

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1664th
 MEETING**

Friday, 9 December 1966,
 at 3.15 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>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: French Somaliland (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate and consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.847 (continued)</i>	467
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	471
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Request concerning St. Vincent (agenda item 23)</i>	474

Chairman: Mr. FAKHREDDINE Mohamed
 (Sudan).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Kanakarathne (Ceylon), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

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: French Somaliland (continued) (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. XII; A/6401, A/6538 and Add.1, A/6558, A/C.4/676, A/C.4/L.847/Rev.1)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.847/REV.1 (continued)

1. Mr. PANNI (Pakistan) complimented the Rapporteur 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 on the excellent and exhaustive report on French Somaliland (Djibouti) (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. XII). The record of French control of the Territory did not appear to be a very happy one. France had exploited the Territory to the detriment of the national interests of the people and had made only half-hearted attempts to educate them and to help them in other ways. He was glad that the administering Power had now decided to hold a referendum in the Territory before July 1967 in order to enable the people to decide their political future. That deci-

sion was in keeping with the enlightened policies for which France was known and respected. He hoped that it would be possible to keep to the date which had been announced. He considered it essential that there should be a United Nations presence in the Territory to supervise the referendum and he hoped that France would follow the example set by Spain with regard to Spanish Sahara and agree to co-operate with a United Nations mission. If the referendum was held under United Nations auspices, it would not be open to question but would be regarded as a true indication of the wishes of the people.

2. His country maintained the best of relations with France and its criticisms of that country's policy in its overseas Territories were made in a constructive spirit in keeping with the present-day trend towards national independence and self-determination. He urgently appealed to the administering Power to grant the people of the Territory the right of self-determination at an early date so that they might freely decide their own political destiny and develop their institutions according to their history, traditions and genius.

3. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation found it difficult to accept the principle that French Somaliland was an integral part of France, especially when the people of the Territory had not had an opportunity to express their point of view concerning their Constitution. France had made it clear, however, that it was in favour of self-determination and, without being asked by the United Nations, had announced that a referendum would be held to give the population of the Territory an opportunity to express their free choice concerning their political future. His delegation had taken France's realistic attitude into account in taking up a position on draft resolution A/C.4/L.847/Rev.1. Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution requested the administering Power to accept a United Nations presence in the Territory. Knowing the French attitude to that question, he was convinced that paragraph 4 would not be implemented, if adopted, and it did not, in any case, compromise the pursuit of the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). That being so, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of paragraph 4 if it was put to a separate vote. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, subject to the reservations he had stated.

4. Mr. ADAN (Somalia) said that the current session of the General Assembly was called upon to make a significant contribution to the peace, well-being and stability of a strategically important part of the world, by paving the way for self-determination for the people of French Somaliland. There was no doubt that the era of colonialism and imperialism, which were

incompatible with the principles of equal rights and self-determination, was over. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, had made that clear. That resolution did not mention referenda or plebiscites as conditions for independence. It reaffirmed the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence. In his delegation's view, self-determination presupposed independence, since it was only after they had gained independence that the people of a country could determine their own future. Paragraph 5 of the Declaration, taken in conjunction with the rest of the Declaration, clearly meant that colonial peoples had a right to independence without any reservations and that it was their freely expressed will and desire which should determine the modalities for the transition to independence. Colonial Powers had increasingly recognized that right to independence and had agreed to independence for former colonial territories without plebiscites or referenda, as had been the case in his own country.

5. There was no question that the people of French Somaliland had a right to independence without conditions or reservations and that that was in conformity with the United Nations Charter and resolution 1514 (XV). His Government would have been happier if the administering Power had set a specific date for the attainment of independence and had planned an appropriate programme of economic, social and political development. Instead, it had decided to hold a referendum giving the people the choice of retaining their status as an overseas Territory of the French Republic or opting for independence. His Government was not opposed to the referendum, but the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to independence made it essential to ensure absolute fairness in the conditions in which the referendum was to be held. He did not question the good faith of the French Government, but it was the duty of the United Nations to ensure that the people of the Territory were able to exercise their right to self-determination in complete freedom.

6. It was a complicated matter to ascertain the will of a people, whether by an election, a plebiscite or a referendum, and the outcome often depended on technical questions, such as the registration of voters, residence requirements, the situation of voting places, timing, and so on. Such matters could be of decisive importance when dealing with a largely nomadic and illiterate population, such as that of French Somaliland. A long-established colonial régime was also at a great advantage in being able to influence the outcome of a referendum in various psychological ways, by making dark prophecies and specific threats, for instance, in order to induce the people to vote against independence.

