

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1813th  
MEETING**

Monday, 16 December 1968,  
at 11.25 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council ( <i>continued</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolutions ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1
Agenda item 23:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Territories not considered separately ( <i>continued</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolutions ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	3

**Chairman: Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON**  
(Trinidad and Tobago).

**AGENDA ITEM 13**

**Report of the Trusteeship Council (*continued*)**  
**(A/7187, A/7204, A/C.4/L.925, A/C.4/L.928 and**  
**Corr.1)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS**  
(*continued*) (A/C.4/L.925, A/C.4/L.928 AND CORR.1)

1. Mr. ROGERS (Australia), referring to the two draft resolutions (A/C.4/L.925 and A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1), said that the subject-matter, Papua and New Guinea, was of great importance to Australia but of even greater importance to the people of the Territory, and he asked the Committee to base its attitude to the draft resolutions on the interests and wishes of those people. As regards operative paragraph 3 of the Liberian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.925), his delegation thought it should have some reference to the wishes of the indigenous population regarding a transfer of further powers to the elected representatives of the people. The paragraph called for action which was already in process. His delegation had reported on the recent general elections in New Guinea, the increase in executive power exercised by elected representatives, and the expansion of local government in the Territory. The wishes of the people would be the decisive element in the rate of transfer of power to their elected representatives. Operative paragraph 4 requested the administering Power to accelerate the indigenization of the civil service; it was the stated policy of the Administration to accelerate localization as rapidly as possible. Since 1963 no Australian could be permanently appointed to the New Guinea public service, but could be engaged only on a contract basis. It was necessary to recruit expatriate staff until there

were enough local people trained to occupy senior positions. Operative paragraph 5 was a reasonable request; significant assistance was already being given to the Territory by United Nations and specialized agencies. His delegation would vote in favour of that draft resolution.

2. The other draft resolution (A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1), contained erroneous and offensive statements. In operative paragraph 2 the General Assembly regretted that resolutions 2227 (XXI) and 2348 (XXII) had not been implemented. Those resolutions had contained statements and assertions about conditions in the Territory which were factually wrong and for that reason the resolutions could not be implemented. Operative paragraph 3 (*a*) called for the fixing of an early date for self-determination and independence. The over-all objective of the Administration was to prepare the Territory for self-determination, but the fixing of a date for self-determination was the responsibility of the indigenous people alone. The objective was self-determination by the people as a whole; a process in which all would participate. Sub-paragraph (*b*) was offensive. Free elections, based on adult universal suffrage with a common electoral roll, had been held in the Territory in February and March of 1968. To call for new elections under United Nations supervision would be to imply that those elections were not a valid expression of the popular will and that there was something wrong with them, and that would be derogatory to the dignity, standing and authority of the House of Assembly. The United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of New Guinea, 1968, had spoken well of the elections. The Fourth Committee should take a friendly interest in the operations of freely elected legislatures in dependent Territories. It should not adopt resolutions which ignored those legislatures or showed a lack of understanding of the democratic processes by which members of those legislatures were elected.

3. In conclusion, he read out the statement made on 12 December 1968 by the Australian Minister for External Territories, who had said that the basic goal of his country's policy with regard to Papua and New Guinea was self-determination based on the economic, social and political advancement of the population. Some people argued that the Government should set target dates and other precise goals for political development, but such an approach would not be in harmony with basic policy. Changes might take place in present attitudes. In fact, the situation was changing rapidly, thanks to the transformation of the economy and the spread of education. Responsible government, or real independence of thought or action, was inconsistent with continued heavy dependence on outside assistance. His Government would act in accordance with the wishes of the bulk of the people but it was trying to follow policies which would accelerate economic development and hasten progress towards self-reliance.

4. His delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1 and would ask for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

5. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be suspended so that certain delegations could attend the plenary meeting of the General Assembly and take part in the vote on an important draft resolution on Namibia.

