

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1303
11 July 1967

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 5 June 1967, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Miss BROOKS

(Liberia)

1. Examination of conditions in New Guinea: annual report of the Administering Authority [4] (continued)
2. Examination of petitions concerning New Guinea [5] (continued)
3. General Assembly resolutions on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua [10] (continued)

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN NEW GUINEA: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1660 and Add.1; T/L.1119) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING NEW GUINEA (T/COM.8/L.2; T/PET.8/L.10 and L.11; T/PET.8/22 and 23; T/OBS.8/12 and 13) (continued)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA AND THE TERRITORY OF PAPUA (2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI)) (continued)

At the President's invitation, Mr. West, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, and Mr. Zurecnuoc and Mr. Eupu, advisers to the Special Representative, took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue the general debate on conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): Edmund Burke was asked on one occasion, What is a free government? He replied that for any practical purpose, it is what the people think to be so. What the people of the Trust Territory of New Guinea think of their present situation is abundantly clear. While happy enough to move steadily along the road to greater autonomy, they are demonstrably not clamouring at this time for their sovereignty. This is not because their voices are suppressed, their aspirations denied or their rights unknown to them. The evidence accumulated in forum after forum, year after year, is that, free to go their own way, free to exercise their right to self-determination, the New Guineans do not yet seek the transfer of all powers to themselves. Edmund Burke and the drafters of the Declaration on colonialism are at one in concurring that the wishes of the people are the final court of appeal.

Yet this admittedly unusual situation is received in varying ways in the United Nations bodies. Some delegations, true to their consistent national policies, can without qualms disregard the freely expressed views of the people of New Guinea. Others, embarrassed by the situation -- for some reason which escapes me -- and seemingly driven by belief in some historical imperative, mould the facts to conform to a preconceived doctrine. Yet others, honestly puzzled and perhaps not fully aware of the people and their representatives,

acquiesce in the recommending of courses of action and time-frames which have worked out satisfactorily enough elsewhere. And others, accepting the known views of the people, seek to ensure that they are brought to the time of self-determination as swiftly as possible and in the most favourable circumstances attainable, and endeavour to help ensure that all options for the future are kept open.

New Zealand counts itself in the latter category, and it is to the furthering of these objectives that I should now like to turn.

The task of attempting to create a Territory-wide administrative system out of the hundreds of small political units, themselves characterized by the general absence of formal political institutions, can be said to have entered a more dynamic stage with the creation in 1950 of the first four local government councils. Councils now help to run the affairs of three-quarters of the population. This is swift progress in seventeen years, given the complete vacuum which formerly existed. How can the system be made fully comprehensive? My delegation appreciates that there are certain advantages in situations like this in awaiting an initiative from the local population, as contrasted with imposing systems from above. We also take the Special Representative's point that in the remote areas where there are still no local government councils difficulties of communication complicate the task. I simply wonder whether at this first stage in the fostering of local responsibility -- especially when time to master the complicated art of government is short -- it may be expecting a little too much to await a spontaneous request for local government councils. There may be a need, or so it seems to my delegation, to go beyond propagating the advantages of creating councils and nudging people to move, undertaking in addition an overt and vigorously conducted campaign to bring the remaining quarter of the population under the system of local government. For the working of the councils, together with the holding of general elections to the national legislature, is one of the most positive means available in the Territory for forging a consciousness of being part of a community wider than the immediate neighbourhood.

I pass over the issue of the future district administration without comment. It is for the Papuans and New Guineans themselves to decide whether, for example, the district administrations are eventually to come under the direction of representative district legislatures or of the central Government.

Ever since, indeed pre-dating, the publication in 1962 of what has become known as the Foot report a preoccupation of this Council has been the working of the representative national legislature set up partly in response to that report. That the House of Assembly is now asserting itself in the legislative field is clear from the course of events in the recent debate over the 5 per cent royalty to be paid to owners of land from which minerals are being extracted. As was uncovered during questioning here, the law until recently in New Guinea was that, as in many other countries, mineral deposits were regarded as a national asset. But a private New Guinean member, under pressure from an electorate to whom the issue was of more than academic interest, felt otherwise. He introduced a bill calling for 5 per cent of royalties to be passed to the owners of mineral lands. The official members of the House, reflecting Administration policy, opposed this and voted against it. They were joined by private members like Mr. Zurecnuoc, on whom the wider significance of the measure, from the point of view both of the loss of national revenue and of the possible encouragement of future secessionist tendencies in mineral-rich areas, was not lost. But they were voted down by a grouping of private members, Australian and New Guinean. The Administrator did not exercise his power of disallowance, and neither has the Australian Government done so through the Governor-General. So the law is on the books. The House of Assembly has put its own stamp on this field and has taken another step towards shaping New Guinean society to its own distinctive pattern.

The Assembly is not the House of Commons. But it was never intended to be and it will develop its own forms and traditions. What is clear is that it is moving with ever-increasing assertiveness and self-assurance to face the problems of the Territory.

This very success in the legislative field points up the comparative slowness in transferring executive responsibilities to New Guineans. In the Westminster model the political executive is drawn from the legislature. A move

towards this model was taken with the appointment of Under-Secretaries for various Departments from the Assembly membership. But it seems that the standing accorded the Under-Secretaries -- who wield some power and influence but not sufficient perhaps to compensate for the difficulties caused them in the House and their electorates through the extra work involved and through the duty they feel to help defend policies they did not, perhaps, play a decisive part in making -- does not seem to render the system fully workable. As Mr. Zurecnuoc put it, "We are under pressure from both: from our duty and then from our people." On the other hand, the forum where the Under-Secretaries meet with the Administrator and the Department Heads -- the Administrator's Council -- has apparently acquired a good deal more policy-making powers and status in recent months. It was encouraging to hear from the two Under-Secretaries that they now participate actively in the decision-making in that body.

Since the Select Committee on Constitutional Review is about to bring down a report bearing on this subject of the move towards a full ministerial system, I would only comment that it seems to my delegation that this, as also the issue of transferring further financial powers to the Assembly, may be a field in which history may need a push. The fact that the execution of policy will obviously remain, for apparent reasons, substantially in the hands of expatriate staff for several years yet until New Guineans with at least a minimum of training are available makes it all the more important that New Guineans be actively involved now in policy-making bodies at all levels of government.

