the Territory of Papua or to another Territory under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The provision to remove a native from a place applies only to another place in the Territory. There is no authority whatever for any native to be removed outside the Territory. As I said yesterday, this authority has not been exercised since the Territory has been under Trusteeship, nor is it intended to, and I shall ensure that advice to this effect is definitely included in the Report for the year which is about to end.

Mr. LIU (China): I see from the reply to question 53 in document T/L.83 that a local officer of the Administration is at present engaged in the review of all the legislation of the Territory with a view to determining whether there are any provisions which might involve discrimination contrary to the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement. When is it expected to have a full report on this review of the legislation?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I do hope that the Report is already available. It will be available within the next month or two if it is not yet available.

Mr. LIU (China): I see from the reply to question 65 that there exists discrimination between the Europeans and the indigenous inhabitants as far as free travel is concerned. I see that the indigenous inhabitant may not accept employment outside his own district unless he obtains special permission.

I would like to know some more details about this practice and to have some explanation as to why the administering authority considers that by introducing such a ruling the indigenous inhabitants are protected. Does this regulation apply also to Chinese workers?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I will answer the last part of that question first. My answer to the question yesterday was that a similar protection is not afforded to non-natives. Non-natives include the Chinese forces. They are not natives. It does not apply to the Chinese. The practice in the territories is that a native is engaged by an employer to go to a certain part of the territory to work. He is taken by the district labour officer, with the agreement to be reached. The employer then pays his transport to the place of employment, and there he is accommodated, fed, and looked after generally. This provision relates to the protection of the native himself. It is not the native who is to go away to a district for employment. It is the native who wanders from his own district, where he has his own home, to a strange district where he has no home, and he wanders around for employment. He gets away from his own people. The different districts are quite different. The people are in a way of a different type. Some of them are rather wild. If a native from a rather advanced or more advanced area gets into an area where the natives are pretty wild, something might happen to him to his detriment, so that we do desire to see where the man is going in order that we may exercise some care and control over him.

It is purely a matter of protection in the interests of the native persons. That is the intention of the law, and there is no other intention whatever. Also there is the question of his going into areas which are not as healthy as the one from which he came, areas where there is tuberculosis or a heavy incidence of malaria. But the thing is simply protection of the person. It is in his own interest. There is no discrimination or any other intention in the law.

Mr. LIU (China): The reply to question 73 says that prison reforms have provision in all prison for the most modern methods, etc. I would like to know what is being done in this respect, and when it is expected that the prison system will be changed.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Actually, some of the changes

have already taken place. This Report is in respect to the period ending 30 June 1949, and since that time a number of these things have been done. There is now in the main prisons instruction in agricultural methods and education. We have a prison where they are growing their own produce, vegetables for use in the prison, and we have provided separate accommodations already for juvenile offenders. We intend this review and this improvement to be continuous.

We provide the prisons or jails in the Territory with the very best facilities we can because we regard the jails not so much in respect to being places where indigenous people should be punished; they are placed where they should be developed, where they should be brought along the road of development. We do not consider during the period there in prison that they should in any way fall back in their development, and our intention is that everything we can do while a man may be in jail to help him along the road to progress shall be done. We do not regard these native people as being criminals or anything like that. They go to jail. When they come out, there is no stigma. They go about their task much the same, and we are trying to make the jail a place of corrective advancement and not a place of exile.

Mr. LIU (China): I have no further questions, and I thank the Special Representative for his reply.

Mr. QUESADA (Argentina): I just want to verify one point with the Special Representative. It is about a prison. He brought up the subject, and I am interested in knowing this. In Resolution 323, it states that corporal punishment should be formally abolished in New Guinea, and that there is the intention to remove these laws from the code. I would like to ask a question if, in accordance with implementing this resolution, that law had been removed from the code, even though it says in the Report that no sentence of corporal punishment has been imposed for a number of years; in particular, this is said in Section 213.

Mr. IONERGAN (Special Representative): The legislation has not yet been amended. It was recommended by the Administering Authority that the provision for corporal punishment be deleted from the laws, and it is now under consideration. It has not yet been done. But, as I have stated before, there have been no sentences of corporal punishment, and it is not the intention of the administration that any should be carried out at all. We are

definitely opposed to them.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): If you will allow me to return to the economic field, I should like to ask a question on something I have not understood. It is stated in paragraph 78 on page 33 that, according to the convention on 1 March 1949, the price of copra is £48 a ton. On the other hand, it is stated in paragraph 35 on page 25 that the price of copra was increased to £60 per ton. What is the correct figure? There seems to be a discrepancy between these two items of information.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I gave that in reply to a question yesterday. Actually, what happened is that in the beginning of 1949 the price of copra was £60 Australian. On 1 March 1948 it was £48 sterling.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): As regards the profits from gold mines, it is pointed out on page 92 what profits were made by certain companies, and I note here that the Bulolo gold mining company had a net profit of £524,300 in 1948 and £419,651 in 1948-1949. Could the Special Representative tell us on what production these figures are based, and what is the capital of this company?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The capital of the Bulolo Gold Dredging Company is, I understand, something in the vicinity of £10,000,000.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): Do you know what the production is? I am interested in that particular company.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): That is the main company carrying on dredging operations. The whole of its plant was destroyed in a scorched-earth policy by the military authorities, and the seven dredges which they had when the war started were all lost. I should say that it cost them in the vicinity of £5,000,000 to become re-established.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): They get no war damages for that?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): They have received some war damage.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): It would be better if we could have that information given in the next report. Obviously, a profit of 500,000 pounds in itself represents nothing. If it is said that a profit of 500,000 pounds has been made on a certain amount of production or if the capital could be given, which, of course, is the figure which speaks for itself, that would be very useful. Simply to state that a profit of 500,000 pounds has been made, without any figures of production or capital given, is not very useful information. It is insufficient.

I wish to return to question 142. I mentioned it during the consideration of the previous Report, and it is repeated again that missionaries cannot go into uncontrolled areas. I presume that certain missionaries would be prepared to go to these areas at their own risk. It may be asked whether missionaries with knowledge and experience of the country might not be a useful element in order to enter into contact with the populations, even if they are not yet under the direct influence of the Administration.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The entry of missionary societies into uncontrolled areas is provided for under an ordinance which states that a person cannot enter an uncontrolled area unless in possession of a permit to do so. It has been the practice of the administration, both before the war and since, to take the greatest advantage of the experience of certain missionaries, and they have gone into the areas with authority well ahead of our patrols.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I also put a written question concerning the death sentence. The reply was given to me that this penalty does exist, but has not been applied since the re-establishment of the civil administration in 1945. I should like to ask the Special Representative to be good enough to explain to me the statement which is made on the top of page 107 of the Report. In appendix III it is stated:

"One death pronounced. Twenty-five deaths recorded."

What does this mean?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The legislation of the Territory provides a penalty for each crime. For instance, wilful murder carries a sentence of death. When a native is arraigned for murder he appears before the Supreme Court on that charge and the judge has to deal with the charge before him.

