

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/FV.1195
11 July 1962

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 11 July 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. BINGHAM

(United States of America)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea [3a, 5b]
(continued)
- Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru [3c, 5a]
(continued)

*from Union 18
Allen B7*

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1195 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.

AGENDA ITEMS 3d AND 5b

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA:

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1591; T/L.1044)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA, 1962 (T/1597 and Add.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: We had in mind starting today with the question, left open yesterday, of the procedure with regard to Nauru. However, I believe it would be better to defer discussion of that until all delegations are present, so we shall therefore proceed now to continue our discussion of the question of New Guinea.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative for New Guinea under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): Yesterday my colleague and friend Mr. Doise asked the Administering Authority whether the indigenous representatives who are with the Australian delegation were going to make any statements or reply to questions. I believe the head of the Australian delegation postponed his reply to this question. Before asking my own questions, I should like to know whether there has been any final decision made in this regard.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I believe I did say yesterday -- at least I meant to say -- that the answer was in the affirmative. Yes, these two advisers to the Special Representative are available, if they wish to reply to questions put to them.

Mr. KCSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I am fully satisfied with that reply. Naturally, our last questions were addressed to the Special Representative, but I think interesting answers could be supplied by the indigenous representatives from the Territory. Therefore, I should like to ask these questions of the two indigenous representatives from the Territory.

The PRESIDENT: It would thus seem appropriate to invite the indigenous representatives of the Trust Territory of New Guinea to sit at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Scmu Sigob and Mr. Himson Mulas, representatives of the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took places at the Trusteeship Council table.

AGENDA ITEMS 3c AND 5a

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/1589, 1595 and Add.1, 1599, 1600; T/L.1039; Working papers Nos. 1-3 prepared by the Secretariat)
(continued)

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of France will permit me, I should now like to revert to the matter of procedure on Nauru since the representative of the Soviet Union has arrived and since the Council Secretary indicates that there might be arrangements that could be made promptly if we could arrive at a decision on that subject. So we will revert to that subject for the time being.

The question is on the procedure to be followed in the drafting of the Council's conclusions and recommendations on Nauru, and I invite any further comments on that subject.

Mr. KOSZCZUSKO-MCORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): We were among those who originated this attempt to change the procedure in the methods of the Council. I must say very frankly that the work that has been submitted to us by the Secretariat has not corresponded to our expectations and our hopes in the sense that we thought we would have a document submitted to us that would be comparable to one submitted by a drafting committee. Our goal was to expedite our work by eliminating one stage of it which did not seem necessary in view of the provisions and instructions that the Council had given, and that step was the drafting committee. The Secretariat thought that it was not within its competence to go beyond a simple summary, and it did not think that it was empowered to submit a paper in the form of recommendations. It therefore gave us exactly the same documents which are sent in general to drafting committees. According to that concept, it is the Trusteeship Council itself which would become the drafting committee. As far as that is concerned, we consider that no time would be saved because it is obvious that to draft a working paper such as this, nine persons would find it more difficult to draft such a paper than with two or three, and we would thus lose time.

(Mr. MOSZULICKI, Morinet, France)

It is not my intention to discuss at the moment whether this concept of the Secretariat is correct or not, or whether, basing itself upon the instructions of the Council, it could have drafted and presented us with a paper in the form of recommendations. We observe as a fact that the Secretariat thought it could not do so. For our part, we think that it is important that the question of Nauru should be concluded and, therefore, we need a document of recommendations to transmit to the General Assembly.

In these circumstances, and deeply regretting that it has not been possible to break away from a certain routine, we shall bow to the will of the majority of the Council if it considers it necessary to have a drafting committee-- such committee, as was proposed yesterday, to have as few members as possible. In view of the work already done by the Secretariat, the drafting committee could prepare in one half day the document which we request of it.

Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary) (interpretation from French): I merely wish to say that the Secretariat did its best, as it always does, in preparing the papers which were requested. The Secretariat had no special authorization from the Council to take the place of a drafting committee; therefore, we prepared the documents which were indicated to us as we had done for the drafting committee. I am very sorry that there were not more precise instructions. We could not draw up a document which would have allowed the Council to take its decision immediately.

The PRESIDENT: If I understand the situation correctly, there is before the Council a proposal, which was made yesterday by the representative of Australia, that there should be a drafting committee to prepare a draft for the Council's consideration, such committee to be appointed by the President. That is the only proposal before the Council on this subject at this time.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to call the Council's attention to the intervention made yesterday by the representative of Bolivia. He presented weighty arguments concerning the preparation of recommendations of the Council to the effect that in this matter of the future of the Nauruans, the Trusteeship

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Council cannot adopt precise recommendations. Indeed, the recommendations of the Visiting Mission were established before the receipt of the proposals of 19 June from the Nauruans. Therefore, the Visiting Mission could not have taken these problems into account in its report.

Now, as it turns out, the Administering Authority has not yet completed consideration of the proposals of the Nauruan people. Thus, one might well ask: what is the Trusteeship Council to recommend? The Trusteeship Council cannot automatically simply approve a recommendation of the Visiting Mission for the very reason that such recommendation could not take into account the proposals of the Nauruan people of 19 June.

On the other hand, we still do not know what the reaction of the Australian Government is to be. Of course, the Soviet delegation, for its part, considers that the only possible cause of action at this time is the adoption by the Council of a recommendation fully endorsing and supporting the proposals of the Nauruan people. If the Administering Authority and the other members of the Council are prepared to accept such a recommendation, we would have great satisfaction in welcoming it and voting in favour of it. We should like to stress that any recommendation against or not in keeping with the proposals of the Nauruan people would be totally unacceptable to the Soviet delegation and we should vote against it emphatically.

We also must take into account the fact that the members of the Visiting Mission have their own points of view on this subject. The members of the Council have spoken here and have expressed their views on the subject and, in the circumstances, the question arises, would it not be better to adopt a report by the Trusteeship Council in which the various points of view would be reflected? The proposals which have been made would be contained therein. Since the parties directly concerned -- the Nauruan people and the Australian Government -- have not yet reached any decision, and we do not know what the reaction of the Australian Government will be to the latest proposals of the Nauruan people, should the Trusteeship Council be hasty in coming forward with a rapidly reached decision? We consider that it would be preferable to have all the points of view reflected and to present all the data and material in the report of this Council for the consideration of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. By that time we shall know the reaction of the Australian

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Government, and the Assembly will be able to adopt a resolution taking full account of the points of view of all the parties concerned.