Given the lessons learned over the past twenty years on the shaky nature of a political independence which lacks firm economic underpinning, the economic policies being followed in New Guinea are a striking testimony to Australia's resolve to carry out in full its Charter obligations to promote the progressive development of the Trust Territory towards "self-government or independence". For the administering Power is not shaping the New Guinean economy into an appendage to the primary economy, subordinate to and permanently dependent upon this more developed structure; it is engaged instead in ensuring that when self-determination is exercised the Territory will, to the greatest extent feasible be able to stand on its own feet economically. These last phrases are

indeed taken from the Commonwealth Government's directive to the World Bank Mission which reported on the economy in 1964. The Bank Mission took the directive seriously and it concluded that the major emphasis in the development programme should be given the stimulation of production and the advancement of the indigenous people. In the words of the Mission,

"Only by these means can the real income of the native people be raised the tax base broadened, the disproportionate gap between government expenditures and revenues raised in the Territory removed and the widening deficit in the balance of payments -- now met by grants from the Government of Australia -- reduced".

Where has the economy, animated by these principles, got to in recent years? Let us look at the pattern of administrative expenditure. In the year 1959, there was a heavy emphasis in the budget on spending in the fields of health, housing, water and sewerage, and general administration. Between them, these items accounted for nearly half the gross administrative expenditure. By last year, 1966, spending on these items had been reduced proportionately -- but not in absolute terms -- to one-third of the budget, while the proportion allocated to both the commodity-producing sector of the economy and the extension of what the economists call its infrastructure -- that is roads, ports, airfields, etc. -- was correspondingly increased. It is an argument of long standing among development economists whether heavy expenditure on development of the infrastructure -- which is the means through which the farmer's crops are marketed -- should precede or follow heavy investment in stimulating actual production of crops. The development of the sort of comprehensive infrastructure being built up now in New Guinea presupposes the long-term availability of external subsidies, and we do not doubt that in New Guinea this is a safe enough assumption. Nevertheless, since it is investment in the commodity-producing sector which puts money more swiftly into the pockets of increasing numbers of New Guinean smallholders and businessmen and gives them a direct and permanent stake in the economy, my delegation -- with some temerity, for this is a tricky field for amateurs to venture into -- is moved to wonder whether there is not justification for concentrating public expenditure even more heavily on the commodity-producing sector.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

One factor that suggests to us that this may be needed is that the levels of private investment from both local and overseas sources have not, we understand, lived up to expectations in recent years. Looking around in 1964 at the likely sources of capital to meet development needs, the World Bank Mission had objectively concluded that substantial private investment, from both local and expatriate sources would be required. But the economic and political climate has apparently proved not so attractive as was thought would be the case. The passing by the House of Assembly of an Incentives to Pioneer Industries Ordinance, and its recent Development Capital Guarantee Declaration, of which the Special Representative told us, bear witness to the members' appreciation of the role which private investment has played and can play in development and to their anxiety at the comparative decline in such investment.

Other sources of both capital and expertise will presumably have to make up the leeway. What other sources are there? We heard with interest from the Special Representative of the spread of loan and savings co-operatives and production co-operatives. He told us too that some of the local government councils are making a contribution in this field. But capital formed from the admittedly meagre local potential will not fill the gap. International sources are not being neglected; the United Nations Development Programme will, for example, provide about \$A1.3 million towards the cost of building and equipping a \$A4 million teachers' college in the Eastern Highlands. A World Bank team has just been examining projects which the Bank might help finance. We assume that help from the United Nations specialized agencies will expand rapidly now that a start has been made.

But none of these sources has the capital available to make up the shortfall which has emerged in private investment; increased public investment, which in effect means increased Australian subsidies or a redirection of existing funds, would seem to be required.

I might interpolate at this point that the failure of private investment to reach the targets envisaged by the World Bank is a quite real and immediate economic worry, but it may prove to be in some degree a long-term political blessing. A respectable body of economic opinion in Australia itself has, according to reports, come independently to the conclusion that less reliance should be placed in the Territory on the expansion of private investment and more reliance on Governmental assistance to indigenous producers. We welcome, in this regard, the recent official decision to seek equity participation for Government in joint government private enterprise ventures such as the new palm oil industry which has been set up. Such a policy, it seems to us, lessens the inherent difficulties which may come to be associated with a "nucleus estate" system, financed wholly from private resources, and is a significant step toward ensuring that when the Papuans and New Guineans become a nation they will retain control over their national resources.

The prospect of ever-increasing requirements for external subvention, in the immediate future, at least, poses quite a dilemma for Australia, for New Guinea itself and indeed for the Trusteeship Council. We have encountered this dilemma before. On the one hand, the people and the United Nations demand a rapid rate of economic development and better and better services and facilities in every field. We demand ultimate standards, approaching those of the metropolitan country, but we pay little regard to the capacity of the territorial economy, even its potential capacity, to meet the heavy recurrent costs which are involved in such better facilities. We discuss wages policy here, for example, as though it had few implications for the financial future of an independent State. Then we turn to the over-all budget figures and apparently see no inconsistency. We deplore the widening gap between exports and imports and between the totals of revenue raised locally and revenue derived from external subvention; and we wonder at the rate at which the latter climbs. In suggesting therefore that there may be a case for heavier government expenditure in the commodity-producing sector of the New Guinea economy, we do so in full awareness that this will demand a proportionate reduction in

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

resources available for social services -- higher and technical education aside -- and in general administration, and perhaps even for building roads and ports. As the World Bank mission reminds us, the attainment of economic viability and growth is primarily dependent upon expanding the productive capacity of the economy. But economies in government administration including the progressive replacement of expensive expatriate staff, and resistance to the temptation to build up government services to a standard which the country will never be able to afford, are a necessary accompaniment. This dilemma I spoke of is not, of course, as great in Papua and New Guinea, with its fairly extensive untapped resources and its substantial potential for growth and expansion as is the case in Micronesia, for example.

So that while it is true that the gap between imports and exports widened from \$7 million in 1962 to nearly \$27 million in 1966, and while the external subsidy has risen in the same period by 130 per cent, one must also note that exports have been increasing at an average annual rate of over 11 per cent, and that in proportionate terms, as opposed to absolute terms, the Australian grant has, in fact, been reduced since 1960-1961 from 65 per cent of the total receipts to 58 per cent in the latest financial year. It is a highly creditable achievement on the part of the people of New Guinea and their Australian partners, and indeed a very good augury for the future that at a time when economic growth has been so rapid the comparative dependence of Australian aid has been able to be reduced in this way.