If his decision is that the man is guilty of the charge preferred against him, he can do nothing but record a sentence of death. He sentences the man to death; he must do that. He may record a sentence of death in cases where the charge is less than wilful murder. He may award terms of imprisonment. The sentence of death, although prescribed by the law and passed by the judge on the person, cannot be implemented without the confirmation of the administrator. Since 1945, the administrator has never confirmed such a sentence; he has substituted a term of imprisonment.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): What is the difference between "pronounced" and "recorded"?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The sentence of death is in the case of wilful murder and it is pronounced. The recording of a sentence of death is used in a case of murder of a lower degree than wilful murder. In the latter case the judge does not say in the court "I sentence you to death", but a sentence of death is recorded against the prisoner. It is used as a differentiation in the degrees of murder.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): We should like to pursue this question further. In what practical way does the differentiation between one sentence and the other sentence work? Is there any difference in the meting out of the final punishment for one crime as against the other? Does one crime establish more grounds for commutation of the sentence of death as against the other; in other words, in the practical application of both sentences, what is the difference between the two?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The position is as the representative of the Philippines has mentioned. The sentence of death is given in cases of wilful murder where there is no doubt that the crime was premeditated, carefully planned and executed. The second sentence is used in cases where a murder did take place but which was not premeditated. In assessing the term of imprisonment which is awarded in lieu of either sentences, amongst other things, consideration is given to the type of murder. The more serious case probably would result in the sentence being commuted to ten years imprisonment, but other cases to seven years. In the commutation of these death sentences to terms of imprisonment,

consideration is always given to the area from which the native has come and the degree of administrative control in that area. If the native has come from an uncontrolled area, where he has not learned very much about things, he gets out of prison rather soon. The commuted prison sentences are subject to an annual review, and it is not strange in the case of a native from a more uncontrolled area who has been brought in for murder to see him taken back by the Government to his area some three years later.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): I should say that this is a very interesting adventure in penal science. We are not aware of the law governing murder in the country of the Administering Authority, much less in the Trust Territory, but in most of the countries within the Anglo-Saxon system of criminal law, premeditation is an indispensable element of murder. Once a verdict of murder is pronounced by the court, irrespective of the language in which such pronouncement is couched, it goes without further saying that the indispensable element of premeditation was established, otherwise there could not possibly be a verdict of murder.

In our own jurisdiction, as well as in others, if premeditation is not established, it falls short of murder. That is why there is a distinction between murder and homicide in some countries. But all of this, of course, could be said to be neither here nor there. What is of interest to us in this instance is the way in which the differentiation in the pronouncement of the sentence is reckoned with in the determination of the final fate of the convicted person. We understand from the discourse of the Special Representative that, in the latter case cited by him, there is more chance for commutation of the sentence.

We wonder if, in a future report, the Trusteeship Council could be apprised of the relevant legislation so as to be able to better appreciate the operation of this differentiation.

Now we wish to turn to another question, one which we submitted to the Administering Authority in writing and which, for some reason or other, has not been answered. The question reads:

"The Trusteeship Council, in examining the Report for 1946 and 1947 put forward several recommendations and considerations and expressed concern over the proposed administrative union between the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua. Does the Papua-New Guinea Act of 1949, in the view of the Administering Authority, give effect to all these considerations and recommendations and, if so, in what precise manner?"

Mr. STIRLING (Australia): I was going to raise this matter myself. It will, of course, be noted from the document that the question has not been answered. The failure to answer the question, I assure the Council, was quite accidental. It was caused by the short time available to the Special Representative to prepare the replies. The written questions were not actually available until Wednesday, and, although Mr. Lonergan worked right through Wednesday night until 9 o'clock Thursday morning, he was not able to achieve absolute perfection. I can assure the Council that a written reply to the question will be given by Monday next.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): I wish to thank the representative of Australia for that explanation. I shall await the reply and, meantime, we shall desist from further comments on the particular subject of administrative union.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): As there appear to be no further questions in the social field, we shall proceed to questions in the educational field.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I am interested in the whole question of teacher training. I think all of us realize that, in a Territory such as New Guinea, the whole educational programme really must rest upon the success of training an adequate number of indigenous teachers. I notice that the Report says, in section 226, which refers to the training school at Keravat, that there are at present 85 pupils at that institution, but that many of them are taking refresher courses. I would be very much interested if the Special Representative could tell us a bit more about that institution. How many pupils are there? How many pupils are there other than those taking refresher courses? What are the plans for the development of that school?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The school was established during the year 1948-49. Prior to that time there was not a school for the training of teachers in the Trust Territory. There was such a school before the War, but it was not until 1948-49 that we were able to re-establish it. In the meantime, the military established a school during the War. As we recovered some of our pre-war teachers from the enemy, we brought them back to Port Moresby and put them into schools there. We have now transferred those people to schools, and we have lost our trainees. The trainees have been absorbed in the schools which have opened. Those doing refresher courses are people who we might regard, to all intents and purposes, as new blood. They are people we had before the War. They had reached the higher stage of education. They lost everything in the way of continued education during the War, and we have recently been able, now that they have spent some of their war damage money and have resettled themselves, to get them to come back into the field. Other people doing refresher courses would be people drawn in from the schools for a

month or six weeks, but the majority are on a two year teacher training course. They have been through the educational system, and they go for specialized courses of two years at Keravat. It is situated in very pleasant surroundings, about twenty-eight miles from Rabaul. It is a pretty place, and they are very happy there. They will spend two years there. We now have thirty-four schools in operation and, from each, we hope to draw quite an appreciable number. This school can handle up to five or six hundred teacher trainees. We intend, as the schools produce more people each year, to establish teacher training institutions in the other districts. The aim is to eventually have up to a thousand teacher trainees coming on to fill vacancies and supply new schools.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): What is the enrollment now, a year after the publication of this Report, apart from the refresher cases?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Slightly over a hundred.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Are there any girl students?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I am afraid not at present.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Why is that? Is it because of religious difficulties?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): No, it is not that. It is something we have not yet got through to the native people. They are very careful of their girls; they do not let them out of their sight, and we find it very difficult to get them away from that idea. We are gradually overcoming it, and while we have no girls in the teacher-training school at present, we do have them teaching or assisting in schools where they can go home every night. In order to attend the training school which, as I said, is some 28 miles from Rabaul, they must be stationed among a lot of boys, and parents will not let us do that. Therefore, we have to do something in the metropolitan area where there can be daily attendance, but we have not got it worked out.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Plans are afoot to bring girls to the school?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Quite definitely. The education of women and girls is a very important feature, which is receiving particular attention at the moment. I might read an extract from a report made by the Administrator to the Administering Authority some time ago. It reads as follows:

"Arising out of proposals recently submitted by the respective Planning Committees, I have set up a special committee at this headquarters to initiate and consider proposals to further the education, social development and welfare of non-European women and girls of the Territory.

"It will be appreciated that any such proposals require, for their effective operation, the active and practical co-operation of the various Departments concerned; and in particular those of Health, Education and Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries. For this purpose, each of these Departments will nominate a suitable woman officer as a member of the Committee.

Miss B. McLachlan, of the Department of Education, will be chairman and Convenor of the Committee, and Miss L. Cunningham of the Department of Education, who, like Miss McLachlan, has had special training in Social Anthropology, will act as Secretary and Research Officer.

"The Committee will meet at regular intervals to consider and recommend measures for the advancement of the non-European girls and women of the Territory and to arrange for inter-departmental co-ordination in the carrying out of the projects approved. On the research side, the Committee will study the lives and interests of native women and girls from every possible angle.

"In due course, members of the Committee will visit all Districts to acquaint themselves with the needs of women and their present conditions, and to confer with and advise District Services' Staff and other branches of the Administration.

"It is hoped that, in due course, there will be posted to each District a woman representative of each of the three Departments concerned -- Health, Education and Agriculture, to form a District Committee representing the Central Committee. Though each individual officer will work within the framework of her own Department under the senior representative of that Department in the particular District as a local Committee, the group will work together to translate into action recommendations from the Central Committee as well as local projects designed to promote the interests of women and girls in the District.

"As an example of how the District Committee would co-operate in a practical way, while the establishment and maintenance of a District School for native girls is the direct responsibility of the Department of Education, the working out of the programme of the institution would be done through the

Committee working as a team, each member being required to take a practical part in carrying out that programme at the school when it was established. This latter would be done by the Woman Agriculture Officer and the representative of the Department of Public Health each visiting or being attached to the school to advise staff and instruct students in her respective field of work within the prescribed programme of the school.

"I would ask all officers of the Administration who may be concerned -- and District Officers in particular -- to do everything possible to assist the Central Committee in its work, and in due course to co-operate actively with the respective departments in furthering any projects which might be established on the advice of the Committee."

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): That interests me very much, and I hope that the next report will indicate what progress is being made along that line.

I notice that, according to the Report, there were three teachers at the teachers' training school at Keravat. How many are there now, a year later?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I am afraid there are not more than three. Unfortunately, the head teacher recently resigned on account of domestic trouble in Australia, and he has left us. We have replaced him, but we should have had four. We plan to extend the staff as quickly as possible. Accommodation for the European staff has been the difficulty, but we are overcoming that too.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): My delegation is very much interested in this whole matter of teacher-training, and we hope that such work will be pushed vigorously.