I repeat that, as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, there is no difficulty, and we are quite prepared to vote for a recommendation expressing unqualified support of the proposals of the Nauruan people. If the Council is prepared to proceed in that way there would be no difficulty. But what recommendation could the drafting committee present now?

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened carefully to the point of view expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. The only point of difference which I have with him is this. The representative of the Soviet Union accepts unequivocally the proposals submitted by the people of Nauru to the Government of Australia. I must call his attention to the fact that the representatives of the people of Nauru did not exclude the alternatives submitted in the report of the Visiting Mission. In other words, technically, I cannot see the possibility of reaching a solution of this problem without the consent of the parties concerned; the people of Nauru must eventually reach a decision.

On this question, year after year the reaching of a final decision has been delayed. The proposals made by the Administering Authority are indeterminate in character, and it seems as if the Administering Authority hopes that a decision will come from the people of Nauru. It is quite possible that such a policy will turn the people of Nauru into experts and that they will not arrive at a decision. Of course, our international Organization has unlimited patience, but I believe that this patience is being worn thin, especially in the Fourth Committee.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

The problem is complex despite the small size of the island. I do not want to go into a problem which we have already fully discussed.

I think that if we are to appoint a drafting committee we must keep in mind an aspect that has not been touched upon by the Soviet representative. In the report we say that a decision must be arrived at now. But each time a proposal of that kind is made there is another delay. If I have interpreted correctly the statement of the Soviet representative, there is unanimity in the Council on the need to terminate the trusteeship as soon as a solution is reached between the parties. I think that we could ask the drafting committee to emphasize that aspect.

However, I do not wish to overlook the fact that generally speaking the Administering Authority is prepared to make an economic contribution to a practical solution. At the same time it must be admitted -- all the members of the Visiting Mission have noted this -- that the population of Nauru has never had a clear alternative before it. This lack of a firm decision on the part of the Administering Authority has obliged the representatives of Nauru to speak in terms of an ideal island. Of course, we all understand that there is no such island.

I believe, to sum up my reply to the Soviet representative, that in our resolution we must stress the point that the decision must be presented as soon as possible. The Soviet representative knows full well that in United Nations parlance the word "immediate" often does not mean what it normally should. On the other hand, I share the Soviet representative's view that we should request that this co-operation take place between the Administering Authority and the people of Nauru with a view to a total solution of the question and possibly the termination of the trusteeship. All that the Council must determine is how the trusteeship is to be terminated.

Having made that clarification, I do not oppose the establishment of a drafting committee.

Of course, the Soviet representative is fully entitled to his opinion that the only thing that can be of interest to the Council is the general proposal of the representatives of Nauru -- namely, that the people of Nauru must have

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

limited sovereignty in association with the Australian Government. I believe that we all agree that this is the solution which must eventually be imposed. The problem is when and how.

I am merely expressing my views now on one point: the urgency of the solution. The position has been this. One year, the population of Nauru has not made a decision; the next year, there is no proposal from the Australian Government; finally, a proposal is made but it is of a general character. If this goes on, the members of the Trusteeship Council and of the Fourth Committee may lose the proverbial patience of international organizations. A solution to this problem is not impossible.

I think that that clarifies my delegation's views on the statement just made by the Soviet representative.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I think that we should ask the President to proceed to nominate a drafting committee. I was one of those who agreed with the representative of France that another course might be followed, but I think it is clearer now than it was before that a drafting committee is required. It would be a pity if we were to resume a debate on substance before we had a draft in front of us. When we have such a draft it will be much easier to settle these matters.

Having said that, I should like to make just one or two further comments. The representative of Bolivia stresses the urgency of this matter. I think that we all feel the need for an urgent solution of this problem, which has been so long under discussion.

The Soviet representative attaches the greatest importance to the recent statement made by the Head Chief of Nauru on behalf of the Nauru Local Government Council and the people of Nauru. I agree with him about the importance of that statement. It is only necessary to add that within the last few days the Head Chief has made two other statements in this Council. First, he said that his proposals were dependent upon a suitable island being found. Secondly, he made it quite clear that in his view his recent proposals did not in any way conflict with the recommendations of the Visiting Mission.

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

Hence, I think that it will be for the drafting committee to take into account the three factors which have been mentioned and to place a draft before us. When we have such a draft I believe that we shall be able rapidly to come to a conclusion.

Therefore, if it is necessary to do so, I would formally propose that we ask the President to appoint a drafting committee.

The PRESIDENT: A proposal to that effect was made yesterday by the representative of Australia.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We fully agree with the remarks of the representative of Bolivia concerning the urgent need for a decision on this matter. We believe that a decision must be taken and must be taken urgently. But the decision must be a just one and fully in keeping with the wishes of the Nauruan people. Thus, we agree with the representative of Bolivia when he proposes that the Trusteeship Council should express its opinion that a speedy solution to this problem must be sought.

But in substance -- and I stress this point -- the Trusteeship Council can adopt no other decision than to approve the proposal of the Nauruan people. To adopt any other decision or recommendation would be tantamount to saying that the Trusteeship Council is not taking into account the will of the Nauruan people -- and that is something with which the Soviet delegation could never and will never agree.

The representative of the United Kingdom has said that the proposals of the Visiting Mission do not conflict with the proposals of the Nauruan people. That statement can be qualified only as an attempt to create a false impression. Indeed, the course of action proposed by the Nauruan people is among the various alternatives proposed by the Visiting Mission. But in the Visiting Mission's report that course of action is placed under doubt; in substance it is scratched out. The Visiting Mission's proposal is that the best solution would be to settle the Nauruan people on the territory of Australia and to create a Nauruan centre there. Thus, there is really no need here for anyone deliberately to

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

create the false impression that the proposals of the Visiting Mission in no way conflict with the proposals of the Nauruan people. The Nauruan people ask to be granted a new island off the shores of Australia, and the Visiting Mission proposes the creation of a model village on the territory of Australia. Is that one and the same thing?

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Before the drafting committee is actually appointed, we would wish to introduce clarity into this matter so that the drafting committee might not follow this false course. We wish to avert that kind of thing.