What all these economic trends and figures mean in political terms is that all options for the future lying before the Papuans and New Guineans are being kept open. While they are still dependent in large measure on generous help from the Australian taxpayer, they have already shown that this will not become a permanent feature of the economy. So they move forward to self-determination with confidence. When the time for exercising this right comes -- and the Australian Minister for Territories said again just two months ago that self-determination is the basic policy for the Territory and that it is the prerogative of the people to terminate their present status and achieve independence if they so wish -- the New Guineans will

be in a position to make a free choice. It seems likely that the choice will be for independence and that the time when this is attained will be in the not-too-distant future. But we, in New Zealand, are not adherents of the new doctrine -- an aberration from General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) -- which postulates that independence is the only option before the people of Papua and New Guinea and that they have no right to determine the timing of the assumption of sovereignty.

In concluding, I should like, with respect, to address a few words to the two parliamentarians from Papua and New Guinea. Their statements to us in the Trusteeship Council have brought us down with a salutary jolt from the elevated plane of anti-colonial doctrine to the reality facing leaders having to take far-reaching decisions on the basis of a narrow range of experience and an educational background which they themselves regard as inadequate. In the current phrase, "They have told us like it is". They are learning to play a complex instrument by the most effective method known, which is playing it themselves. What they seek from us is a little more time for further lessons and practice. We, for our part, cannot deny them this.

I have only one comment to make. Mr. Zurecnuoc told us, in his very graphic way, of a basic misunderstanding entertained by his people. "The peoples think" -- he said -- "that if we would have self-government, the Australians would certainly get up, pack and go home and that we would be left stranded." A precipitate Australian withdrawal is not the bare alternative to the present standing of the Territory. As the Australian Special Representative reaffirmed in this Council last week, Australia does not propose to make any alterations in the nature of its financial aid to the Territory or in its other forms of practical help, as long as these are necessary and the people want them. A presentation of the position as being in conflict with such undertakings, can only confuse the people and bring disharmony in New Guinea. The whole bias of Australian policy, political and economic, is towards keeping the New Guineans' options open, and this should be made known to the peoples themselves. It seems sensible for both appointed official and elected representative to make it clear to the New Guineans themselves that when they wish to call the tune in their country, the Australian mentor will not abruptly refuse further tuition or stop paying a proportion of the fees.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Madam President, the written and oral reports of the administering Power and the replies given by Australian representatives to questions from members of the Trusteeship Council leave us quite sure that there have been no changes in Australia's colonial policy towards the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua.

As in the past, we have heard a great flow of self-praise from the Australian representatives, and not only the Australians, for which, as usual, there is absolutely no objective foundation. As in the past, we have tried to discover what is really being done to enable the people of this Trust Territory to become free and independent in accordance with their right recognized by the United Nations and established in its Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. But the answer remains the same - no independence for the people of Papua and New Guinea.

At the thirty-fourth session of the Council, as at all previous sessions, we continue to be confronted with the fact that the Australian Government's policy towards this Territory continues to be a typical colonial policy. Like other colonial Powers, however, the Australian trustees are obliged to take account of the changing times, of the growing dissatisfaction of the people of the Trust Territory, of the insistent demands of those who are in favour of the immediate abolition of the system of colonial oppression. They are obliged to manoeuvre to a certain extent in an attempt to adapt themselves to changed conditions and changes in world opinion.

Thus, for example, we no longer hear statements like those that were being made, say, seven years ago. Then the Australian trustees did not consider it necessary to camouflage their real actions and aims. Then things were called by their names and the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Menzies, openly said, concerning his Government's colonial policy towards New Guinea: "We are here and we don't intend to leave".

Now times have changed and such frank statements are no longer to be heard. Indeed, they would now have us believe quite the contrary. They tell us, for example, that voting in the Territory is conducted in accordance with the principle of "one man, one vote" and that independence will be granted to the people of the Territory if and when they want it.

Very fine words. But what about deeds? Let us take first questions relating to the so-called political and constitutional development of the Trust Territory.

The facts of the political and constitutional situation in the Territory, freed from the web of words with which the Australian trustees carefully concealed them, conclusively show that the Australian Government's policy toward this Trust Territory is still not to allow, or at least to seriously delay, the granting of independence to the Territory. What shows this to be the case?

Firstly, the Australian representatives constantly try to draw everyone's attention to the Territory's House of Assembly and to represent it as a revolutionary step in the Territory's constitutional development. But everyone knows, and this is confirmed by the administering Power's report, that this body has no real powers. None of its legislation has had, or will have any force without the approval of the Administrator, a representative of the colonial Power. This is a fact and no one can deny it. Reference has been made to numerous insignificant constitutional reforms, but all these constitutional reforms have one specific aim: to distract attention from the main task, which is the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and the implementation of the Declaration which provided for the immediate granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples, regardless of their stage of development.

Everyone knows that no legislative body can be called competent or representative if it does not have legislative powers, if all its laws can only enter into force with the agreement of a colonial administration.

Recently, there has been much talk about the results of the work of the House of Assembly's Select Committee on Constitutional Development, which recommended some changes in the size and composition of the House. Its membership is to be increased from sixty-four to ninety-four, and this is supposed to be some kind of revolutionary advance. But in fact it has form without content. The number of open electorates (i.e. those where both representatives of the local population and Australians can stand as candidates) is to be increased, it is true, from forty-four to sixty-nine. The ten special electorates (i.e. those in which only Australians can stand as candidates) are to be abolished, but in their place fifteen so-called "regional electorates" are to be formed, in which only persons with certain educational qualifications can stand, which seriously limits the indigenous inhabitants' chances of being elected to the House of Assembly. The number of appointed "official members" (i.e. senior officials in the colonial Administration) remains the same.

In his statement on this electoral legislation, Mr. Barnes, the Minister of State for Territories, said that the final responsibility would remain with the Australian Government, i.e., it would continue to have a veto over all decisions of the House of Assembly. And yet they talk about the people of the Territory having the right to do this and decide that for themselves. Is all this intended for some completely uninformed public? I would say, primarily, for the public in Papua and New Guinea. The purpose of this is to deceive the people of the Territory. And here in the United Nations we simply hear lying speeches about how the people are being given the right to decide their own affairs.

The situation in fact is that the whole fuss about new constitutional changes merely means introducing insignificant changes of form while leaving untouched the substance of the existing system in the Territory, i.e., rule by the colonial Power.