I am also interested in the matter of adult education, and I have noted particularly paragraph 234 on page 85 of the Report. That, again, is a subject which interests and concerns all of us who are dealing with Territories of this nature. Could Mr. Lonergan tell the Council a little more about the adult education situation -- education through the medium of motion pictures, radio and various other methods? Could Mr. Lonergan give us a little more information than is contained in paragraph 234?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Adult education is being pressed very vigorously. That has been the case since the end of 1949, and it is being done mainly in the areas where there are quite a number of people and where we have the facilities available for the purpose. It is meeting with great response. One of the places where particular attention is given is any location where a large number of native workers are accommodated. Action is taken there to arrange all sorts of interests, such as frequent visual education programmes, talks on various matters, such as agriculture, development, etc. There is a visual education team which goes through the Territory. It has a European officer in charge, but the operators are natives, and actually, sometimes they are sent away on their own to carry out this adult education programme. They travel by air, when the occasion arises, and go to any particular place where there is a chance of getting people interested.

Wireless broadcasting is a medium through which we do intend to reach everybody in the Territory in due course. At present we broadcast from a station in Port Moresby, which is available for both Territories. This aspect is going to be strengthened, and later there will probably be other broadcasting stations in the Territory. That will not be for a little while because the station being constructed in Port Moresby is costing over £300,000, and a similar amount will not be available too soon. However that project is for the purpose of giving a full service to the native people. A special studio is to be included in the station, and through this the Department of Education will send out lessons to the whole of the Territory. There will be talks in the language of each different tribe, and it will be a continuous effort.

A newspaper is shortly to be established. There were two in the Territory before the war, and now a new one is to be established -- the South Pacific Post. We have already seen the Directors of this newspaper company, and they are going to include in their paper three times a week a visual education supplement. As in Western Samoa, a number of copies of this are to be distributed through the different parts of the Territory in order to give the people some idea of development.

It is something which is occupying the attention of the authorities in the Territories very much indeed.

Getting back again to women's education, both adult and junior, our representative recently attended a conference of women and girls in India. This experience was very useful to her. She studied the plans along these lines in India. She now has to implement that in the Territory; they are all being incorporated into the general policy of mass education of adult people.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): Eighty-five teachers are listed in the roster of the administration school for indigenous inhabitants. This is shown in appendix XIII, page 158 of the Report. The administering authority states in the Report that the supply of teachers is not yet adequate to meet the current demand. What was done in the year under review to make this profession more attractive for both indigenous and non-indigenous teachers?

Mr. LONGERGAN (Special Representative): With regard to the non-indigenous teachers, there has been a considerable advance in salary which has been approved recently. This increase has been something like 20 per cent. It has produced more teachers and will produce more teachers. It has been quite a satisfactory improvement in salary rates, and it has been accepted by the non-indigenous teachers themselves as being quite satisfactory.

On 1 January 1950 the rates of indigenous were reviewed and there was an upward revision. These rates, of course, are all in addition to accommodations and rations. The following rates were approved: the minimum for grade 1 is £4 and it rises to £6/10. A teacher-instructor grade 2 has a minimum of £7 rising to £8/10; grade 3 £10 rising to £11/10; grade 4 £13 rising to £16. Then there are supervisory teachers: for the first year £17, second year £18, third year £20. Those figures are per month. Those are quite appreciable increases over the rates that did exist before.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): The Report 1948-49, page 81 states that, pending the introduction of appropriate legislation, the Director of Education maintains direct relations with the missions. When will this appropriate be introduced?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The legislation has already been drafted and approved, in consultation with the mission, and it is now waiting to be printed. It should be in force very shortly.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): Is a revision of the school curriculum contemplated in such legislation?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The legislation itself really does not provide for the curriculum that will be laid down. It provided that the missions will adhere to certain rules and regulations laid down under other ordinances. The curriculum is being revised at the present time.

I have undertaken -- and I am sorry it has not been done before -- to have the curriculum published in the next report in detail so that some knowledge of the matter can be obtained by the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): The inclusion of information on that matter would be most desirable in forthcoming reports.

Section 226 of the report fails to mention whether the curriculum of schools contains instructions on the United Nations and the special status of the Territory. Would the special representative give us information on whether anything is contemplated to implement the recommendation of the General Assembly in this respect?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): In all the indigenous schools of the Territory, and in other schools as well, particular care is paid to give lessons on the United Nations and its objects and functions. In all the schools throughout the Territory on the last United Nations Day which was celebrated, there were special features in all the schools of the Territory, including the flying of the flag of the United Nations and special celebrations in which all the children of the territory participated. That is a continuing part of the curriculum, through which is intended to bring to the children, full knowledge of the type of country in which they live and the authority which is ultimately responsible for that Territory.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): What portion of the revenue of the Territory is allotted to education?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): At the present time no particular part of the revenue is allotted ^{to} any special field. Our own internal revenue is far below that necessary to provide the services which we are giving at present. The type of revenue is only £ 830,000, whereas our total expenditure is in the vicinity of £ 3,000,000. Thus, this is what is done: each year each department puts in its estimate of the amount which it considers it could spend during that year, and there is nothing to reduce that amount except their inability to achieve their goal.

That will not be the ultimate idea

That will not be the ultimate idea once we get down to a basis of solid budgetary control where you must live within your revenue. There will be a limit. But, at present, there is no limit to the amount that will be made available to the Education Department except as ^{it} is imposed by the ability to get things. There is no particular percentage at present. Whatever is required is made available by the Administering Authority.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): Do we understand that there is some sort of a budget for the expenses of all the departments mentioned by the Special Representative?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): Yes. In preparing the type of budget that is made up by each department when it submits its requirements to the Treasurer, its plan for the year, its proposed expenditure, each department puts in an amount of money to cover each of those particular fields. That is then included as the total amount of all the departments and becomes a total budget for the Territory.

We are at the position now where we get a total requirement as to the sum the departments consider they can spend during the year. It is three million pounds. All the money that we can possibly secure from internal revenue is five hundred thousand pounds. The rest of that money is made up by the Commonwealth Government in the form of a grant, and the full amount of the budget is there for departments to spend if they are able to. There is no limit at present as to what the department can spend provided it is able to spend it. That is the only limit.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): May I ask a few questions? On page 83 of the Report, towards the bottom of the page, it is said that for European Schools "a school syllabus for the Territory is to be compiled." May I ask why it is not ready?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I am very sorry that it is not ready. There is a curriculum for the schools in the Territory but, as explained in that paragraph, it was a measure of expediency. We had to bring up teachers from the different part of the States of Australia where they had a different

syllabi; and we adopted whatever was the quickest in order to get on with the task.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, a full syllabus for all the schools is or has been drawn up. It should be completed by now, and it will be available in the next report. I am sorry it has not been made available before.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): On the same page, the following appears:

"Children in areas where there is no school established are provided with correspondence tuition from the various Australian States and New Zealand, the annual fees being paid by the Administration."

I am sorry but I do not understand the exact meaning of this sentence. What is meant by it? "Children in areas where there is no school established are provided with correspondence tuition" -- what is meant by the statement that the children "are provided with correspondence tuition" in the areas where there are no schools? Is it meant that you give them money to obtain an education by correspondence? It is possible that I am not familiar with the technical terms employed here.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): This occurs where a child is isolated from any school, and there are many up there in the hills and parts of the Territory. This is a system whereby we purchase a set of papers for a weekly school lesson from the Education Department in Australia and send it to the people. This set of lessons is supervised by the mother or father of the child. On the payment of a fee, which in this case they do not pay, the set of lessons is sent. Each day, the mother takes out the day's work, which is given to the child to do. Then, at the completion of the different lessons for the particular day, they are put back into an envelope and sent to the Central Correspondence School where a teacher checks them, comments on them and sends reports back. It is a continuous system of lessons going up to the child, being done, being returned to the school, and comments going back all the time. It is like being in school. The child sits in his home and does a lesson as though he were at school. That is provided by the Administration.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I was very much interested in the plan to fight illiteracy. The Report speaks of "Dr. Laubach, a well-known authority on mass literacy technique", having been asked to undertake a study of the matter during this year. Of course, the matter is still in its infancy. The Report, perhaps, is still in the hands of the Authorities. But is it possible to know something about his efforts? This is a very interesting field.