As for the proposal to appoint a drafting committee, we would wish to know how you contemplate appointing that drafting committee. Do you intend to consult the members of the Trusteeship Council on that? As regards the Soviet delegation, we consider that the membership of that drafting committee should not include representatives of the Administering Authority, at least. We consider also that the best membership for a drafting committee would be representatives of India and Bolivia. They are representatives of non-Administering Authority Powers. They are representatives of those countries which form part of the Visiting Mission and who are acquainted with the situation on the spot. We consider that these two representatives could quite speedily present us with the necessary draft of a report.

Mr. HCOD (Australia): I did not wish to say anything more but the representative of the Soviet Union referred to the need for clarity in what we are doing. It is in the interest of clarity that I feel bound to point out that this is precisely the kind of situation in which proper drafting procedure is essential.

A great deal has been made by certain members here of the proposals of the Nauruan people. I should point out that, without any derogation at all to the importance of those proposals, these were directed to the Administering Authority, in effect, the Australian Government. They are not proposals which have come directly before the Council -- addressed to the Council. They were submitted in the course of the general information presented to the Council by the Special Representative and my delegation. Hence, these proposals come before the Council as part of the information submitted by the Administering Authority, and quite rightly.

In the final draft report there will be a heading entitled "The future of the Nauruan people". Under that heading presumably there will be a reference to the information submitted not only by the Administering Authority but indirectly from the Nauruan people. It is entirely a matter of drafting how that information is dealt with in the report of the Council to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

If this course is followed -- and nobody ought, I think, at this point to lay down what the drafting committee should do -- and if that point is borne in mind and everything falls into its place, then none of us need have any fear that the whole situation will not be properly, frankly and adequately presented to the Fourth Committee when the time comes.

The PRESIDENT: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would appeal to members of the Trusteeship Council not to continue this discussion further. The procedural question before us is a very simple one. Members have been engaging in debate on the substance which seems to the Chair to be irrelevant to the point before us. The point before us is the question of whether or not to create a drafting committee to proceed with the preparation of the conclusions and recommendations of the Council on this subject. The alternative course is for the Council to attempt to do that itself. If the proposal is rejected, the Council will proceed to do this job itself and in that connexion, of course, there will be ample opportunity for debate on the substance. There will also be ample opportunity for debate on the substance again when the drafting committee's report comes before the Council if it is decided that there should be a drafting committee. I think that the time has come when a decision can be taken on this procedural question.

Sir Hugh ECOT (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I fully agree with you and I should not wish to continue the debate. I have one point which I must make in reply to what was said by the representative of the Soviet Union. I merely wish to draw his attention to paragraph 81 in the report of the Visiting Mission which states:

"The proposal which the Mission suggests is therefore twofold. It is that the Australian Government should itself carry out a full survey of all possible islands in the vicinity of Australia and New Guinea. If any island which offers even a remote probability of providing what is required is found, a specific scheme of settlement should be worked out." (T/1595, pp. 20 and 21)

Then we dealt with the alternative and said:

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

"Both these detailed schemes would then be put to the Nauruans for their consideration and discussion, with opportunity being given to them to make proposals for any changes or improvements which might occur to them."

(Ibid.)

Therefore, if any representative suggests that we have ruled out the possibility of another island or that we have in any way excluded the proposals put forward by the Head Chief, those are just not true. I am glad to have the opportunity of making that point in reply.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will now put to the vote the question before the Council. The question is the creation of a drafting committee to prepare and submit to the Council conclusions and recommendations on Nauru.

The proposal was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEMS 3a AND 5b

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA:

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1591; T/L.1044)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA, 1962 (T/1597 and Add.1) (continued)

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French):

Mr. President, I am happy first of all to greet, after you, the presence at this table of Mr. Somu Sigob, a member of the Legislative Council, and Dr. Himson Mulas. We are happy to thank the Australian delegation for having brought them here.

The question that I should now like to ask them bears upon the over-all problems of New Guinea. When we look at a map of New Guinea, we observe that this island which is a single entity geographically, geologically, and even ethnically, has been divided by the chance of colonization and of two world wars into zones of different administration and even, with the same administration, of different status.

Now, there is a petition which perhaps did not escape the attention of the members of the Council; that is contained in document T/PET.8/L.9. In that petition the members of the community of Kavieng mentioned their anxiety over the events happening beyond the frontier.

(Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, France)

Have no fear, Mr. President; I shall not speak here of a problem which is being considered by the General Assembly. I shall speak of it only incidentally and to the degree that it pertains to New Guinea under Australian administration. It is for that reason that I should like to ask, especially of the indigenous representatives at this table, the following question.

What are the relations of the inhabitants of New Guinea under Australian trusteeship on the one hand with the inhabitants of Papua under Australian administration and, on the other hand, what are their relations with the Papuans of Netherlands New Guinea? Are there any visits, any ties of any kind among these different inhabitants of the various parts of New Guinea?

I am addressing my question both to the Special Representative and to the other representatives who are here.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The positions of the Soviet delegation and of a number of other States are well known in regard to the question of West Irian, which is still being unlawfully retained by the Netherlands. The Soviet Union considers that West Irian is an integral part of the independent State of Indonesia, which is a Member of the United Nations. We therefore consider it totally inappropriate to pose any questions in the Trusteeship Council which relate to the affairs of a sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations.

I consider that the President, as the official personality in our Council, should safeguard the interests of all the Members of the United Nations in conducting the debate in this Council. Accordingly, we deem it necessary to make our position clear. We believe that the Trusteeship Council should now discuss the question of New Guinea or any other questions related to Trust Territories and to the functioning of the Trusteeship system. But the Trusteeship Council has no right whatsoever to interfere in any fashion, either directly or indirectly, in the affairs of sovereign States.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that the point of order that was raised by the representative of the Soviet Union is that the question is an improper one.

The Chair rules that the question is not improper. In the Chair's view, any Member representative of the Trusteeship Council may enquire of the representatives at the table of matters concerning the relations of the people of a Trust Territory with any peoples whatsoever in the rest of the world.

The objection is, therefore, overruled.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): In reporting to this Council in previous years, the question of relationships between the Australian administration of New Guinea and the Administration of West New Guinea has been put. At both times, I have replied that co-operation at a purely administrative level has occurred in order to attempt to further the interests of the people on both sides of this border through an exchange of experience between the two Administrations in the administrative field.

I have previously given examples of this purely administrative co-operation which has taken place by citing exchanges of visits between officers working in the same field, and some small exchange of training facilities whereby the Australian Administration was able to take advantage of some training facilities in Dutch New Guinea and was able to offer some small measure of training to the people of each part on the other side of the border. As this Council well knows, this purely administrative co-operation in exchanging experience and practice, which might benefit the indigenous people of the Territory, has occurred.