A perfectly accurate appraisal of the powers of the future House of Assembly is contained in the description of the present House given in the periodical Pacific Islands Monthly, which stated in one issue that in their speeches during the electoral campaign the candidates could not promise the electors anything because the Australian Government would continue to keep control of the House in its hands and would call the tune.

Thus, the House of Assembly, a powerless body, has been created by the Australians just in order to make it look as if the people of the Trust Territory were taking part in the administration of their own affairs and using the Assembly for their own purposes.

Secondly, trying to justify its refusal to comply with the requirements of the United Nations Declaration on decolonization and grant immediate independence to Papua and New Guinea, the Australian Government states that political independence can only be granted on the basis of a healthy economy and an efficient administrative system. We have heard similar statements in the Council from the Special Representative and the representative of Australia.

During the nearly fifty years for which Australia has had trusteeship of the Territory, if there were a sincere desire to help the people of New Guinea achieve the aims set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, it would have been possible to do a great deal in that direction. History can provide many examples of free peoples who have achieved striking successes in various fields

over such a period of time. Unfortunately, the fact is that in Papua and New Guinea Australian colonial policy throughout all these years has been to develop the Territory's economy, both in volume and in structure, in a direction profitable to Australian and foreign monopolies, to hold back the economic development of the Territory and to keep it at the level of a natural economy, using all possible means to prevent the indigenous inhabitants from getting an education. For the benefit of anybody who doubts these statements, we may cite the following figures. After fifty years of Australian trusteeship, 95 per cent of the population live in natural economy conditions; agricultural produce accounts for 90 per cent of the Territory's total exports; about 80 per cent of the population are illiterate, unable either to read or write; about 70 per cent of the children of school age do not go to school; there are only two indigenous inhabitants with higher education; there is no indigenous inhabitant in a senior administrative post. It is representatives of Australia who have told us these things, no one else. Such are the more than disastrous results of colonial rule in the Territory.

Is this not a deliberate policy of Australian colonialism to artificially hold back the economic development of the Territory and the intellectual development of the people? And after all this the Australian colonizers hypocritically claim that the people of the Trust Territory are not ready for political independence. We have heard such statements from Australian representatives again at the thirty-fourth session of the Council and from some others as well. The representative of the United Kingdom defended Australian colonialism with particular zeal. He tried to prove that General Assembly resolution 2229 (XXI) was more or less at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, since it did not take into account the wishes of the peoples of Papua and New Guinea. How insulting these words are to the people of the Territory and how disrespectful to the United Nations, which has not only confirmed the inalienable right of the people of Papua and New Guinea to immediate independence, but at the last session of the General Assembly called upon Australia to set an early date for their independence. That resolution, however, has been ignored by the administering Power.

Recently, the Australian trustees have made very frequent statements to the effect that only the people of the Territory themselves can decide their future State system and set the date for independence. But if this is so, we do not

understand why the administering Power is constantly intensifying police supervision of the representatives of the indigenous population. Why do hired agents of the Special Branch of the colonial police make their way into all administrative offices and all educational institutions and keep a constant watch on the representatives of the local people, trying to identify any New Guineans who may criticize the colonial Powers in any way?

The January 1967 issue of New Guinea published a letter from an indigenous inhabitant of New Guinea telling about the situation in the Territory. Here is what he said:

"In New Guinea today, we don't even trust our local Members and European Members of the House of Assembly, because once you make a statement or bring up something, a Member may reveal the secret to the Administration officials just to secure his position. One is not really free to say anything or express one's views."

And later:

"I can assure you people in New Guinea are living in fear, because of threats used by some Administration officials, and many people are scared to express their opinions on some of the policies made by this Administration."

One may well ask what can be the aim of this police policy of the colonial Administration, if not to forbid the indigenous inhabitants to think and speak about the possibility of existence without their Australian trustees, about the possibility of establishing an independent State? In these circumstances what worth can we attach to the administering Power's statement about the role of the people of the Territory in determining their own future?

These are the real deeds of Australian colonialism in the Trust Territory. They show that in the political and constitutional field, the Australian Government is taking measures which will enable it to preserve the old colonial system in the Territory, to keep all power for itself and thus ensure its continued supremacy, at the same time taking steps to improve its image, to give a more attractive outside appearance to its methods of colonial oppression and as far as possible camouflage the colonial nature of its rule over the Territory.

This is also the aim of the colonial Administration's economic policy in the Territories.

The whole policy of the administering Power in this field is directed towards turning the Territory into an economic appendage of the Metropolis and creating the most favourable possible opportunities for Australian and other

international companies. The act concerning the economic development of the Territory which was forced on the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea by the colonial Power at the end of last year opens the door wide to predatory exploitation of the Territory's natural wealth by Australian and other foreign monopolies and gives them wide opportunities for plundering the national property of the Territory. Rapaciously exploiting the abundant national resources of Papua and New Guinea, Australian colonialism has relegated the indigenous population to the status of a reservoir of cheap labour for foreign capital.

The dominant position in the economy of New Guinea is occupied by the colonial Administration and foreign private capital, but the representatives of colonial Powers in the Council sing songs of praise about this, conceal the true aims of international monopolies in the Territory from the people and mislead the House of Assembly and its members. Let them open their eyes and they will see where this law is leading. As the proverb says, "The rich man is like an ash-tray — the more he gets, the dirtier he gets".

The dominant position in the economy of New Guinea is occupied by the colonial Administration and foreign capital.

It is common knowledge that the key positions in the Trust Territory's agriculture are held by Europeans. Until 1965, the 1,181 European farmers produced 100 per cent of the rubber, 75 per cent of the copra and cocoa and 60 per cent of the coffee.

Copra is the Territory's main export. It accounts for 44 per cent of total export earnings. All matters relating to the export of this crop and payments to the producers are dealt with by the Copra Marketing Board, which is appointed by and responsible to the Minister of State for Territories.

The biggest cocoa producer in the Territory is the Tolai Cocoa Scheme, which is guaranteed financially by the Administration and run by a board of directors who in the final analysis are also accountable to the colonial Administration.

The leading role in the Territory's timber industry, which special efforts have been made to promote recently, is occupied by Commonwealth New Guinea Timbers Limited, 51 per cent of whose shares are held by the Australian Government and the remainder by Canadian and Australian private investors. In 1965 this company's timber exports alone were worth about \$3 million.