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): I do not have a copy of Dr. Laubach's method with me. To me, it is rather complicated, but to an educator, it is probably quite a simple matter. Earlier in this session of the Council, I did undertake to send along a full report of the Dr. Laubach method and of the progress that has been made to date. That will come along with the next report as an annex to it.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Are there any other questions? If not, the Council could then proceed to the general remarks.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): Most unfortunately, I was unable to be present yesterday. Perhaps I would now be impinging on a subject that has been disposed of. If so, I regret it. However, I am extremely interested in the statement made in the opening address of the Special Representative to the effect that the Administration of New Guinea has been fortunate enough to recruit thirty-eight fully qualified medical practitioners from amongst displaced persons. That is quite an astonishing feat, and the Australian Government and the Administration must be congratulated on it.

We have found such extreme difficulty in obtaining suitable medical officers for comparable posts that I would be extremely interested indeed to know how it was possible to obtain such a bulk supply. Could we, perhaps, be informed of the financial arrangements, the salaries, conditions and who is to finance the sum in question? In addition, what terms, etc., were provided for the employment? It would be most useful to us to know how such an extremely successful feat was accomplished.

Mr. LOMERGAN (Special Representative): I do admit that we were very fortunate to obtain these people. We were surprised at the results that were achieved.

It became known to our Director of Public Health that amongs the displaced persons who were in Australia and who were required to do such work as was necessary for two years -- not in their own field of endeavour -- there were a number of these people. He conceived the idea of going around to the camps where they were. He saw quite a lot of them and became impressed with the qualifications that they possessed. Then, he put an advertisement into every camp in Australia where these people were, setting out the conditions that were available in the Territory and offering them employment in the Territory at the ordinary rate which we have been paying, which is in the vicinity of eleven hundred pounds. It will be slightly more shortly due to the cost of living increase.

These people are thoroughly well qualified. Some of them are specialists in T.B. and different fields, and they are a good type of people. They are not very old and they are quite fit to go out into the territory and into all the rigours of it. Their fares are paid to the territory and, of course, back from the territory when they go on leave. They are appointed at present for a period of two years in each instance. That is more or less a common rule in bringing in new staff. You appoint them for two years. If at the end of two years they have a period of leave and they want to come back, then we say, "We will appoint you permanently". One stipulation we made with these people was that although they may be married, we could not let them bring their wives to the territory for twelve months or so. That is only on account of the lack of accommodation for women. Another reason was that we did want to be sure that we could shift these people around the territory to the places where we needed them, without the incumbrance of a wife, which may obstruct us from doing so. They were brought to the territory and given a local course of three weeks, during which every department addressed them at a school on the different functions of each department, so as to orient them to the territory completely; and now they have gone out. It has proved very successful.

Actually, we received a great number of applications more than the people we actually appointed. I should say that there is a field there which is open to anybody who wishes to explore it. I should say that the number of applications we received exceeded one hundred, and we have only taken thirty-eight of them.

Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): I am most grateful to the Special Representative, and I am very much impressed by the accomplishments. I think we can expect to see the results reflected in the vital statistics and in the happiness and prosperity of the territory. I propose to take advantage of those concluding remarks and ask Mr. Grattan, when he gets back, to immediately inquire as to the prospects of getting some of this quite astonishing surplus. To me it is incomprehensible that it should be possible to meet a difficulty which we have found almost insuperable, and I do not think that we offer any less -- I am speaking without the book now -- but I think that is the sort of remuneration we have offered, without any particular success. It might be that there are better openings in New Zealand for medical men than there are in Australia, but I had better not follow that line.

I wish to ask one further question. I note with interest and, subject to further consideration, some disappointment -- no, perhaps disappointment is the wrong word -- some lack of understanding, the statement by the Special Representative that it is intended to establish at Port Moresby a Central Medical School, along the lines of the Central Medical School at Suva, at which it is the intention to train native medical practitioners in the territory. I should have thought that the advantages of association in such matters as the training of native and medical practitioners for comparable areas was so obvious that it would be not only financially wasteful but inefficient to establish more than one school, if one school can meet the need, and I would be glad to be informed -- bearing no criticism at all -- why this perfectly admirable school at Suva--which has turned out medical practitioners and is beyond adequate praise-- is not regarded as adequate for New Guinea?

Mr. LONERGAN (Special Representative): The school at Suva is regarded by the administration of the territory as being quite admirable, but the point is that our people have not yet reached the standard of education that is required by the Suva people, and the people we have over there were well educated in the standard of which we are talking. When they arrived at Suva they had to do a further twelve months at school before they were allowed into the medical school. That is quite understandable. What we thought was a good standard of education was proven to be quite wrong when compared with the standard that does actually exist among the Fiji people. Therefore, that has been the determining factor in setting up in the area a school for Assistant Medical Practitioners. We do not propose to develop it so far, at the moment, as to full practitioners. We want a man who is something in-between and who can do quite a lot of things that medical practitioners can do, and thus give us the results we are after. We do think that within the next twelve months we will have a number of people to go into the commencement of that course. The proposal to set up a medical school in the area does not detract from any proposal which the South Pacific Commission may have for a university in the Pacific area or any institution such as that. This is purely to try and overcome a difficulty which exists at the moment. It is not a project which will remain forever. It is a temporary expedient to get done quickly something which we want to have done in the area.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): The Report laid before us by the Australian Government on the administration of New Guinea is indeed vast and bulky, but leaves much to be desired, both in the report itself as well as, I am afraid, the administration in the Trust Territory. I believe it is fair to say at the outset that it is very difficult to judge here on motives and intentions, especially of governments, inasmuch as such intentions and motives are not translated into actions. This Council has no way of judging the motives of a government, except by its actions, and the results of its administration. And therefore, in this respect the Council will be unable to judge on the motives and the administration for the government under discussion except by the yardstick of its own actions.

There is another point which I ought to make at the outset. If I find that the administration of New Guinea leaves much to be desired it is not for any lack of understanding or realization of the difficulties facing that administration. I believe that my past handling of the report of New Guinea should vindicate the attitude of sincere, detached, and reasonable criticism that I have always taken. I believe last year, when the Council was discussing the question, I said that the difficulties facing the administration should be taken into consideration. I said that the territory is truly backward, that the administration was confronted with a situation that was the result partly of a great war, and that reconstruction demands hard work and time. To judge by the attitude of the Council I believe we had been so far generous with the Australian administration and indeed most understanding.

But when all is said and done it is difficult to hide the feeling that the situation as it exists now is very disappointing. Progress in general is extremely slow, indeed slower than it ought to be. One would have expected that even with the destruction of the last war, in fact, because of it, administration should have been most speedy and helpful to a simple population that had sustained so much suffering during the war through no special fault of their own. Although the report does not say in clear words, commercial exploitation is facilitated to the utmost and is taking precedence over all other considerations.

To begin with the political field, as I had to say at the beginning of my questioning, I believe that it was the New Guinea report in 1948 which gave rise to the now complicated problem of what is called the "administrative union".

I have no hesitation in saying that I would be the first man to rejoice in seeing that problem settled justly to the satisfaction of all, since as long as it exists it will continue to be a thorn in the side of this Council. But short of such a settlement, the Council is bound to discharge its duty in exploring its highways and byways.

In New Guinea, we can find no change for the year under review and in the working of the Union between Papua and the Trust Territory. We have in the past thought that the Union was a more than administrative, and there is nothing in the Report that could justify a change in this attitude or this opinion. In wisdom and fairness, I would rather wait upon the result of the investigation ^{being} undertaken now by two important bodies of this Council on that question. The Visiting Mission is still out in the Pacific and is expected to visit New Guinea. Its findings will be awaited with great interest. Equally well, there is a Committee of this Council working on the same question and its findings, too, will be awaited with the utmost interest. Until the results of these two investigations are at hand, it would perhaps be premature to pass judgment. But so much can be said at the present time. There is so far no change in the Union we had in the past thought to be more than administrative, and such a Union should be of the utmost concern to the Council.