I shall now address myself to the second part of the representative's question, which dealt with the relationship between the people of the Trust Territory and the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua. I did make a statement in this Council last year regarding the view that, as far as anybody could envisage and subject to the wishes of the people themselves, the future developments in both of these Territories would proceed along the same lines. ~~There is no barrier to the free interchange of visits among all kinds of workers between the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua.~~ As this Council is well aware, the two Territories have common administrative organs, common legislative organs, and common judicial organs. Many Papuans presently work in the Trust Territory; many New Guineans from the Trust Territory presently work in Papua.

The PRESIDENT: Do either of the representatives of the Trust Territory wish to reply to the question put by the representative of France?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I am sorry; may I have that question again, so that I may answer it or assist my colleagues in answering it?

The PRESIDENT: I understood that the representative of France was putting his question not only to the Special Representative, but also to the representatives of the people of the Trust Territory, if they cared to reply.

I call upon the representative of France to clarify that matter.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I wish first to thank the Special Representative for his reply. The question that I should now like to make clearer to the representatives of the Territory is the following: Do they feel that they belong with the populations of Papua and the populations of New Guinea, which are under Dutch Administration? In other words, do they feel that they belong to the same ethnic and national entity and have they relations with these different parts of the populations of the neighbouring Territories?

The PRESIDENT: If either Mr. Mulas or Mr. Sigob would care to reply to the question, would he so indicate by raising his hand.

Mr. MULAS: In regard to the relationship between the Trust Territory of New Guinea and Papua, it is only in this Council that the two Territories are being separated in any way. But these two Territories, as we in this Council might know, are being administered jointly by the Commonwealth of Australia. I might say here that the relationship between those two parts of the Island is very good, although there are a few minor exceptional points which are not worthy of discussion in this Council. I will say this, however: that the relationship between the indigenous populations of the two Territories is very good; and it is only in this Council that we are discussing the two Territories separately.

As for Netherlands New Guinea, according to my understanding, the people within the borders are somewhat illegally crossing the borders; people from the Australian side are going over to the Netherlands side and vice-versa; and I am reasonably sure that there is some relationship between Netherlands New Guinea and Papua, and between Netherlands New Guinea and the Trust Territory.

Mr. MCCARTHY. (Special Representative): I would just like to clarify or add a little to a statement made by my colleague as to the border between these two Territories, for the understanding of this Council.

It is very easy to get a wrong concept of a border from a map. I am talking of borders, generally. It appears clearly on a map as a line, parting from one point to another, and through a series of points. The situation is very different on the ground, anywhere, and perhaps particularly different in some aspects on the ground in New Guinea. Mapping of New Guinea has been proceeding for many years, and one of the purposes of this mapping has been to establish, in fixed relationship to points on the ground, the actual course of the border, which goes through a diversity of country, from the coast through some of the most rugged country in New Guinea; and at many places the exact course of the border is not known. It is therefore inevitable, inasmuch as this border is not a material thing in the minds of the people, that there should be a spontaneous contact across the border, which is, in fact, on the ground, not a reality.

Mr. KCSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I thank Dr. Mulas and the Special Representative for their replies. If I asked this question it was because, not only were there some fears expressed in the petition to which I referred, but the report, itself, reflects this; and, on the other hand, the preoccupations of the French delegation are, I know, shared by a great number of African and Asian delegations who understand fully the Declaration on the granting of independence to the colonial peoples, regarding the free determination of peoples and their right to national integrity and unity.

Mr. KIANG (China): Before I put several questions to the Special Representative, I would like to know whether, in our questioning, we will cover all fields of development or merely confine ourselves to the political field.

The PRESIDENT: It appears to have been developing as a practice at this session that the questions can be put in any field; and I would therefore suggest that the representative of China ask such questions as he wishes at this time.

Mr. KIANG (China): I notice that the representative of Australia is raising his hand. He must have something to say.

The PRESIDENT: It may be that the Australian delegation would prefer it otherwise.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): The fact is that the ground is considerable, and the material which the Special Representative, in particular, has with him, for the information of the Council, is extensive, and it would be helpful at this stage, I think, if questions could be confined to one particular field, as we have done in the past. That would be a more orderly, and for us, a more helpful arrangement.

The PRESIDENT: I am certain, the distinguished representatives will be willing to accommodate the Australian delegation in this regard and will respect those wishes. Therefore, I would suggest that, for the time being, questions be limited to the political field.

*reccer copy
with hand line*

Mr. KIANG (China): I am glad to hear this. It has been the understanding of my delegation that Australia always likes to have questioning confined to the field of political development at the initial stage of questioning.

Now, Mr. President, with your permission; I would like to pursue the question raised by my colleague from France. I do so simply because the Visiting Mission has reported to the Council on the expression of concern on the part of the New Guineans in certain parts of the Territory.

In the Sepik District, at the public meetings, I think, in the Buka Local Government Council, the members of the Council did express or, at least, give the impression to the Visiting Mission that they were very much afraid that the events in West New Guinea might spread into the Trust Territory. I must say, even as early as 1959, when I was in the Territory, many of the New Guineans, in fact, questioned the Visiting Mission as to how much we know about things going on in West New Guinea; and particularly they said they want no one else to come to West New Guinea. Today, people in Sepik District express their concern about what is happening in West New Guinea.

I would like to know, not from the representative of New Guinea, but from the Special Representative, as to whether he had heard the same expression of fear or concern in other parts of New Guinea, besides Sepik District.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): It is my understanding that there is natural, understandable and quite widespread concern among the people of New Guinea regarding the disturbed state of affairs in Netherlands New Guinea. It is my understanding, from my journeys with the Visiting Mission and my previous journeys, that this concern is not confined to the Serik District, but is more generally spread through the Trust Territory than that district.

Mr. KIANG (China): I believe it quite natural that the highlanders would be more concerned than those in the coastal areas.