On the basis of the so-called "Mining Ordinance", which declared all mineral deposits in the Territory to be the property of the colonial Administration, the Australian Government and monopolies together with other foreign companies are plundering the natural resources of the Territory.

In order to meet the interests of foreign monopolies, the colonial Administration continues to buy land from the indigenous inhabitants for a song and then resell it to international monopolies. Thus, for example, in the Vanimo area the colonial Administration bought 28,000 acres of land for \$24,000 -- and I give this example not because they bought 28,000 acres, they bought a great deal more, but this gives some idea of how much the land was sold for, 28,000 acres for \$24,000, i.e., the owners of the land were paid less than a dollar an acre. The United States has bought 134,000 acres in Papua. Buying up vast stretches of land for practically nothing, Australian and many other international monopolistic combines -- they are mainly from Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere -- are grabbing for the natural wealth of Papua and New Guinea. They have recently been prospecting on a large scale for useful minerals -- oil, gas, and other natural resources.

United States and United Kingdom monopolies alone have spent 40 million Australian pounds looking for oil. Recently, according to reports, Japanese and French monopolies have been very active in this field.

The dominant position of foreign monopolies in Australia's Trust Territories is a serious obstacle to their progress towards self-government and independence. Recognition of this fact is to be found even in the Australian Press.

The Financial Review, the organ of Australian business circles, said in its issue of 8 June 1966 that one of the main conditions for success in the Australian colonizers' plans to turn Papua and New Guinea into a major source of timber for Australia was to guarantee future political stability.

The representatives of monopolies in the colonial Administration exercise a direct influence on the Territory's political affairs. It will suffice to refer to the Sydney Morning Herald, a Conservative newspaper, which in June 1966 said straight out that the campaign to deprive a deputy named Guise of his powers as leader of the elected members of the House of Assembly was led by an

appointed member of the House, an Australian coffee planter called Downs. The true amount of the profits made by foreign monopolies is carefully concealed. But the scraps of information that get into the Press show the enormous profits made by the companies.

As the Pacific Islands Monthly said in November 1965, one of the leading Australian monopolies, the V.R. Carpenter group, reported that in 1964-1965, out of total profits amounting to £2,324,000 sterling, over £1.2 million (i.e. 56 per cent) came from outside Australia, and mainly from Papua and New Guinea.

While the foreign monopolies are piling up fabulous profits through ruthless exploitation of the human and natural resources of the Territories under Australian rule, the social situation of the indigenous population remains very bad.

As was stated during debates in the House of Representatives of the Australian Parliament, indigenous inhabitants employed by Commonwealth New Guinea Timbers Ltd. get about 75 cents a week, a miserly ration of food and a place in a shack. But few can count on even this wretched return for their labour.

Racial discrimination continues to flourish in New Guinea and Papua. The public service act which was in force in the Territory in 1964 has not been repealed and provides for two separate salary scales, a high one for Australians and a low one for the indigenous inhabitants.

The newspaper Australian of 19 April 1966 stated that the pay, for example, of a New Guinean district medical assistant was one fifth of that of an Australian in the same post.

A group of Australian Members of Parliament led by the Chairman of the parliamentary commission on foreign affairs, which visited Papua and New Guinea in June 1966, received a report from the Members of the House of Assembly of the Territory, which drew attention to the sharp deterioration in relations between the races.

This is not something we have made up, but the Australian representatives here deny everything outright.

It was thus no accident that at its twenty-first session the General Assembly proposed that the Australian Government should take measures to eliminate any discriminatory practices in the Territories. The silence with which the administering Power has met this appeal from the General Assembly cannot be regarded as anything but an encouragement of the present practice of racial discrimination in all fields.

The information contained in the petition we have received (T/PET.8/L.10) throws new light on racial discrimination in the Territory.

Growing concern is being aroused among world opinion and the people of the Trust Territory by the administering Power's plans and measures to turn the Trust Territories into a strategic military base and draw the peoples of the Territories into its hazardous ventures, using military bases and installations in Papua and New Guinea for the transport of aggressor troops to carry on the war against the peoples of Viet-Nam.

Activities connected with the transformation of Papua and New Guinea into a military base have been particularly stepped up in recent months --

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of New Zealand on a point of order.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): The subject of Viet-Nam is one which could very well be discussed in United Nations forums. My delegation, for its part, would be very happy to engage in a discussion of Viet-Nam. We would have thought that the Security Council was the appropriate forum for conducting such a discussion. The representative of the Soviet Union was given an opportunity at the beginning of last year to have such a debate in the Security Council -- the appropriate forum -- but for reasons best known to his own delegation and to his own country, he was not willing to engage in a debate in the Security Council -- the appropriate forum. If, however, the representative of the Soviet Union wants to discuss subjects like Viet-Nam which are not on our agenda, then my delegation, for its part, will wish to reserve its position to raise other subjects which are not on our agenda, such as the whole role of the Soviet Union in the Far East over the last twenty years, and the question why it has not given any right of self-determination to its territories in the Far East.

The PRESIDENT: I appeal to all members of the Council to adhere as closely as possible to the item on the agenda. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I am adhering strictly to the agenda item under discussion. If the representatives of the colonialist Powers consider it their duty to praise Australia's policy, we consider it our duty to state the actual facts and to point to the true situation in the Trust Territory. We are speaking about the conditions in the Trust Territory, and only on that subject. We are keeping strictly to the rules of procedure. Since the representative of New Zealand has taken the floor, I should like to reply to him with a proverb to the effect that "sometimes you do not like it when you are bitten". What he has said has been said many other times by other representatives of the colonial Powers here.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

What we are saying is clearly based on the resolution concerning Papua and New Guinea adopted by the General Assembly at its last session. That resolution contains a direct appeal to Australia to halt all military activity in the Territory.

I shall continue. The activities in transforming Papua and New Guinea into a military base have attained particular scope quite recently. We see this from the expenditures for military purposes in Papua and New Guinea which are growing with each passing year. For example, for the period from 1959 to 1965, that is, for a six-year period, \$15.57 million were spent for military purposes in Papua and New Guinea, whereas for the period 1965-1966 alone, those expenditures have amounted to \$20 million.