There is no suffrage law in the Trust Territories or electoral system of any kind, except perhaps on very rare occasions when a tribe may have to elect a chief. Admittedly the population is backward and is not quite ready for an electoral system on the modern pattern, but what is disappointing is that in this respect there is no serious beginning being undertaken to train the people in some sort of an electoral system. Surely, the Administration should not expect that the Territory will wake up one fine day in the future and undertake a large-scale election for a House of Representatives. What they should expect, however are relatively small results from a patient and steady progress for which a beginning of some sort of electoral system is inevitable. The Special Representative said that there was a law contemplated, but he could not say whether the elected would be native, or when this law will come into force. I hope that the Australians make no mistake about one important point in this respect; when we speak of elections or electoral systems, we do not mean to put a few Australians from the gold-mining companies or petroleum companies into the Legislative Council. What we mean exactly is the natives themselves, the owners of the country, who

ought to be trained and given the opportunity ultimately to govern themselves. I am not casting any reflection on the Australians sitting in the New Guinea Legislative Assembly, but the fact remains that they are not natives of the Trust Territory, and what we are concerned with here is the training of the natives of the Trust Territory. It is the people of New Guinea who, in the long run, will have to represent their country and govern them and the people.

There is much stress laid -- perhaps too much stress -- on the traditional tribal system. I had occasion to pose what I thought to be a very important question to the Special Representative. I had noticed that in Africa there are two conceptions of rule and progress. One laid stress on the tribal system and its rule, and the other on modern progress. While it is odious to compare and while every Territory must be judged on its own merits, one cannot help have the feeling that to lay too much emphasis on the traditional tribal system has resulted in retarding the role of modern development in the Territory. This is the case in New Guinea. Of course, it is easier for the Administration to govern through this system because modern institutions require work and patience, but the reward is immense, once obtained. Once obtained, it would bring everlasting credit to the Administering Authority. We believe that the Administering Authority should do its utmost to modernize the tribal system and make the tribes and chiefs accept, as much as possible, modern institutions, as indeed the new generation will do -- if there is one. Without this the Territory would remain forever as backward as the Australians found it. The Special Representative said that the Administration does not interfere with the election of chiefs, rare as this may be, but it will make little difference in the present state of things whether they do or not, from the point of view of general progress. If the system is still rigidly antiquated and if there are no modern progressive elements in the population, then one tribal chief is as good as another, and the Territory would gain nothing by a choice between two backward, ignorant and antiquated men. The important thing in this respect is the intention of infusing modern progress and modern elements of the population into the tribes and getting the chiefs to accept them, and incidentally accept the modern institutions entailed by such a practice.

We have repeatedly encountered obstacles arising from the lack of a registry in the Territory. I understand that it is not easy to undertake such a registry in the Territory, but in the examination of the Report it seems that

it has given rise to difficulties. Whether such difficulties are real in the field, I do not know. But I was surprised to learn that the Administration takes the word of the native when they give them identity cards/in/matters of residence and birth, such as place, date and other information. I wonder if the natives themselves know all this information and do not perhaps fabricate it on the spot, to say nothing of the fact that no passports are issued to those natives who leave New Guinea. I think it is appalling that no one single native has so far ventured outside of Australia, that is to say, really gone abroad for one reason or another, be it commerce, study or pleasure.-- not one single native. It is an indication. Naturally, the general backwardness of the Territory has not yet produced even a thin stratum of the population who would go abroad. That itself is a way of reading into the Report an aspect of the Administration and the degree of progress prevailing in the Trust Territory. The basic economy of the Territory is the production of raw material. There are no local industries at all, and this is a great pity. There are many resources that could be utilized to raise the population from its primitive state to a usefully productive people. We agree with the Special Representative that sugar, pulp and timber and other products could be produced in the Territory as an industry, yet that has never been done so far. If such industries were in existence, they would be purely raw material, money-drawing industries. But the institution of local industry would bring immense benefits both to the Administering Authorities and to the people themselves, both economically and socially, and it would have gone far towards putting the population, socially at least, on a level that would enable it to absorb modern progress to a degree.

So far, the Administration has not yet established a registry, so to speak, of the capital investment in the Territory after it had been destroyed in the last War. Considering that five years have elapsed since the end of that War, and considering the rapidity with which the exploitation companies have been swift to resume their activities, lack of such information is surprising. To say the least, it is hampering the Council in evaluating adequately the overall economic picture.

The gold-mining companies pay 5% to the budget of the territory. This amount is merged with the budget and is not set aside for any capital enterprises. Whatever arguments there are to the contrary, we believe that 5% is too small an amount to be paid in royalties and it certainly does not seem to go far in improving conditions in the territory. Considering the backwardness of these conditions, the percentage ought to be more. We were told that the company builds houses for its workers. I hope the Administration will produce more details next year on such enterprises and how they are worked. The Administration ought to encourage natives to live in modern houses, if they are available, with their families. This is the only way to train them, or make a beginning in training them, in hygiene and living conditions in general. The Special Representative said that the houses were built for as many as 800 workers by the gold mining company in the year under review. I hope there was no mistake in that, for it is encouraging to know that in one year 800 workers could be housed in modern tenements.

Speaking of the social side, there is still no survey of the cost of living. The Administration has had ample time after the war to find its feet, establish its departments, and undertake the necessary surveys. Without the cost-of-living survey the Council is hampered in its evaluation of the income groups, the economic cost of daily living, and the relation between salaries and prices, or the possible development of the progress in the standard of living. None of these things can be properly estimated without a survey of the cost of living. I have no doubt it is very low. Correspondingly, I have no doubt that the standard of living is extremely low, but it would be unfair to the Administering Authority to pronounce judgment without having the benefit of the proper survey in the hands of the Council. We urge them, therefore, to include in next year's report such a survey.

The representative is loud in stating that no restrictions exist on the liberty of speech, conscience and religion. I have no reason to doubt the word of the Administering Authority in this respect, and I take it as the truth. There is one point which ought to be emphasized in this connexion. These liberties have no meaning unless they exist in^a somewhat advanced society or at least a progressively developed one. What is the use of freedom of speech if the backward people have no opportunity or the qualifications for using such a freedom? If a man has the blessing of the freedom of writing a letter to

differ with the policy of his Government, this blessing would be a real one if first he could be in an advanced state to think about the matter, and secondly if he had the qualifications to write the letter. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not expect that the native people of New Guinea should suddenly be able to make use of these freedoms on a high level, but the proclamation of these freedoms would have no meaning unless the people are fairly set on a progressive way of at least making a beginning towards exercising those liberties. That this liberty exists in the Territory is a commendable thing, and I would be the first one to congratulate the Administering Authority for their institution. But a proper use of such liberties can only come through relative advancement of the population, no matter to what a small degree it is.

There are a few hospitals. We are told that an advanced programme is under consideration. One could only hope that such a programme can be put into use as rapidly as possible, as the present state of health is very far from adequate. The Territory has been ravaged by war, and partly, from the application of the trusteeship agreement, there ^{was} a moral obligation also on the part of the Administering Authority ^{to have} helped these people since the devastation of war. Diseases are still rampant, and more hospitals are needed. It is good to learn that there are clinics in various parts of the Territory. But I would suggest the use of mobile clinics also. I discovered that in West Africa this operation is very helpful. Although I agree that the ruggedness of the terrain and the lack of communications in New Guinea would hamper perhaps such an operation, nevertheless I believe it would be highly desirable if mobile clinics could find their way to penetrate into far away villages and to help the population there. There, again, the shortage of building materials has been claimed many times as an obstacle to development. But now, the validity of such a claim is becoming less and less. Two or three years after the war it was possible to make houses-- but not five years in a small population! This shortage of material is hampering house building; living conditions deteriorate; no new houses are being built in adequate numbers. And the responsibility upon the Administering Authority to find ways and means to eliminate this shortage as much as possible is quite evident.