*The meeting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.20 p.m.*

6. Mr. COX (Canada) expressed the view that real economic and educational progress had been made in Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. The participation of UNESCO and IBRD in the five-year economic development plan showed that the international community could have confidence in the Territories. It should be remembered that the Australian Government was tackling a difficult task which, according to the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of New Guinea, 1968,<sup>1</sup> it was successfully accomplishing. It was clear that the administering Power was promoting the economic and political development of the people to prepare them to exercise the right of self-determination. For those reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.925 and against draft resolution A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1, which in its opinion did not reflect the true situation.

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that Sierra Leone had withdrawn from the list of sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.928/Corr.1).

8. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution submitted by the Afro-Asian group (A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1) gave a more comprehensive picture of the situation in the Territories and it was not by chance that the Australian representative had protested against it. It was clear that, as was stated in operative paragraph 2, Australia had not yet fully implemented the relevant United Nations resolutions and was still trying to convince the world that the people of the Territories were not ready to exercise the right of self-determination. It was also clear that little progress had been made in their economic development and that all the production was orientated towards the Australian market.

9. With regard to the Liberian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.925), he saw no justification for the reference in operative paragraph 1 to the Trusteeship Agreement of 13 December 1946, for that agreement did not provide for the establishment of a date for the independence of the Territories. Furthermore, the reference to the agreement ran counter to the General Assembly resolutions which called for the elimination of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories. It should be borne in mind that at the twenty-first and twenty-second sessions the General Assembly had reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Papua and New Guinea to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), without any reference to the Trusteeship Agreement of 1946. That practice should be continued. For

those reasons, his delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.4/L.925.

10. Mr. ADLAN (Malaysia) expressed his conviction that Australia was making efforts to promote the economic advancement of the Territory and that steps had been taken to transfer political power to the people of the Territories, although there were still some aspects that could be improved. His delegation would therefore support the Liberian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.925) and would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1.

11. Mr. LUARD (United Kingdom) said that he was pleased that the Visiting Mission to Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea had been able to see the progress made as a result of the action taken by the administering Power. Important features of that progress were the new local government councils, which enabled the people to play a greater part, the increased economic aid given by Australia and the steps taken to develop agriculture. With regard to education, he drew attention to the increase in enrolments in technical schools at the University of Papua and New Guinea and in teacher training.

12. The situation was therefore clear and there could be no doubt that the administering Power intended to prepare the Territories for independence at the right moment. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Liberia, since it took cognizance of the constitutional progress which had taken place in the Territory and reaffirmed the people's right to self-determination and independence. On the other hand, he would vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1 because he could not accept the contents of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

13. Mr. EL MASRY (United Arab Republic) said that his country maintained that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be implemented immediately in Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Despite General Assembly resolutions 2227 (XXI) and 2348 (XXII), Australia refused to set a date for the independence of the Territories, on the pretext that the people did not yet desire either self-government or independence and were not able to understand the meaning of those concepts. That attitude was contrary to resolution 1514 (XV), in which it was stated that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence. His country did not believe that the people of Papua and New Guinea were not ready for independence or that they lacked a sense of nationality. If that were so, it would only prove that the administering Power had failed to carry out its task.

14. Furthermore, there were reasons for fearing that Australia intended to annex the Territories and for believing that there were, in fact, parties in the Territories which advocated self-determination; in addition, there was nothing to show that the administering Power was complying with paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) relating to military activities.

15. He thought that the General Assembly should send a special mission to Papua and New Guinea. He would vote in

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 2 (T/1690).

favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1, which represented a conciliatory solution. Finally, he appealed to the Liberian delegation not to divorce itself from the rest of the Afro-Asian countries by pressing its own draft resolution.

16. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) recalled that, during the more than twenty years in which the United Nations had been in existence, many countries had achieved independence, with a resultant increase in the number of members of various United Nations bodies. On the other hand, the Trusteeship Council was a body based on conditions prevailing twenty years earlier and its composition had not changed. The question arose, therefore, whether it was a good instrument of progress in decolonization, particularly when it was borne in mind that some of its members, such as Australia, had abstained when the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had been adopted.