In this connexion, there is great concern amongst the populations of the Trust Territory owing to the possibility of Australian military bases in the Trust Territory being used for carrying out an aggressive war in Viet-Nam in order to crush the national liberation movement of the peoples of South-East Asia. In June --

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The representative of New Zealand has already properly raised a point of order. The representative of the Soviet Union asserts that what he calls "military preparations in New Guinea" are being used for the purposes of Viet-Nam. They are not being used for the purposes of Viet-Nam at all. It is completely in accordance with the rights of the Australian Government, as confirmed at the proper time by the Soviet Union, to take such military preparations as it deems fit in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea to protect the rights of the people there. That is all that the Australian Government is doing there.

I would reinforce the point made by the representative of New Zealand with regard to the proper place to bring up this question of Viet-Nam, if the representative of the Soviet Union wants to bring up the question of Viet-Nam.

He and his delegation have had every opportunity of bringing up the question of Viet-Nam in the proper organs of the United Nations; and they have scrupulously refrained from doing so. Madam President, I would ask you to enforce your previous ruling.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I, too, would like to support your request, Madam President, to the Soviet representative that he confine himself to the subjects on our agenda. The subject of Viet-Nam is not on the agenda; indeed, it is in no way related to the Trusteeship Council. As the representatives of New Zealand and Australia pointed out, the Soviet delegation has refused every opportunity to discuss this subject in the proper forum, which is the Security Council. I would ask you, Madam President, not only to request the Soviet representative to abide by your appeal, but to insist that he do so.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say that the subject of Viet-Nam is not on the agenda. However, the Soviet representative has indicated that military bases in the Trust Territory are being used for a certain purpose. It is the prerogative of all members to speak of military bases in the Trust Territories, but I would appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union, in order to maintain peace and harmony in the Trusteeship Council, to try to avoid using references which would cause disturbances in the Council? I call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Madam President, I am amazed that the representatives of the colonial Powers immediately raise points of order and state that the Soviet representative is not in order. We are not discussing the question of Viet-Nam here. We are speaking of something else. We are saying that there is a decision of the General Assembly to halt all military activities in the Trust Territories. We are quoting facts and figures showing that the Australian Administration is carrying out these military activities for a given purpose: the purpose of waging war in Viet-Nam -- that is what we say. Why, in the House of Assembly --

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Madam President, I request you to reinforce your previous ruling. The Australian Government is not carrying out any military preparations in New Guinea for the purpose of waging an aggressive war in Viet-Nam -- the representative of the Soviet Union saying that it is doing so, does not make it a fact. I pointed out that these bases are not being used there for that purpose. I pointed out that whatever military preparations are being made in Papua and New Guinea are being made in accordance with the Charter and in accordance with the Trusteeship Agreement to which, again I would say, the delegation represented by our colleague from the Soviet Union was a signatory. Furthermore, if he wants to talk about military preparations in the Pacific, the question can be widened much further. I have no doubt my colleague from the Soviet Union will talk about certain islands in the Pacific as having been arranged by the San Francisco Conference to be placed within the control of the Soviet Union. That is as it may be. That is a very doubtful proposition. But the fact remains: what are the Soviet colonies being used for in the Pacific? What do we know about the Soviet colonies in the Pacific? Perhaps he might consider that relevant, if he wishes to discuss this question.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): Madam President, it was my understanding that you asked the representative of the Soviet Union to confine himself to the subjects on our agenda; and while you conceded that the question of military bases might be relevant to the Trust Territory, you did not concede that discussing the question of Viet-Nam is in order in this Council. I would ask you to rule the Soviet representative out of order because I believe that this Council would uphold you.

The PRESIDENT: I believe the proper procedure would be a right of reply, since references have been made to military bases in the Trust Territory. But, as I have already done, I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union, in order that we may get on with our work in the Trusteeship Council, to avoid references of that type.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since I am not allowed to speak here in this Council -- and I understand why: because there is a predominance of colonial Powers here -- since that is the case, I will quote a member of the House of Assembly, Mr. Mirau, and let the colonialists try to challenge his words and not my words. For example, in June 1966, Mr. Mirau criticized Australia in the House of Assembly because Australia was spending millions of dollars for military, naval and air bases in Wewak, Manus and Daru, bases which can be used in military operations against other countries, as a result of which, the Papuans and New Guineans could be drawn into a conflict against their will. Referring to the statement of the Minister of the Air Force, Howson, to the effect that jet fighters of the Mirage type might be able to land at the air bases in Boram and Nadzap, Mirau stated that consequently those bases could be used as forward attacking points. In expressing the concern of the native population, this Deputy stated further:

"Australia is participating in a war on the Asian continent in Viet-Nam, and might well increase its commitments there."

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

That is what Mirau says, and not what I say. He continued:

"And these commitments will entail an entire series of political consequences for us. Some Australians consider that the Papuans and New Guineans are their own tools, and they want to draw us into their own Asian policy."

That is what Mirau states. Mirau referred here to a Press communication in the Trust Territory which called for the sending of Papuan and New Guinean troops to Viet-Nam, and I quote from it:

"Australia decides who should be our friends and who should be our enemies" -- this Deputy stated.

We read in The New York Times of 30 November 1966 that, when an Australian member, in the House of Assembly in New Guinea, raised the question of the participation of New Guinean soldiers in the war in Viet-Nam, two members of the House of Assembly left the hall in protest against the participation of New Guineans in the war in Viet-Nam. In that same article we read that:

"Australia intends to increase, beginning next year, the strength of the so-called New Guinea regiment of the Pacific Islands from 2,000 to 3,500. It has been noted that there is an undoubted relation between the plans to increase the strength of the troops in New Guinea and the attempts of the Australian members of the House of Assembly to impose on the House a discussion concerning the sending of New Guinean soldiers to the war in Viet-Nam."

We do not say that; that is what the members of the House of Assembly state. And attempts are being made to gag us so that we will not be able to speak about it in the Trusteeship Council. However strange it may seem, all this activity and military preparation of Australia in the Trust Territory has taken place -- and I stress this point -- since the recent session of the General Assembly made a special appeal to the Government of Australia to refrain from using the Trust Territory for military purposes.

For that reason, everything that we say here has a direct relationship to the situation in the Trust Territory. The Soviet Union, true to its consistent policy, has always come out in favour of the elimination of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Trust Territories since

such bases and such armed forces are used for interests which are foreign to the cause of peace and used as a means of pressure on peace-loving states and of armed intervention in the internal affairs of other peoples.

We consider that in order to remove the threat to international peace and security, military bases on the Trust Territory of Papua and New Guinea should be immediately liquidated and foreign troops should be withdrawn from them.