There is as yet no school syllabus for the Territory for the Europeans. This is an unnecessary lack which ought to have been remedied easily. We are told that there are no girls going to school. This is very odd indeed. What do the girls do? Whether our plans are envisaged or not, such a phenomenon is certainly astounding. When are those plans coming into life? They are no doubt being formed. But when are they going to be formed?

The Administering Authority should take immediate steps to rectify this deficiency. How can we expect a society to develop if half of it is educationally neglected? There is still not one secondary school in the Territory. There may be more to do in the field of primary education. I readily agree. But it is inconceivable that in the Trust Territory itself -- a large Territory which admittedly contains a small population but is big enough to justify a secondary school -- there is as yet not such a school, as far as I could make out from the Report. I strongly hope this gap will be filled as soon as possible. We cannot in fact judge properly the educational situation, since the Administering Authority itself says on page 84 of the Report as follows:

"At the present time it is not practicable to supply a sketch map showing the distribution in relation to population density of the various types of schools, and the number of pupils in attendance in each area."

Why not? Why should not such a map be produced? It is already five years after the war, and at least in education some progress ought to be made. Leave the political aspect aside. Here is a trust of a backward people, innocent people. They are put in the hands of another power socially, educationally, and economically. We expect some advancement. Who is going to speak for them?

There has been a great neglect by the Administration. It is no use harping on the devastation of the war; it is no use saying that some years have to be taken to remedy this deficiency or rectify this error. Five years is quite enough, and something ought to be done for the population, apart from the exploitation companies and the gold-mining and petroleum companies. When is that going to be done? I hope I may be excused for my remarks made in this way, but I have not been able to use more than half the typewritten speech that I had prepared, since I was trying to economise in the time of the Council by speaking immediately after the questioning.

In conclusion, I would strongly suggest to the Administering Authority first, that they seriously help the people in their charge and, secondly, that they help the Council to evaluate the people in their charge.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): It would be unfair to make remarks on the Report which has been submitted to us by the Government of Australia without recognizing, to start with, that among all the Trust Territories it is the Territory of New Guinea which presents the most backward populations and the most difficult conditions. I think that the representative of Iraq, in the observations which he has just made and which in themselves are founded, did not sufficiently take into account the difficulties which are met with when a population avoids the action of the European authorities, which is the case with many of the populations of New Guinea. We must realize that some of the natives of New Guinea are not yet submitted to European influence, because the natives try to avoid this influence. The Government of Australia does not wish to submit them by force and begin its occupation of this Territory by any kind of native war. We must realize that situations such as this do exist in other parts of the world, and that there are other populations who try to avoid any contact with Europeans and that it is very difficult to make the Administering Authority responsible for everything that happens in a country where the natives are making efforts to avoid the influence of that Administering Authority.

Having said this in a general manner, I think that the Australian Government deserves thanks for the contribution of a financial nature, a very considerable one, which has been made to the budget of the Territory. We must

recognize that the resources of New Guinea at the present time are extremely limited and that the results achieved by the Administration would not be so considerable if the Australian Government did not contribute to a very large degree to the expenditure of the Territory. The contribution of the Australian Government represents a total of two-thirds of the budget, the local receipts being £800,000 and the contribution of the Australian Government more than £1,500,000.

In general, I think that the Council would wish to receive more complete statistics concerning certain fields. For my part, among other things I asked that we be given information as to the extent of European plantations which produce for export, the extent, that is, of each category of production -- cocoa, coconuts, coffee and so on. I asked also for more complete information on the extent of the road network and, finally, I said that I believed it would be useful for the Council to receive more extensive information on the profits of the gold mines, so that these profits could be compared with the production and the capital of the mining companies.

In my specific remarks, I should like to point out that in the political field there are difficulties resulting from the ^{absence of} official recognition of native jurisdictions. It is stated in the Report that native jurisdictions of a traditional character, which are not officially recognized, settle a certain number of conflicts between natives. Due to the fact that these native jurisdictions are not recognized, the result is that, after having submitted a dispute to a native decision, if one of the parties concerned is not satisfied with the solution given by the native jurisdiction, it is possible for him to present it to European jurisdiction. Thus a man who has been punished by the native jurisdiction may be punished once again for the same crime by the European jurisdiction, since the European jurisdiction is ~~not~~ compelled to ignore what has been done by the unofficial native jurisdiction. I think it would be advisable for legislation to be enacted which would recognize native jurisdiction and, at the same time, would submit it to effective control by the Administration.

In the social field, I think that the Council will notice with satisfaction the fact that between the two budgetary years expenditure for health has been doubled from £227,000 to £467,000. The Council also will

congratulate the Australian Government for the steps it has taken to accelerate the recruiting of medical personnel, especially from among displaced persons in Europe.

In the educational field, my delegation has been especially satisfied to read, in paragraph 221 of the Report, the principles by which the Government of New Guinea understands collaboration with missions. I think that we could not express it better and that it is a formula which might be adopted as an assertion. It is a very happy affirmation of the fact that:

"The general principle is not to duplicate Administration and Mission projects in the one area, providing the Missions are able and willing, in due course, to conduct schools in their areas on lines described by the Administration and to fit them into the general education plan."

That is a very good condition. The Government wishes to use the goodwill of missions and to assist these missions by subsidies but, on the other hand, it wishes to control their activity very closely in the field of education and to ensure that the schools which are subsidized by the Administration conform exactly to the programme of the Administration and are inspected by the personnel of the Administration. That is a formula which in a primitive and not rich country enables one to use the money available in the best interests of the population.

My delegation was interested to see the start which has been made in the provision of facilities for the training of native staff and personnel for public education at the education centre at Keravat. That is a meritorious effort, but it is only a beginning. It is quite certain that the present expenditure of £84,000 for public education is insufficient in relation to the expenditure as a whole in the Territory.

Those are the specific remarks I wished to make. I wish to thank the Special Representative, who has been submitted to a system of real hard labour since he had to spend the whole night seeking replies for our questions. I thank him for having done this with such goodwill and such obvious frankness and with such great courtesy.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France)(Interpretation from French): First, I wish to deplore the fact that there is such a discrepancy between the programme of work of the Council and that of its visiting missions. It is very regrettable that the Visiting Mission should be in New Guinea at precisely the time when we are studying the Report on that Territory. I hope the Committee which was decided upon the other day, which will study the methods of work of the Council, will help us to arrive at a more consistent time-table, so that the Council may know exactly what it is talking about and may have information of both the most precise and most varied character when taking decisions on situations in specific territories.

As it is, I do not know whether the conclusions of the Visiting Mission will be consistent with those which I have been led to draw during this discussion. I hope this will be the case as my conclusions are much less pessimistic and severe than those of the representative of Iraq. I was even under the impression, throughout the lengthy questions put to the Special Representative, that the Council generally had a somewhat divergent opinion from the one it had noted in the ~~two~~ previous years. In 1948, we noted comparative severity in view of the report we had to consider on New Guinea. But gradually, it seemed to me, we have had to face certain realities and today, if things are not quite perfect -- as, of course, is the case -- in the Australian Administration of New Guinea, nevertheless we should take into account all the elements of the case, both the difficulties and what has been accomplished.

I think it is necessary to make a general remark on one point. It has been said that nothing has intervened in regard to the system of administrative/union between Papua and New Guinea. The Committee on Administrative Unions had occasion to study this point this morning. So far we have studied a draft of a law on administrative union between New Guinea and Papua. At present, we are faced with the actual law voted by the Australian Parliament which will regulate the matter for a certain length of time. We have been able to notice, during our study this morning that there were certain differences and one of them was rather substantial. This leads me to advise, if I may, that, in the recommendations which are going to be addressed to the Administering Authority, representatives should not deal with the administrative union between the two territories. I think we would be better advised to leave this chapter entirely aside for the time and wait until the Committee on

Administrative Unions had concluded its work. At that time, it will be possible to bring forward appropriate conclusions or recommendations for the General Assembly which will take into account all the facts. For the present, I do not consider that the question has been fully studied, and I do not think we should take any decision in one direction or another.