Now may I ask for clarification of certain passages in the opening statement of the Special Representative. The Special Representative stated that "In general the Mission found no political consciousness and political demands of the kind which..." -- and my question does not involve the second part of this sentence, which is found on page 11, of document T/FV.1194. Now, in my opinion, political consciousness is one thing and political demands are quite another. It may be said that there is not as much political consciousness in New Guinea as the Administering Authority and we in this Council would like to see in the Territory; but it seems to me that the rapid development of the local government councils is an achievement of which the Administering Authority should be proud, and I believe that that rapid development is an index of growing political consciousness in the Territory. Does the Special Representative believe my interpretation to be correct?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): My intention there in that part of my opening statement was to refer to militant political consciousness, consciousness demanding rapid political change. I did not intend to refer to a lack of political consciousness of any kind, and the representative of China has pointed out that indeed the rapid development of native local government councils is indicative of a type of political consciousness which the Administering Authority has been at great pains to foster.

At the same time I would point out in this connexion, as the Visiting Mission itself found, that in certain areas of New Guinea there is still not sufficient political consciousness to demand the formation of local government councils. This demand has to be fostered. Indeed, in certain areas not only

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

does this demand not exist, but there is an express desire on the part of the people not to participate in this or similar forms of political development, and the process of developing councils in those areas has to be one of patient instruction and waiting.

Mr. KIANG (China): In the light of that clarification, may I be permitted to make one comment. I think it would be a great credit to the Administering Authority if the political development of the Territory can proceed and continue successfully, so successfully that there will not be any political demand. In fact, it should be the policy and objective of the Administering Authority always to move ahead of and to lead the people so that the people feel no need to urge it on or make political demands.

May I further invite the attention of the Special Representative to the part further on in his opening statement where he said:

"And such is the speed and vigour of development in this field that many more are now preparing towards the target set by the Administration which provides for the incorporation of almost a million people in the council system by 1967 in Papua and New Guinea, with the bulk of this increase taking place in the Trust Territory." (Ibid., page 12)

This is a very interesting and, I think, very significant statement, and I should like to ask the Special Representative whether the Administering Authority envisages any structural change of the local government council system itself when, by 1967, one million people will have been brought within the system of the local government councils.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): What I say here is largely my personal opinion. I do envisage structural changes, perhaps quite far-reaching ones, developing in the councils as this period indicated by the target date goes on. Indeed, those structural changes are even now developing in a very marked form in certain areas. In certain areas quite spontaneously certain local government councils have amalgamated themselves to form one council, or, while retaining their separate identities, have amalgamated certain of their functions.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

I referred also to the native local government council conferences, which have become an annual event and which have been commended by the members of this Council. I have no doubt that out of these very valuable annual meetings will come positive proposals and movements for structural changes of various kinds in the native local government councils.

In my opening statement I referred also to an observation by your Visiting Mission that the Administration should develop a grant-in-aid system to enable native local government councils to undertake wider responsibilities with more adequate budgets. I did say that this is in fact happening, that the grant-in-aid system has been developed and is being developed further, and I believe it will continue to develop.

All of these points illustrate the fact that quite inevitably structural changes, in the light of experience and the development of new councils, are taking place and will take place in accordance with the changing conditions of the times as more and more of these councils develop.

Mr. KIANG (China): My next question is also derived from Mr. McCarthy's statement. May I invite the attention of the Special Representative to his own statement. I think that the Special Representative quoted Minister for Territories Hasluck indirectly from one part of the statement he made in Canberra on 18 May. Mr. McCarthy said:

"He said that he looked to the Legislative Council itself in the future to express the wishes of the Territory". (T/PV.1194, page 16)

I myself understand very well the meaning behind this sentence if I understand the political philosophy of Mr. Hasluck. I should like to know from the Special Representative if we can construe from this remark that the Legislative Council itself, as it is constituted now, does not seem to express and is not able to express the wishes of the Territory at the present juncture, and that what he had in mind was that the demand for political advancement or political reform should come from the people themselves rather than from outside. In other words, I think that he thought it would not be in accordance with the wishes of the people of New Guinea for anyone else to push for political reforms. I think that is his philosophy. I think I am quite right in my understanding of this philosophy. Thus, it is quite logical for us to come to the conclusion that the Legislative Council as it is constituted now is unable to express the wishes of the Territory, even if they have some wishes.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Special Representative): I would not accept the proposition made by the representative of China that the Legislative Council cannot in some measure express the wishes of the people of the Territory. I should like to refer to the fact that in that Legislative Council there is an elected body of twelve members out of a total membership, including the President, of thirty-seven members.

I also invite the attention of the Council to the fact that there is a nominated membership in that Council which is drawn from significant sections of the population, represented by citizens who are held in particular regard in the Territory for their experience, their wisdom and their concern with the Territory's welfare.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

I would also invite the Council's attention to the fact that there is a body of official members in that Council. Most of them have had very long service in the Territory and indeed are closely in touch with the thoughts and thinking of significant numbers of people in the Territory. So I would not agree with the proposition as it stands, and I would expect that this Council, as it is presently constituted, even with a small elected membership, and indeed a comparatively small over-all membership in relation to the population as a whole, could state very significant expressions of opinion regarding the wishes of the people. I could cite as an example here in this connexion the presence here with me today of my colleague, Mr. Somu Sigob, who is himself an elected member of the Legislative Council and who is closely in touch with the wishes of a great many of the people he represents. He is the freely elected member of the indigenous people from the New Guinea mainland coastal electorate and moves constantly among those people. He is familiar geographically with the areas he represents and has become known to large numbers of those people. He himself is very competent to speak for them and their political thinking.

Mr. KIANG (China): I now come to the crux of the matter in relation to this particular sentence and also in the light of the recommendation of the Visiting Mission. I can very well understand the attitude of the Administering Authority. I think it is perfectly fair for the Administering Authority not to commit itself at the present time with regard to that recommendation of the Visiting Mission so far as the preparation for an essential parliament is concerned. I have great sympathy with that. I think it is not right for the Council to press it, but I should like to try to gauge the thinking of the Administering Authority and that of the Visiting Mission.

I am not going to talk about the concrete recommendation of the Visiting Mission. I do not think it is fair for us to do that in the Council now. In the light of this particular sentence saying that "he looked to the Legislative Council itself in the future to express the wishes of the Territory", I should like to know what actually is the length of the future which Minister Hasluck had in mind and also as regards the realization of the political reforms

as recommended by the Visiting Mission. What is the actual distance between the two? I do not wish the Special Representative to tell me this in terms of days or months, but I should like to know approximately what the distance is as we should like to gauge that distance. This is very important because I think that the members of the Visiting Mission also must have faced the same question upon their return. People asked them, "What do you think, how long will it take New Guinea in order for it to be able to govern itself?" Therefore I would appreciate a response to this question, and I hope I am not pressing the Special Representative and that I am not placing him in great difficulty. I would appreciate it very much if the Special Representative could tell us what is really the distance between the thinking of the Administering Authority and the thinking of the Visiting Mission which has been reflected in their recommendation.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): With the reservation that I made yesterday that I do not have a decision of my Government to communicate to this Council, I will do my best, on a personal basis, to answer the question of the representative of China.