The meagre results in the political and constitutional fields, as well as in the economic, social, educational and public health fields in the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the colony of Papua, show that Australia, as the Administering Authority, is not implementing the obligations which it has under the Charter. This policy of the ruling circles of Australia with respect to the Trust Territory has very deep roots.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

Australia, just as any other colonial Power, is motivated in its policies concerning the Trust Territory, not by the interests of the people, as the representative of Australia tried to intimate here, but by completely different interests, by its own interests. It tries to gag other representatives here in order to prevent them from speaking before the Council, hoping to count on the colonial majority in the Council for support.

An analysis of the situation in Papua and New Guinea shows that in their efforts to keep this Territory under the colonial domination of the Australian Government at any cost, the Australians are guided by two main factors; first, by the imperialist efforts of the big monopolies to keep this Territory as a source of cheap raw material and cheap labour and also as a sphere for the investment of capital, capital which is extracting huge profits from the exploitation of this Territory, and, secondly, they are guided by factors of a military and strategic nature in the interests of carrying out an aggressive imperialist policy in Asia.

What concrete conclusions can be drawn from a study of the report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory for the period under review in the light of United Nations resolutions? Firstly, during the period under review the Administering Authority has not taken any concrete measures to fulfil the obligations imposed on it by the United Nations Charter, by the decisions and recommendations of the United Nations and, primarily, by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to colonial countries and peoples. New Guinea continues to remain a colony of Australia, and the Administering Authority is showing by its acts that it is trying to prolong indefinitely its period of domination over this Trust Territory. The Administering Authority has used the Trust Territory for its own selfish purposes, and it is concerned primarily with safeguarding its own interests and the interests of Australian and foreign monopolies. The peoples of the Territory continue to live under conditions of misery, poverty and illiteracy.

Further, the Administering Authority is going further along the road to the utilization of the Trust Territory for its own imperialist purposes, purposes which are incompatible with its obligations under the United Nations Charter and under the decisions taken at the twentieth and twenty-first session of the General Assembly concerning this Territory. The Administering Authority is taking

(Mrs. Anderson, United States)

My delegation is particularly aware of the many problems which New Guinea faces: over 700 languages or dialects are spoken, there is economic dependence on primary commodities, and there is a lack of internal capital, just to mention a few. These difficulties are similar to those found in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. However, it is clear that significant progress is being made, as attested to by such developments as the expansion of educational opportunities, the extension of the road system, increased economic investment and increased political development.

In his opening statement, the Special Representative emphasized that Australia's basic policy for Papua and New Guinea was self-determination at a time selected by the people themselves. In my delegation's view, this policy complies with the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The Administering Authority is pursuing its duty to advance the political growth of the people.

In this regard, my delegation was pleased to learn that the Administering Authority has continued to emphasize the development of local government. Since June 1965, more than 300,000 individuals have been added to the populace covered by local government councils, which means that at present more than three-fourths of the people are directly affected by their own elected governmental organs. In addition, my delegation was impressed by the voluntary change in the composition of the Council from wholly indigenous to partly multi-racial.

The local Government councils have broadly drawn terms of reference. My delegation would hope that the Administering Authority would follow a policy of actively encouraging the council to make increasingly full use of their powers. This policy would greatly increase the number of people with meaningful governmental and administrative experience.

The expansion of the House of Assembly and the elimination of special non-indigenous electorates are both welcome steps which will make the Assembly even more accurately representative of the people. The increase of fifteen elected members will allow additional capable men and women to gain high level legislative experience.

My delegation was pleased to learn that the duties of the Parliamentary Under-Secretaries have been more clearly defined as a result of an evaluation of the first two years of operation of this programme. This programme has been

(Mrs. Anderson, United States)

criticized by some in this Council as being merely advisory. I do not believe that such criticism was warranted. Certainly the ultimate responsibility for all decisions lies with the head of a department or the Administrator, but this does not mean that the department head alone makes all decisions. Mr. Zurecnuoc, the Under-Secretary for Finance, explained that he was frequently called upon for advice and counsel, and, furthermore, that he was able to affect both policy and operations.

It should be remembered that the purpose of the programme is not merely to place New Guineans in high level positions, but primarily to give them the practice and experience necessary to make wise decisions. I stated last year that this programme was probably the best method by which to qualify the indigenous people for their future tasks. On the basis of the reports we have heard, I am even more convinced of the value of the system.

Less than a year ago, the Select Committee on Constitutional Reform filed a report requesting certain legislative changes. My delegation was gratified to learn that all the requests were accepted by the Administering Authority and are now being put into practice. My delegation is very interested in the Committee's final report covering the Executive Branch. We would strongly urge the Administering Authority to give the most serious consideration to those of the Committee's suggestions which the House of Assembly decides to approve.

My delegation further believes that the House of Assembly should undertake a continuous programme of constitutional review. In addition to its educational functions, such a review would be a form of continuing self-determination. By accepting the responsibility of considering and deciding upon the form of government under which they will live, the people of New Guinea have taken a great step towards the completion of the process of self-determination.

Turning now to economic development, my delegation last year encouraged the Administering Authority to continue its efforts to develop the economic potential of the Territory, but it also noted the importance of rounding out the economic base of the Territory. My delegation is pleased to note that the Administering Authority presently expects the value of indigenous crop production to grow from less than 25 per cent of the total two years ago to about 30 per cent by 1969 or 1970. We were also pleased to hear of the establishment of a palm oil industry

(Mrs. Anderson, United States)

in New Britain and a tea industry in the Western and Southern highland districts. These industries may have a large impact on the indigenous sector of the economy. I was particularly gratified with the provisions in both industries that 50 per cent of the equity in production facilities will be held by indigenous people or by the Administration in the interests of all the people.

In reading the supplementary report, my delegation was struck by the export trade statistics. The figures are, of course, preliminary and subject to revision, but I believe they do roughly point to one major economic fact, Exports in the last half of 1966 were \$24 million, or about \$4 million per month. During the first three months of 1967, only about \$9 million were realized from exports, about \$3 million per month. Because the projected total exports for 1966-1967 are higher than for 1965-1966, I presume that the drop is a seasonal variation, but it does point out the difficulties inherent in an economy based on primary tropical commodities.

My delegation believes that the Administering Authority has made a start in diversifying the economy, particularly by the establishment of the Territorial Development Bank and the ship building industry in Rabaul. The ship building industry will both train the indigenous people in the Rabaul area and indirectly help to further unify the Territory by facilitating trade and communications.