17. Since the Trusteeship Council was under the authority of the General Assembly, the latter was responsible for Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea and must defend the right of the people of those Territories to freedom and independence. He therefore called upon all the members of the Committee to support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1.

18. Mr. CAINE (Liberia) wished to make it clear that his country had not divorced itself from the Afro-Asian group; the reason why two draft resolutions had been submitted on the same topic was to be found in the breakdown of the system of consultation. His country's draft resolution had been submitted first; it sought to offer an objective appraisal of the present situation in Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. His delegation did not wish in any way to delay the progress of the people of the Territories towards self-determination.

19. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) proposed that, in view of the statements made by the Liberian representative and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.928 and Corr.1, and the latter's desire to hold further consultations, discussion of the item should be deferred until the afternoon meeting.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to defer discussion of the matter until the afternoon meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 23

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Territories not considered separately (*continued*)\* (A/7121**

**and Add.1-5, A/7127, A/7200/Rev.1, chaps. X-XIV and XVIII-XXXI; A/7278, A/7319, A/7343, A/7371, A/C.4/L.911 and Add.1-8, A/C.4/L.926, A/C.4/L.927, A/C.4/L.932)**

### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*) (A/C.4/L.911 AND ADD.1-8, A/C.4/L.926, A/C.4/L.927)

21. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the three draft resolutions which had been submitted in respect of Territories covered by agenda item 23: draft resolution A/C.4/L.911 and Add.1-8 concerning the question of Gibraltar, draft resolution A/C.4/L.926 concerning Ifni and Spanish Sahara, and draft resolution A/C.4/L.927 concerning twenty-four Territories. He noted that the Secretary-General had submitted a statement (A/C.4/L.932) of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.4/L.926.

22. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) said that for nearly two weeks the Tunisian delegation and his own had engaged in consultations on behalf of the Afro-Asian group on the draft resolution relating to Ifni and Spanish Sahara (A/C.4/L.926). The sole aim of those consultations had been to assist the delegations concerned to reach an agreement on a common basis of action on the problem at the current session. The consultations had been undertaken with the Moroccan and Mauritanian delegations, which were directly concerned with the situation in the Territories, and the Algerian delegation.

23. The provisions of the draft resolution did not, in the main, differ from those of the previous year's draft resolution. Section I, dealing with Ifni, embodied the same provisions as resolution 2354 (XXII). Section II, dealing with Spanish Sahara, reaffirmed the principle of self-determination as a key to the solution of the problem of so-called Spanish Sahara. The formula "any other interested party" had no exclusive meaning and covered also the interest manifested by Algeria in a harmonious settlement of that colonial problem. Paragraph 4 of section II sought to ensure that a special United Nations mission should visit the Territory of so-called Spanish Sahara and submit a report to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. That was a significant change from the previous year's draft resolution and the sponsors hoped that the administering Power would facilitate the sending of the mission and that the special mission's report would be available to the Committee at the twenty-fourth session. The sponsors hoped that the Spanish Government would facilitate the full implementation of paragraph 4.

24. In conclusion, he thanked the delegations which had taken part in the consultations for the restraint that they had exercised in many of the difficult moments during those consultations. He also thanked the Tunisian representative for the effective and constructive role he had played in the efforts to lay a basis for draft resolution A/C.4/L.926. He proposed that the draft resolution should be put to the vote at the present meeting and be given priority over the other draft resolutions dealing with the same agenda item.

25. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that he did not object to priority being given to draft resolution A/C.4/L.926 in the

\* Resumed from the 1808th meeting.

voting and he was prepared to support the proposal. He pointed out, however, that the other draft resolutions dealing with the same agenda item must also be put to the vote. In view of the advanced hour, he wondered whether a vote would be taken only on the draft resolution dealing with Ifni and Spanish Sahara, or whether all the draft resolutions would be voted on at the afternoon meeting.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the late hour, it might be preferable to defer the voting until the afternoon. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that procedure.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*