My understanding is that the proposal of the Visiting Mission in this connexion was not a radical proposal in its basic principles in relation to the thinking of the Administering Authority at the present time. I did say yesterday that the target dates had been set for some of the developments of the kind that the Visiting Mission obviously had in mind. I wish again to quote a passage which I previously quoted in this Council from a speech made by the Administrator of the Commonwealth of Australia at the opening of the reconstituted Legislative Council in April of last year:

"My advisers have expressed readiness to set target dates for the performance of the various practical tasks they have undertaken in social, economic and educational advancement. The stages in the progress of political advancement will be set by the response of the people themselves. Nevertheless, my advisers have it in their own minds that after experience of one full term of the newly constituted Council and

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

after a second general election, that is to say, in perhaps five years from now" -- and this speech was made early in 1961 -- "the Council and the Australian Parliament might be asked to consider what the next step forward should be. My advisers also have it in mind that as soon as the people of the Territory feel themselves ready for the change they should move to a system of elections on a common roll. On all these questions my advisers look to the participation of all the people of the Territory through this Council in shaping the course of change and progress."

There is a clear and specific reference to one of the basic factors of the Visiting Mission's proposals: the development of common rolls which will be based on a system of universal franchise, a system of elections by one body of voters regardless of race -- that is, the people who make up the common roll. The suggestion was made that this should happen in perhaps five years from the beginning of 1961, which would bring us to 1966. That was not a firm and final target in the sense that the Government was "hide-bound", to use the Minister's own term, to this course of development or that. My understanding is that if, in the judgement of the Government, taking into account the response of the people, the time was ripe to bring these reforms in earlier than the date suggested, then it would not hesitate to do so.

In pursuance of the aims thus described, as I indicated to this Council yesterday, two bodies have been appointed especially charged with the task of looking into the matter and the problems associated with the development of common rolls, electoral procedure and all the necessary political paraphernalia which must be associated with a far-reaching change of this kind. Those two Committees, as your Visiting Mission was informed, are at work and, as a result of the discussions between the Visiting Mission and the Minister for Territories, instructions were issued to those committees -- one of them a Select Committee of the Legislative Council itself, on which two indigenous elected members are represented and two non-indigenous members -- to accelerate their work and to accelerate their advice on the various aspects and terms of reference which were laid before them. So, when I said yesterday that the Administering Authority had, in certain fundamental respects at least, anticipated some of the suggestions of the Visiting Mission in this respect, that statement was a very soundly based one.

Your Visiting Mission has made a proposal which, in terms of time required for the mechanical operations involved alone, will be a difficult and somewhat time-consuming operation. Despite the existence of the excellent census records, referred to by Sir Hugh Foot yesterday, despite the fact that the Government can and will proceed to the development of common rolls on the basis of these census books, nevertheless the setting up of the whole paraphernalia for a

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

body such as that indicated by the Visiting Mission will take time simply as a mechanical procedure. I am not able to judge the time that will be involved.

Thus, in principle and in certain fundamental respects, there is not a great gap between what the Visiting Mission has suggested and what the Australian Government itself has already defined as its policy.


Mr. KIANG (China): As I once remarked in this Council, when one asks questions of Mr. McCarthy, he always gives answers, whether one agrees with him or not.

When we put questions in the political field we do experience one difficulty, which is that unless we can also touch on education, it is not easy to pursue some of our questions, particularly those concerning the recommendations of the Visiting Mission, which we do not wish to question but rather to discuss.

I should like to offer one comment in the light of the reply which the Special Representative has given. In our judgement -- which may be quite wrong -- if the Administering Authority were given fifteen years, calculated from 1959, the Territory of New Guinea would be quite prepared to reach that goal which we all have in mind. That would be in 1974, which is two years more than the representative of Nigeria mentioned in the General Assembly as the target date for the independence of dependent territories; I think he said 1972. I believe that if we really concentrate -- and if the Administering Authority does the same -- for the next fifteen years, the situation in New Guinea will be quite different.

I should like to ask the Special Representative for some clarification with regard to his statement. There is one question which, in our opinion, is a critical issue and I was rather astonished that the Visiting Mission did not touch upon this in its report; I do not know whether this was done intentionally or whether the matter is almost settled.

The Council may remember that in 1959 the question arose whether it was correct for the Administering Authority to pursue its policy of so-called uniform development. Yesterday the Special Representative said that the Minister for territories had informed the Mission that "the Australian Government was not by any means 'hide-bound' by the idea of uniform development, but firmly believed that the more broadly based any system of self-government might be, the better



it would be." (Ibid.) I should like to ask the Special Representative a frank and simple question -- I know there is some difference of opinion between Port Moresby and Canberra. Has the Administering Authority as a whole changed its philosophy with regard to uniform development? I think that this is a very important matter, particularly in the light of the recommendations of the Visiting Mission. If the Administering Authority insists on continuing this so-called uniform development, then I am afraid that those important and far-reaching recommendations of the Visiting Mission cannot be carried out even if the Administering Authority agrees to do so. I think that the whole development of New Guinea will depend very largely upon a change in the fundamental philosophy of the Administration regarding the uniform development of the Territory. I think that the Special Representative will realize that this uniform development would be an impediment in the creation of an enlightened, intelligent and well-educated New Guinean leadership, whether or not it is a minority. This philosophy will impede that development and, for this reason, I should like to hear from the Special Representative on this point.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): It seems to me that this is one of those cases which arise so often when we become dominated by words and phrases and tend to become slaves of the expressions we ourselves have created.

The Trusteeship Council will recall that over a period of years it repeatedly urged the Administering Authority to accelerate the pace of development in what had been the under-developed, uncontrolled and restricted areas of the Territory. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that that was a recognition by the Council of the importance of spreading the benefits of good administration as widely and as quickly as possible, and a recognition of the right of even the most backward people to opportunities of advancement similar to those being offered to and accepted by the most progressive people.

I agree that it is clearly impossible, impracticable and undesirable to wait to make significant steps forward until the whole Territory has reached a uniform stage of development -- which, of course, is the ultimate at one extreme of this proposition.