The necessity of co-operation between the Territory and outside sources of development capital and know-how has been recognized by the Administration and the elected representatives of the people. The joint Conzinc Riotinto-Administration development of a copper deposit may double the Territory's export in the next few years. This proposed joint effort is desirable both because of the amount of revenue involved and because the people of the Territory will be assured of a 20 per cent equity interest in the operation. My delegation is most gratified with the latter provision. The potential value of this one development programme underscores the necessity of expanding the available knowledge of resources.

My delegation appreciates the fact that the Administration has done considerable work in surveying the mineral wealth of the Territory by means of an individual project system; but unco-ordinated surveys are bound to leave gaps in the available information. My delegation would like to suggest that the Administration should expand its efforts to collect comprehensive, basic geological and geophysical information about the Territory. Airborne surveys appear to be a logical first step. This type of information would be used to ~~xxxxx~~ attract investment and, most important, would be invaluable to the indigenous people in making informed decisions about the future status of their country. I understand that the initial subscription of \$1 million to the Development Bank was merely to allow the Bank to begin operations. My delegation would hope that the Administering Authority would continue to give full financial support to this excellent initiative.

In this regard I should like to note that only about eighty loans required disbursements of over \$3 million under an agricultural development scheme.

To conclude my comments on economic development, I should like to commend the House of Assembly for its determination that outside development capital should be welcomed as a benefit to the Territory and its peoples. This declaration must, of course, be read in conjunction with the policy of reserving large portions of all investments directly for the interests of the Territory and its people.

In connexion with educational development we note that there are now approximately 185,000 indigenous students. We are encouraged that the number of students is growing rapidly and the opportunities for education are being expanded. The University of Papua and New Guinea, the Goroka Teachers' College and the Institute of Higher Technical Education all enrolled their first students in the last year. I was happy to hear that appreciable numbers of women are attending high school and that some are continuing on to more advanced education. I am sure that their numbers will grow rapidly. In this connexion I recall the statement of the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, who once said that when you educate a man you educate only one individual, but when you educate a woman you educate a whole family.

In the field of education my delegation would hope that the Administration would persist in its efforts to bring all schools up to an acceptable standard and would attempt to bring educational opportunity to all parts of the Territory.

The United States is a multiracial society and my delegation is very conscious of the deleterious effects of racial discrimination. I am aware that racial discrimination has been outlawed in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, as it has in the United States, but I think we would all agree that legislation alone will not make the ideal a fact. The Trust Territory has before it two petitions which contain allegations of discrimination. The House of Assembly has undertaken to investigate the possibility that the Discriminatory Practices Ordinance of 1963 is not sufficient to prevent all forms of discrimination. I understood Mr. Eupu's answer to my question to be that his intention in proposing the investigatory committee was primarily to look into the educational system. This will be a good start, but my delegation would suggest that the House Of Assembly should initiate a continuing programme of looking into the enforcement of anti-discrimination statutes. It may be that the committee which Mr. Eupu initiated has this type of activity within its powers; if so, it should exercise them and should not limit itself to looking into discrimination in the educational system. I should note in passing that the Visiting Mission from the Trusteeship Council in 1965 did report that it found very little evidence of discrimination in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea.

I often think that it is rather presumptuous for those of us who work here in New York to reach such broad conclusions about a country that is halfway around the world from us and one which many of us have never even visited. Even with the comprehensive reports, such as those we have heard here on New Guinea, we are likely to make decisions or recommendations without adequate knowledge. The actual desires of the people whose futures we would affect should always be our most important guide in the conduct of our deliberations. For this reason I believe it is essential that leaders and representatives from the Territories which we are considering should come to New York to explain to us what they themselves think and what they themselves want their future to be. In this connexion I believe that both Mr. Zurecnuoc and Mr. Eupu, both freely elected representatives of their people, have been most helpful, and I want particularly to thank them not only for their presence and their candid comments and answers to our questions, but for the very constructive role that they have played here for us in the Trusteeship Council. They have told us their opinions concerning the future of New Guinea, which is certainly the subject which interests us all deeply; and I noted that their views

(Mrs. Anderson, United States)

did not necessarily always coincide with those of the members of this Council. Nor do they necessarily coincide always with those of the Administering Authority. But I believe that we should pay the closest attention to the desires of the people of Papua and New Guinea as expressed by their freely elected representatives, for they are the ones after all, the people of the Territory, who must live with the decisions that are made.

In conclusion I would say that the Administering Authority, in its annual report and in the statement by the Special Representative, declared that it is its policy to foster political development so as to bring the people of New Guinea as quickly as possible to the point where they will be able to manage their own affairs and determine their own future. This basic democratic principle -- that of fostering the most rapid development of political understanding while abiding by the "freely expressed wishes of the people concerned" -- is embodied in Article 76 of the Charter, in the Trusteeship Agreement, and in operative paragraph 5 of resolution 1514 (XV). It is my hope that the Trusteeship Council, in formulating its conclusions and recommendations concerning New Guinea, will be guided by these principles, for it is the welfare and self-determination of the peoples themselves which we must assure.

The PRESIDENT: There are no other names on the list of speakers for today. I would suggest to the Council that we should adjourn now and meet tomorrow afternoon when we would continue the general debate and hear first the representative of Liberia, followed by the final statement of the representative of Australia. We would also consider the Secretary-General's report in connexion with offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of the Trust Territories. Finally, we would proceed to the examination of petitions.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I apologize for interrupting, Madam President, but you were courteous enough to ask me earlier in the day when my delegation would be in a position to make its final statement, and I said that we would be prepared to make it tomorrow afternoon, if that suited you. That was, of course, on the understanding that the general debate would be concluded in the Council before then. It is very difficult for the representatives of the Administering Authority to prepare a final statement before they have had time to listen to and consider all

the observations of representatives and, preferably, to have a quick glance at least at the verbatim records. Therefore, I would suggest that our final statement should be made on the following day. In making this suggestion I have no wish to hold up the work of the Council -- on the contrary.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, I would suggest that we meet tomorrow and hear the representative of Liberia, take up the question of overseas training facilities and the examination of petitions, and then have the final statement of the Administering Authority on Thursday morning. I would suggest also that on Thursday we should hear the opening statement on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I understand that the Special Representative of the United States will be arriving in New York tomorrow evening and will be prepared to make his opening statement on 8 June.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.