I shall make only one further remark, which, it seems to me, is an important one after what I have already said. In his preliminary statement, the special representative informed us of a certain number of plans, some of which will be implemented shortly, concerning the industrial equipment of the country and industrial transformation. To one of the questions I asked, the special representative replied that that was in fact the policy of the Australian Government, a policy which intends to develop the industry of the country so that the country may, as far as possible, be self-supporting. I note this statement with great satisfaction. I think it is important indeed for the Australian Administration not to waste time in this matter. We may, and we must, consider the fact that the territory is to a certain extent a backward one. That is true, but, in my opinion, it has absolutely to do with the economic and industrial means which it is appropriate to give the territory. There are other examples, it is needless to mention names, but we might quote other territories in the world, where, some 20 years ago, it was agreed that the psychological and moral conditions of the populations were backward. Now we note that it is regrettable that a proper programme of equipment and industrialization was not undertaken some time ago. I repeat that these two facts do not necessarily have any relation to each other. We may notice, at a given moment, that a certain delay has occurred when there was no need for it. The fact that there are uncontrolled areas does not mean that we should not set up a transformation of industry or a basic industry.

In view of the fact that the special representative has assured us that that is the effective policy of the Australian government and that, moreover, certain steps have already been taken and others are contemplated, I feel it was appropriate to simply stress this point in order to emphasize its importance. This is not, however, a criticism; it is simply a warning and a remark.

I do not wish to enter into a number of details; I think that most of the remarks I wished to make have already been made. Therefore, I simply wish to thank the special representative for his great patience and for the very useful clarifications he has given to the Council.

Mr. AQUINO (Philippines): With a view to giving the written replies of the special representative the consideration that they merit, as they constitute the bulk of the enquiry we wished to make, we wish to reserve our right to make our comments at the next meeting of the Council, be it Monday or Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Note will be taken of the request of the representative of the Philippines.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m and resumed at 5.00 p.m.

PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR NEXT WEEK

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall now resume our exchange of views on our working programme for next week, which we started yesterday. We had considered the suggestion of convening the meeting of the Drafting Committee for Western Samoa on Monday. It will meet at 10.30 a.m. in room 3. But as we had thought that we would start with Jerusalem on Monday morning at the same time, the suggestion was as follows: we still have two more days in which to discuss New Guinea in the schedule that was prepared; namely, Monday and Tuesday. There is another problem which we shall have to consider after Tuesday. The discussion of Nauru is scheduled for Wednesday, 14 June. However, we have just heard that the Special Representative will not be able to be here at that time because he has become ill. We shall have to find a substitute and this, of course, will take time.

Therefore, as a matter of fact, we have several afternoons free next week. But we only need Monday afternoon to simplify the distribution of our work. We also have the last part of the general remarks for New Guinea. That will depend on the distribution of the written replies. We might take that up again on Tuesday, and finish with New Guinea. The meeting on Jerusalem might be held on Monday afternoon. There will be four hours of work, starting at 2 o'clock. This is a suggestion I wish to put forth to the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France) (Interpretation from French): I quite agree with your suggestion, Mr. President, but I would like to point out one thing. This morning, in the Committee on Administrative Unions, we decided to convene on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday mornings of next week. Several members of the Committee on Administrative Unions belong to delegations which are not numerous enough to allow of their presence both in a possible meeting of the Council and in a meeting of the Committee on Administrative Unions. This Committee has requested me to inform the Trusteeship Council of the situation in order that we may decide, in principle, that there will not be any meeting of the Council on the day when the Committee on Administrative Unions convenes. I wish to repeat that this would apply to Tuesday, Thursday and Friday of next week.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall take note of this information when we distribute our work for next week. For the time being, what we must decide is what we are to do on Monday. Naturally, if the consideration of the question of Jerusalem is prolonged, the Council will have to return to the idea of having morning meetings. However, we shall try to arrange this without interfering with the work of the Committee on Administrative Unions.

If there is no objection, the Council could agree that the question of Jerusalem will be on its agenda on Monday afternoon, and we will leave for Tuesday afternoon the final discussion and conclusions with respect to New Guinea.

There is another point on which I should like to consult the Council.

Mr. STIRLING (Australia): I should like to express the great regret of my delegation at disarranging the schedule of the Trusteeship Council, owing to the event to which the President has just referred, the illness of the Special Representative for Nauru. My Government had intended that the Special Representative for Nauru should be the Administrator of the Island, but I have had a telegram, as the President knows, advising as to his ill health. It is hoped that the Administrator himself will be well enough to come a little later. If he cannot, arrangements are being made for somebody else, a senior official, to come over. But it will take a little time and, therefore, I would ask the Trusteeship Council to be good enough to consider the setting aside of equivalent days -- two days -- if possible, to about the end of the first week in July.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall have to change our schedule in accordance with what the representative of Australia has just said. We shall have to redistribute our work.

Mr. STIRLING (Australia): It would be a great help to my Government if we could have, as soon as possible, an indication of the days that would be suitable to the Council for the hearing of the Report on Nauru.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I shall take note of what the representative of Australia has just said and we shall consider, together with the Secretariat, the way in which we can re-arrange our work. That would be in accordance with the notes which the Secretary has just taken on this matter. We shall be able to give this information in a day or two at most.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): In view of this development, I am wondering whether it would be possible to advance the consideration of the Pacific Islands, which is on our schedule following the Nauru examination. I should like to offer to do that at once, but we are facing the very practical difficulties that Admiral Fiske, who is to be here with respect to the Pacific Islands examination, is at present, I understand, on the seas, and whether his arrival can be advanced or not seems doubtful. I rushed out to the telephone during the recess and contacted Washington, D.C., and if it is possible to advance that date it will be done. However, the word I received from Washington, D.C. is that inasmuch as he is on the high seas now, they think that it looks doubtful. I have asked them to let me know at the very earliest moment, and I shall pass the word on to you, Mr. President, as soon as I hear about it. But they tell me that it is a bit doubtful whether they can get him here in time.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I should like to thank the representative of the United States for his desire to help us fill the gap in our distribution of work. I hope that we may perhaps put forward by one or two days the question of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. FLETCHER-COCKE (United Kingdom): As the Council will be aware, we have fixed 3 July for the consideration of the Ewe question and for the consideration of the Ewe petitions. And, presumably, we shall be considering at the same time, the petitions in respect of which a number of other petitioners have asked to make oral presentations to the Trusteeship Council. I do not think it would be possible at this stage to say quite how long that would take. However, if we were to leave, possibly the week from 3 July until the following Friday, and make a fixed date of 10 July for the advent of the Special Representative for Nauru, perhaps we could take it that if we had not disposed of the Ewe and all identical problems by that week, that possibly we could, for that subsequent week beginning on the 10th, have two meetings a day, which would mean that we would go on with the Ewe problem for so long as it was necessary in order to finish it without interruption. But, on the other hand, we would not delay or put out the Special Representative for Nauru, because it will probably take only two meetings and we could then perhaps have it, if necessary, on the mornings of 10 and 11 July.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I have listened with great interest to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom, but I very much fear that with the many drafting Committees we have, it will be difficult, with respect to the proper distribution of work, if we have two meetings a day. However, it is a useful suggestion and we will bear it in mind in due course.

Are there any other suggestions regarding our distribution of work?