In the statement to which I have referred here the Minister himself recognizes this. He does not say that one must wait to decide that the policies of the Australian Government have reached the appropriate point until the last of the most backward tribesmen have been accommodated in a school and become literate. What the Government does look for, I believe, is the development of an informed and vocal opinion, even on a sectional basis, among the major groups of people in the Territory, as a guide for its policies. That, I think, is what the Minister meant when he told the Visiting Mission that he was not hindered by the policy of uniform development. At the same time, he hopes that when vital political decisions are made by the people themselves they will be made on as broad a base as possible. But, as I have said, this does not mean that the whole Territory must reach a uniform stage of advancement. As I understand it, I repeat, it means the development of an informed and vocal opinion among important sections of the population as a whole.

Mr. KIANG (China): I have only two minor points on which I should like to seek clarification from the Special Representative.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

In his opening statement yesterday, the Special Representative quoted Sir John Crawford. I have met Sir John Crawford. He has a very interesting thesis: political independence and economic viability. I think that the Special Representative quoted Sir John Crawford to prove, in a way, this very popular thesis. *all*

ce However, I think that the Special Representative would agree with me that if the criterion were economic viability -- let us even say complete economic viability -- there would be very few countries in the world which could be regarded as politically independent. I do not think, in fact, that there is such a thing as complete economic viability.

I would therefore like to ask the Special Representative whether he really subscribes to the entire theory of Sir John Crawford in this respect, so far as New Guinea is concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): There may be some misunderstanding here, which perhaps arises from the fact that the quotation in my opening statement is of course taken out of context.

In passing, I would refer to Sir John Crawford's status in our own country. He not only is a scholar and economist of great note, but was until recently the very, very active head of the whole Trade Department of the Government of Australia.

As I understood it, Sir John Crawford did not say that the development of political independence was dependent upon the development of complete, or even almost complete, economic viability. We again come to this problem of phrases and what they mean. What Sir John Crawford did suggest, I believe -- and what I intended to suggest in my statement -- was that the problem of economic viability could not be disregarded. I did not intend to suggest that political independence or self-government for Papua and New Guinea must wait until they have become economically viable in any complete sense. I put that forward merely as a factor to be taken into consideration in this Territory, which I said was largely dependent -- in fact almost completely dependent -- on external and artificial aid provided mainly by money subscribed by the Australian Government and the investment of Australian capital.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

I would refer the representative of China to the following sentence from my opening statement:

"The point of balance between these two factors remains uncertain".

(T/PV.1194, page 22)

What I meant by that was that great political leaps forward cannot and should not wait for complete, or even a great degree of, economic viability. I was suggesting, however, that this point could not be disregarded in studying any concept of self-government or independence, because to the extent that a country is dependent on external financial aid it loses some of the elements of the classical concept of independence.

Hence, my suggestion was simply that close attention should be given to this matter to determine where the point of balance lay. In my judgement, that point of balance will certainly be far short of complete economic viability in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea when self-government does come.

Perhaps I could express it this way: independence or self-government can and should come only at a time when there is a prospect of a reasonable degree of economic viability.

Mr. KIANG (China): I am very glad to hear that clarification by the Special Representative. What he has said has certainly proved our point that economic development in New Guinea is so important that the recommendations on this matter by the most recent Visiting Mission and previous Visiting Missions should be taken very seriously by the Administering Authority, in order to give the economy of New Guinea at least that degree of viability which the Special Representative has in mind.

My last point relates to the Buka incident -- and I hope that the mention of this question will not alarm the Special Representative.

In annex II to the Visiting Mission's report we find a summary of a statement issued by the Department of Territories in Information Sheet No.5. I have checked this summary against the comments made by the Special Representative in his statement.

Buka

(Mr. Kiang, China)

There is one interesting discrepancy or gap which arouses my curiosity. In the Visiting Mission's report (T/1597) on page 1 of Annex II, there is reference to the "incidents at Buka Island" of 6 February. I presume that all of us know the whole story of this Buka incident; therefore, I am not going to summarize the incident itself. I am sure the Special Representative knows what I am referring to. The Visiting Mission's report mentioned 6 February. If you examine the text of the summary very carefully, together with the facts given by the Special Representative in the second part of his statement, actually nothing really has happened on that particular date. It is interesting why the Visiting Mission should mention the incidents of 6 February -- that is a bit curious. Since I am a lawyer, just as the representative of Bolivia, I am interested to know why there is mention of the incidents of 6 February and yet you have nothing mentioned in any part of the statement with regard to the incidents on that particular date. I should like to hear from the Special Representative.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I am not quite certain what the representative of China is referring to. He has the advantage of me in reference to a particular date -- 6 February -- because the incidents to which reference has been made in their leading up process, in their development, and in their subsequent decisions and actions that were taken in relation to them, were extended over a long period. Perhaps the leader of the Visiting Mission could explain the significance of the particular date referred to better than I myself.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I do not think I can help very much without notice on the matter of the date. I think that the date was taken from the statement of the Administering Authority. I would not be able to check further on that without going to papers which are not available to me here.

Mr. KIANG (China): The reason I did not ask any member of the Visiting Mission is that I do not think it is fair for us to question the Visiting Mission on this point because this is a summary taken from a statement by the Department of Territories. This is why I am asking the Special Representative why, suddenly, he mentions the incidents of 6 February. I am sure that the officer who submitted

(Mr. Kiang, China)

that report to the Administration must have had very much in mind that particular date, otherwise he would not have mentioned the incidents of 6 February; and yet, not a word of that incident was mentioned in the summary. That is curious. I think a great deal happened on 6 February and it does not appear in the report; that is very interesting, and that is why I want to know.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I think I can help the representative of China a little here. I would quote from a document containing a summary of the events referred to. Without going into detail, I would recall that the events referred to developed over a period of weeks and indeed months, initially from a cult movement of some kind into a positive refusal by a group of people in the Hahalis area of Buka Island to pay taxes. I quote from this document:

"On 6 February 1962, in accordance with the plan formulated in Port Moresby at the end of January, the District Officer with a police party, numbering approximately eighty, moved into Hahalis at 9 a.m. At 11 a.m. a crowd of native people, estimated at 2,000, approached the police camp. A senior inspector asked Teosin and other tax defaulters to accompany him to Sohano to appear before a magistrate. When he placed Teosin under arrest, the senior inspector was attacked by a number of women and Teosin was pulled away. Another leader, Sowal, was arrested but he was rescued by a crowd of women. About noon, the native people disappeared only after another arrested man had been released. The considered opinion of the officers was that attempts to make arrests would endanger the lives of women and children. The Administrator instructed the police to remain in the district."

To my knowledge, those were the incidents of 6 February, which were just one incident in a whole chain of incidents constituting the incidents of Buka during this period.

Mr. KIANG (China): I am quite satisfied with the reply given by the Special Representative.

May I further ask him to tell us of the 417 people arrested on Buka Island, how many belong to the Hahalis Welfare Society? Do you have any data on hand? I am not pressing for an immediate reply. I am just curious to know how many of them who were arrested belong to the Society?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I cannot give the answer to that question, but I shall do my best to find out and report later to the representative.

Mr. KIANG (China): That Society was openly formed in February 1960. I am sure the Administration was well informed of the background of this Society. I should like to know when you say "openly formed", did that Society go to the Administration and register? Could the Special Representative tell us a little more of the background of this Society, other than what already appears in this summary?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): To the best of my understanding the Society was not registered. There is no law under which such a Society which is spontaneously formed need be registered, because it did not necessarily have the co-operative existence of a co-operative society or a local government council. My understanding also is that after this Society was formed, which was a sort of self-help society, it did not appear that there was anything reprehensible in its activities or proposed activities. Indeed, in many aspects these proposed activities were commendable. As this Society developed further, however, it lost, as far as I understand the situation, many of the features of an economic and social group which had been banded together merely to help the people to help themselves. It became permeated by cult thinking of various kinds; the cult thinking manifesting itself in certain traditional ways which can be made more understandable by reference to the appropriate annex to the Visiting Mission's report and perhaps to my own remarks. As this Society developed then some of the activities of this cult thinking became concentrated to such an extent on its own purposes that it refused to co-operate or participate with the Government. This refusal finally culminated in a positive refusal to pay taxes which many of the members were legally obliged to pay. The issue then became one simply of defiance of the law with regard to taxation requirements.

Mr. KIANG (China): I should like to ask the Special Representative whether he would draw a parallel between this local incident and the incident which occurred in Nakanai. *Kiang*

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I suppose parallels can be drawn between the incident which took place at Nakanai some six or seven years ago and the development of this incident on Buka Island. There may not be a direct parallel, but perhaps it is significant that the incident at Nakanai of course encouraged a small section of the Tolai people, that is, the people around Buin.

One of the attempts that the Administration made to pacify the people and to get them to see reason before they reached a point of no return in the course of law-breaking, to which they were committed, was to ask Mr. Tobaining, a member of the elected Legislative Council from Great Britain, to go across and add the weight of his wise counsel, which is universally recognized through the Territory, and to lend his prestige to the efforts of the Administration. Mr. Tobaining did this. He talked to the people and tried to make them see the error of their ways. He pointed out the inevitable results of the course on which they had embarked. But this did not, at that stage, turn them from the course which they had decided to follow.

Without special study, however, I would not attempt here to draw any close parallels between the two incidents.

Mr. KIANG (China): I wish to thank the Special Representative, both on my behalf and on behalf of my colleagues, for all his replies. I regret that we have spent so much time in questioning.

The PRESIDENT: Since it is almost time for the luncheon recess, I should like to consult the Council with regard to their wishes for this afternoon. *X*

First of all, I wish to announce the appointment of India and the United States of America as members of the Drafting Committee on Nauru. The Council had scheduled a meeting for this afternoon at which time it was hoped that the questioning of the Special Representative would be completed so that we could

(The President)

proceed with the general debate tomorrow. On the other hand, I know that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission has a conflicting engagement in the Committee of Seventeen and would prefer that the Council not meet this afternoon.

It is for the Council to decide, it seems to me, whether it wishes to press ahead with this matter or whether it wishes to allow the Drafting Committee on Nauru to meet, which it could perhaps do.

I might point out that if the questioning could be completed this afternoon, it might be possible to have just one meeting tomorrow and such a procedure would permit the Drafting Committee to meet.

Mr. KIANG (China): Since the questioning at present is confined to the political field, even if we finish the questioning in the political field this afternoon we may still have some questions in the other fields. That will take another meeting; so I think it would be an excellent idea if we meet tomorrow -- say tomorrow morning and tomorrow afternoon -- at two meetings to finish with the questioning and then we can start with the general debate on Friday. If we do have a meeting this afternoon, I think it will facilitate many delegations not only in preparing their questions, but I think they will be able to prepare their general statements for the debate on Friday.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): You have been kind enough to note that I am unable to be in this Council this afternoon. Naturally, I would not wish that fact to interfere in any way with the work of the Council. I very much regret having an engagement which I think I must keep, in the Committee of Seventeen this afternoon, but I do not wish that unduly to influence the Council in its decision.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I believe that in planning our work there is no reason why we need several meetings. I think now that the members of the Council are not so numerous, and taking into account the fact that my delegation and several others are members of the Visiting Mission, the questions asked might be only for purposes of obtaining definite details or a clarification of points which appear contradictory after the questioning.

I would therefore be inclined for us to have a meeting this afternoon, and then we could exhaust the political matter and enter into the economic field, and I think it would be useful to have a final meeting, perhaps tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. However, it is very possible that, in the way we are working in the Council -- we are working quite fast -- there would be nothing gained in having several meetings. A few days are needed by the Administering Authority to complete this questioning. I think the questioning will be exhausted very soon.

What I suggest is not to take an immediate decision this morning upon the way we are going to plan our work throughout the week. I think that this afternoon, after hearing a few more questions and replies, we will be in a position to know how we are to proceed throughout the rest of the week.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Is it known to you how many members of the Council would, in fact, be ready to put questions this afternoon? This might be a relevant point.

The PRESIDENT: I think the point of the distinguished representative of Australia is well taken. It might be helpful to know how many representatives would be prepared to ask questions this afternoon, although that would not necessarily be a conclusive indication. May I have some indication as to what delegations would be prepared to ask questions this afternoon?

Inasmuch as the representatives of the United States, New Zealand and the Soviet Union have raised their hands, there seems to be actual work to be done this afternoon. It is the opinion of the Chair that the Council should press ahead. If there is no serious objection from members, it would seem preferable to proceed with questioning this afternoon.

On that basis, we will adjourn now until three o'clock this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.