But, in any case, I think it might be useful to take the date suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom to consider the Nauru Report. We could in any case say that it would be on 10 July and try not to change that schedule since the Special Representative would come on that date.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I quite agree, and I have no objection to it. Nevertheless, I should like to make an observation. I think the representative of the United Kingdom pointed out the other day that it would be desirable for the Council not to continue its work beyond 15 July. If, in order to hear the Special Representative of Nauru we had to continue our work beyond 15 July, that would be a serious difficulty for a great many members of the Council. On the other hand, I should like to recall the fact that the Visiting Mission has been to Nauru or is going there. The Visiting Mission will have studied the whole situation of Nauru. However, Nauru is a small island of 1800 inhabitants with one single problem: the phosphates problem. The Visiting Mission which has spent several days there will have studied the situation in detail, and I think the Council will be well advised in not showing itself to be too affirmative in its conclusions, as it might run the risk of being contradicted by the observations of the Visiting Mission. For my part, even if the Australian Government finds it impossible to have a Special Representative designated to present the report for Nauru to us, I think that it would not present a very grave or major difficulty at the present time, and I think that rather than defer the consideration of the matter of Nauru to a very late date, we might ask the representative of Australia if the Australian Government wishes to insist this year upon its right of having a special representative when the consideration of the Nauru report comes up.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of Belgium has made a very interesting suggestion. He suggested that the question of Nauru is really not so complex; but, of course, it depends upon the delegation of Australia, and perhaps that Government has a special interest in having the special representative present here, and perhaps then we could finish with the question of Nauru without the direct participation of the special representative of Australia.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): In fact, allowing the presence of a special representative was a privilege extended to the Administering Authority. Now we attach additional importance to it. It is a proof of the courtesy of the Administering Authority towards the Council. If the Australian representative in the Council is not informed of all the details of what occurred in each one of the territories, it would be a sign of courtesy on the part of the Administering Authority to send a special representative.

If the Council agreed, we might say to the Australian delegation, that from the point of view of courtesy towards the Council we consider that the Australian Government has made this gesture. For my part I consider that the Australian Government has made a gesture of courtesy towards the Council, and I would not insist upon the presence of a special representative. If Australia, on the contrary, wishes to have a representative, that is a different matter. But I think the Council might show the Australian Government that it appreciates its proof of good will, and we should not insist on it.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Perhaps the representative of Australia would wish to answer today, or he might wish to think over the suggestion and take it up at a later date.

Mr. STERLING (Australia): I am quite sure that my Government greatly appreciates the courtesy that has been expressed by the representative of Belgium. I can assure the Council that they would wish to avail themselves of the privilege of being represented, as far as possible, by an official connected with the administration of Nauru, and they will make every possible effort to have him here.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): This item might be decided at a later meeting, when we are more certain of the date. In any case, we will postpone the consideration of the Nauru Report until 14 June. It will not be discussed on 14 June; that, in any case, is definitely changed on the schedule.

It is then decided that we will have a meeting on Jerusalem on Monday at 2 p.m.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to have the views of the Council on the following point. On the agenda there is an item which deals with the revision of the rules of procedure. This is item 8. We still have to consider this because in Geneva a Committee on Petitions was likewise requested to suggest amendments to the rules of procedure. We have adopted amendments which were adopted by the Committee, but some of these have been left in suspense and we have arrived at no decision. Now we must conclude this item of our agenda. It seems to me that in Geneva the Council did not wish to take into account the other amendments on the rules of procedure. However, it is up to the Council to decide. Nothing was specifically decided. It was left in suspense, and I should like to know whether the Council wishes to maintain this item on the agenda or else merely adopt a resolution to the effect that the matter is postponed or deferred. If not, we shall have to enter into an examination of the rules of procedure and consider whether the Council wishes to amend its rules of procedure. We shall then have to have a committee to examine the rules of procedure.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom): You will recall that in Geneva the Committee to which you refer made certain suggestions regarding the method of handling petitions.

Those suggestions were discussed at some length in the Committee, and I believe I am right in saying they were put forward to the Council with the unanimous vote of the Committee. In the Council they met with some opposition, and the representative of Belgium and myself, who were members of the Rules of Procedure Committee, both took the view that, although we felt that these particular proposals were common sense suggestions which would enable the Council to dispose more rapidly of its business, there were suggestions that the present procedure and the present definition of petitions were adequate, at any rate, for the time being. We therefore said that we did not feel that we should press these suggestions until they were likely to receive a larger measure of support in the Council. I cannot imagine that very much has occurred in the interval to suggest that the Council, or the majority, or a large minority of the Council, has changed its views on this subject. My delegation was under the impression that we had for the time being left the rules of procedure, and that we had finally agreed upon a new procedure for dealing with petitions, namely, through the Ad Hoc Committee which is now only working for one session, but which nevertheless produced very excellent results. We were certainly under the impression that the Council would wish to leave the matter there for the time being, always leaving it open for a revision of the rules of procedure possibly at some later date in the light of the experience which has been gained in the Ad Hoc Committee.

I might add that my delegation was a little surprised to see this item on the agenda at all, as we did think that the matter had been disposed of at Geneva, and we thought it would not be raised again unless a delegation, or possibly the Secretariat, through the President, specifically suggested that the time had come to make a revision of the rules.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Yes, I am under the same impression. However, we had not really examined the agenda thoroughly the first day. We merely adopted it. I was under the same impression. However, if a delegation wishes to propose amendments to the rules of procedure, it is of course free to do so at any time. For the time being, however, we will not examine the matter thoroughly. If that is the wish of the Council we can decide

that it has been disposed of for the time being, and that it is up to the initiative of each delegation to propose amendments to the rules of procedure. Would the Council agree to deleting this item from our agenda? If there is no objection, I think that we can then delete this item from our agenda.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): You will forgive me, but truly I do not know what we are talking about. We seem to be hopping from one subject to another. I cannot say that I agree entirely or that I disagree with the proposal to take this item off. I just do not know. I must refer to my papers. I cannot either say yes or no. Truly, I do not know what we are talking about. It is true that it is on the agenda. But I would not prefer to discuss this item now.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Mr. Khalidy was in Geneva. If Mr. Khalidy prefers that we should decide this at a future date, I have no objection. I merely put the question to the Council, because it has to be raised one day or another.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I wonder if I might remind Mr. Khalidy and others of what took place at Geneva, because I think -- maybe Dr. Jamali was sitting at the Council table, or was it you?

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I do not know.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): What happened, as I remember, was that we considered three separate rules--rule 26, rule 53 and rule 90. The latter, rule 90, was one of particular importance concerning the ad hoc committees. You remember that we can change rule 90 very materially by providing for a new procedure for the handling of petitions. We also changed rule 53. I confess that I was a little surprised to see this item reappear on our agenda for this meeting, because I thought that we had disposed of the matter as it was presented to us in Geneva. Certainly all of us are ready to reconsider new proposals for rules. If there are any pending, I, for one, would be most happy and ready to consider it. So far as I know, there are no pending

suggestions at present. I am simply saying that as a reminder.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am very much indebted to the representative of the United States, Mr. Sayre, and I think that that does clarify the position. Like him, I also have nothing pending. I have nothing on these articles and, therefore, would have no special reason for maintaining them on the agenda.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): But I understood that Mr. Khalidy proposed that we should postpone taking a decision on this matter.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): Just as you like, Personally, the situation is quite clear now. I thought that there was something that we really had to decide on those rules, but I myself have nothing to suggest and, if you wish, you are of course quite free to delete this item from the agenda.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Of course, it is up to the Council to decide this. I think, in any case, the situation is clear and Mr. Khalidy agrees with me.

Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina): Regarding the substance of the question, I am in agreement with the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States. But I think we ought to take some notice of observations made by the representative of Iraq to the effect that it would be very convenient, if a question is going to be discussed -- for instance the question of New Guinea today at the end of a meeting -- that the representatives receive notice of that question to be discussed, because, as in the case of my delegation, a delegate may sit for the New Guinea item on the agenda. Otherwise, the one who perhaps knows a little more about the item which is brought suddenly to the attention of the Council is not here, as happens to be the case today, and we might find ourselves in the position of the representative of Iraq. So I would appeal to the President to try to give at least 24-hours notice when items like these are being discussed.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I should like to say to the representative of Argentina that this item was on the agenda for the day before yesterday. It was not reprinted in the agenda for today. It was included together with the item on the questionnaire. In order to have an orderly discussion, it would perhaps be better to leave the question until we can include it specifically in a future agenda. We can decide it then. I agree with that suggestion because in fact it was not included in the agenda for today.

We seem now to have no more work to do today, because representatives who wish to make further remarks on New Guinea have requested that their rights in this sense be reserved for them for another meeting at which we shall discuss this. We shall then adjourn until Monday next at 2 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.