7. His Government had been greatly disturbed by the debate in the French National Assembly on 2 December 1966 concerning the referendum, arrangements for which had been approved at first reading. The voters were to be asked whether they wished the Territory to remain within the framework of the French Republic under a remodelled Statute regarding its government and administration, the essential contents of which were outlined in a summary several hundred

words long. The proposed Statute, incidentally, did not conceal the non-self-governing character of the Territory. No specific question would be asked concerning independence. The French Minister for Overseas Territories had made it clear in the debate that, if the people of French Somaliland chose independence, they would have to accept the risks of such a course. Independence, he had said, would bring civil war and foreign invasion and it would be difficult for France to give financial or technical assistance to a country which would be unable to fulfil its obligations. Many speakers in the National Assembly, including Mr. Mitterand, a former French Minister for Overseas Territories, and the deputies from French Somaliland and Martinique, had expressed alarm at the resentful attitude of the French Government, which some had described as blackmail. The deputy from French Somaliland had said that the people of the Territory had never intended to remain for ever under French domination, but wanted to be, like the other people of French Africa, true friends of France. As Mr. Mitterand had said, France had accepted the independence of the French-speaking Territories which, in 1958, had voted for continued status within the French Union, and there was no reason why it should discriminate against French Somaliland if that Territory chose the same course. His delegation hoped that the attitude shown by the French Government during that debate would not prevail, since it would create the gravest doubts about the fairness of the referendum. Moreover, the decisions regarding French Somaliland would be considered by many French deputies as setting a precedent for other French overseas Territories.

8. It was even admitted in France now that the outcome of the referendum which had been held in French Somaliland in 1958 had not truly expressed the free will of the people. The Territory had a relatively small population and there was great need for scrupulous fairness in the conduct of the voting. A very small number of additional votes in favour of independence in 1958 would have reversed the outcome, yet tens of thousands of inhabitants had been excluded from participation in the referendum. The demonstrations which had taken place in the Territory in the summer of 1966 during the visit of President de Gaulle had revealed that the people's longing for freedom had grown in intensity. It was regrettable that, following those demonstrations, the French authorities had resorted to police measures such as expulsions and arrests, which had resulted in the deaths of several people and injuries to hundreds of others. Those measures were continuing. Between August and November 1966, almost 6,000 men, women and children, virtually all destitute, had been either deported or compelled to leave the Territory for fear of persecution and were now in the Somali Republic, where they represented both a human and an economic problem. Several international organizations, including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, had given assistance and the Somali Government had been in contact with the French authorities in an endeavour to arrange for the refugees to return to French Somaliland. If they were not allowed, or did not dare, to return in time to be registered for the referendum, the referendum could not be considered fair. Moreover, the three-year

residence qualification for participation in the referendum should not be used to deprive the political refugees and deportees of their right to vote; 6,000 votes out of a total population of 100,000 could have a considerable effect on the outcome of the referendum. In order to dispel any doubts about the fairness of the referendum, the administering Power should be asked to arrange for United Nations supervision.

9. If the people of French Somaliland chose independence, it was the responsibility of the French Government to ensure that there would be an orderly and peaceful transfer of power to the people and it was the duty of the United Nations to ascertain at an early date what constitutional and political arrangements were being made by the French Government to meet such an eventuality.

10. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) asked whether any reply had been received from the representative of the administering Power to the request that he should speak in the debate on French Somaliland at an early stage.

11. The CHAIRMAN replied that no reply had so far been received.

12. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia) said that he appreciated the efforts which had been made to reconcile the different views on the item under consideration. In its approach to the question his delegation was guided by the resolution which had been adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its third ordinary session, held in November 1966 (see A/6538), which represented a compromise achieved after long negotiations. His Government adhered fully to that resolution, which it considered the starting point for an African approach to the problem.

13. He drew attention to a letter (A/6538/Add.1) which he had addressed to the Secretary-General on 9 December 1966, subsequent to a letter which had been addressed to the Secretary-General by the representative of Somalia (A/6558), in which he had confirmed that, although neither Ethiopia nor Somalia had sponsored the OAU resolution, both had voted in favour of the resolution in its final form.

14. His delegation was now in general agreement with the draft resolution under consideration, since the paragraph referring to the OAU resolution had been reintroduced. He concluded by reserving the right of his delegation to explain the position of his Government when the vote on the draft resolution had been taken.

15. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Niger) pointed out that his country was one of those formerly under French domination which had been given independence unconditionally. His delegation had always strongly supported the complete decolonization of all African Territories and had been a co-sponsor of many resolutions designed to achieve that end. His Government supported unreservedly the resolution which had been adopted by the OAU in November 1966 concerning the referendum to be held in French Somaliland. He hoped that the French Government would accelerate the process of decolonization in the Territory. It had already decided to hold a referendum and that deci-

sion had been approved by the French Parliament. His delegation did not question the good faith of the administering Power, since it had decolonized more than twenty African Territories. The draft resolution therefore served no useful purpose and his delegation would not take part in the vote.

16. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation shared the views which had been expressed by the Administrative Secretary-General of the OAU at a meeting of the Special Committee held at Addis Ababa in June 1966 that small Territories were as important as large ones and that all African Territories must be freed from foreign domination (see A/6300/Rev.1, chap. II, para. 241). Resolution 1514 (XV) must be implemented in all colonial territories, without exception, and all peoples, including the people of French Somaliland, must be given the right to self-determination and independence.

17. During 1966 the Special Committee had heard many representatives of the people of French Somaliland, both in Africa and in New York. The information they had provided showed that the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory were subjected to colonial exploitation, that their political rights and freedoms were restricted and that freedom of activity was not permitted to political parties which were in favour of freedom and independence for the Territory. Nevertheless, the movement for independence was gaining strength, as had been shown by the demonstrations in Djibouti in August and September 1966. The French Minister for Overseas Territories had stated that those demonstrations were indicative of a genuinely national political thinking, and the French Government had decided to hold a referendum. The resolution which had recently been adopted by the OAU on the subject had expressed the hope that the voting would be conducted on a free, democratic and impartial basis. His delegation considered the provisions of that resolution very timely. Their implementation would undoubtedly help to create the necessary conditions for the people of French Somaliland to exercise their right to freedom and independence in strict accordance with resolution 1514 (XV). The General Assembly should reaffirm the right of the people of French Somaliland to freedom and independence and appeal to the administering Power to discharge its obligations to the people of the Territory by giving them a real opportunity to express their wishes freely in the referendum.

18. The draft resolution corresponded to the requirements of the moment and was designed to ensure the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) in respect of the people of French Somaliland. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of it.

19. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) said that the fact that his delegation had not participated fully in the debate on French Somaliland did not mean that his country was not concerned about the critical situation in that French colony. On the contrary, his delegation would strive for the emancipation of French Somaliland as for that of any other colony and held that the people of that Territory had a right to self-determination and independence.

20. There seemed to be a misunderstanding with regard to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Some delegations appeared to feel that there was no need for a United Nations presence in French Somaliland. In his delegation's view, nothing could be further from the truth. His delegation was convinced that such a presence was absolutely essential in order to ensure that the people of the Territory were able to express their will freely. His delegation wished to make it clear that in advocating a United Nations presence in French Somaliland, it was not impugning the good faith of the French Government. What was most important was the interests of the people of French Somaliland, and his delegation was sure that it was expressing the views of the oppressed people of that Territory in calling on the delegations which opposed the United Nations presence to reconsider their position.

21. The representative of Niger had spoken about the good faith of France. The Zambian delegation agreed that France's decolonization record was admittedly not the worst in the world, but the fact was that France was a colonialist Power and had inflicted untold suffering on the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa. No colonial Power relinquished its colonies without pressure from the nationalists. It was the historical events sweeping Asia and Africa that had forced the colonial Powers to retreat. A few months previously, when General de Gaulle had been in French Somaliland, the people had demonstrated and demanded self-determination and complete independence from France. In his delegation's view, there could be no doubt regarding the wishes of the people of French Somaliland and it was the duty of the United Nations to do its utmost to ensure that they achieved their objective.

22. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He hoped that the delegations which had spoken against the draft resolution would take his words seriously and would accept the draft resolution as it stood.

23. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) said that his delegation wished to pay a tribute to all the parties concerned for their wise approach to the question of French Somaliland and for the desire which they had shown to achieve a peaceful settlement. Somalia and Ethiopia were linked by ties of history, culture and trade, and their desire to avoid physical conflict set an example for others to follow.

24. His delegation would have no difficulty in supporting the draft resolution.

25. Mr. MAHMUD (Nigeria) said that, in introducing the draft resolution at the previous meeting, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had made it clear that operative paragraph 4 was in no way intended to question the good faith of the French Government. On the contrary, its purpose was to assist the French Government, which had already announced its decision to hold a referendum in French Somaliland. Moreover, the sponsors felt that it would be in the interests both of fair play and of the French Government itself if that Government accepted a United Nations mission. A United Nations presence before and supervision during the holding

of the referendum would ensure that the results accurately reflected the views of the population.

26. He called on delegations which still had reservations to reconsider their position. He assured them that the sponsors had no intention whatever of questioning the integrity of the French Government but felt that paragraph 4 would promote the interests of that Government and of the people of the Territory.

27. Mr. SIDIBE (Niger), replying to the Zambian representative's remarks, said that Niger had fought against colonialism for twenty years and that its position on the question of French Somaliland did not mean that it had abandoned its anti-colonialist policy.

28. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that the problem of French Somaliland was not a question which concerned France alone. French Somaliland was part of the African continent, which had been divided among the colonial Powers. Members should never forget that essential point.

29. In the 1958 referendum French Somaliland had voted to remain under French rule, but it was obvious that the people had been unable to express their true wishes. Many petitioners had asked for United Nations supervision of the forthcoming referendum, and in his delegation's opinion the people of French Somaliland had a right to request United Nations assistance. It was only the demonstrations that had taken place during President de Gaulle's recent visit to the Territory that had made France decide to hold a referendum. The people of the Territory had requested a United Nations presence to supervise the referendum and the United Nations should comply with their request.

30. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, thanked the representative of Niger for the respectful way in which he had referred to the Zambian delegation's remarks. His delegation did not question Niger's stand in the struggle against colonialism. He had merely been appealing to the delegations which had not spoken in favour of the draft resolution under consideration. Zambia admired the efforts which the people of Niger were making to develop their country and which contributed to the prosperity and unity of Africa. He agreed with the Guinean representative that the problem of French Somaliland should not be regarded as a question that involved the French Government alone; that concerned the entire United Nations. It was with that fact in mind that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

31. He saw nothing wrong in calling for a United Nations visiting mission. Indeed, such a mission had been appointed recently to go to Aden. It was well known that colonial Powers had rigged the elections in some countries, with the result that the outcome of those elections had not reflected the true wishes of the population. All colonial Powers had economic, financial and strategic interests to protect and they could not be trusted. The French Government expected the people of French Somaliland to vote in favour of remaining under French rule and had said that, if they did not, it would discontinue all economic and financial aid to the Territory. It was the duty of the United Nations to ensure that France did not resort to the familiar tactic of setting up a puppet régime.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)
(A/6304, A/6363, A/6364)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

32. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that unfortunately he had not heard the Australian representative's statement at the previous meeting but felt that that representative had probably painted a rosy picture of the conditions prevailing in New Guinea and Papua. The Australian representative had probably not mentioned the fact that Australians in the Territory earned ten times as much as the indigenous inhabitants for the same work and that there was a vast difference between the living conditions of Australians and those of the indigenous inhabitants. The schools in the Territory were still segregated. The Administering Authority had said that the racial separation of students in A and T schools was due to language difficulties. Hospitals, too, were segregated: there were paying wards for Australians and non-paying wards for indigenous persons. No indigenous person, regardless of his ability to pay, was admitted to paying wards.

33. The Liberian delegation had objected to the practice of reserving ten seats for Whites in the New Guinean House of Assembly. It had deplored the fact that aliens were given the right under Australian administration to legislate on behalf of the indigenous inhabitants. His delegation therefore attached great importance to the statement of the Minister of State for Territories on 20 October 1966 that the ten seats would be abolished and replaced by fifteen regional seats open to candidates with a minimum educational qualification. The Liberian delegation wondered why special qualifications should be required for candidates for some seats and not for others. Australia had said that it was because the people of New Guinea wished to have Australian members in the House of Assembly. He refused to accept that explanation because there were Australians who had won the respect of the indigenous inhabitants and had been elected to the ordinary seats, for which there were no educational requirements. His delegation regarded the practice of reserving regional seats as discriminatory and felt that it should be discontinued. Discrimination was also practised in the recruitment of teachers. He was not concerned with Australia's policies in its own territory, but he felt strongly about the fact that Australia was attempting to apply its racial policies in Territories which did not belong to it.

34. The Liberian delegation regretted that no details had been given of the use to which Australia's annual grant to the Territory was put. Much of that money was used to pay the salaries of Australian citizens. The people of the Territory were obliged to build their own schools, but the Administering Authority had actually built a large hospital at Port Moresby.

35. Although there were many industries in the Territory which could be developed, the Administering Authority had discouraged such development in order to avoid competition with its own industries. Prospecting surveys in the Territory had revealed the existence of valuable minerals. The people wanted to be able to enjoy the benefits of those resources. The Administering Authority should refrain from

signing long-term leases with Australian and foreign companies which would be binding on the people when they came—he hoped before long—to manage their own affairs.

Mr. Fakhreddine (Sudan) took the Chair.

36. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that the Guinean delegation had always expressed its views regarding each colonial problem before the Committee and that it would in future pay increasing attention to the Trusteeship Council, which confined itself to praising the policies of the Administering Authorities.

37. Australia continued to pursue the same unacceptable paternalist policy in New Guinea and Nauru. In the past, colonized peoples had been told that they were incapable of managing their own affairs; yet they had attained independence and were happy to be their own masters. He saw no reason why Australia should be allowed to act as it wished with regard to the Territories under its administration. It was a colonial Power, which masqueraded behind a façade of philanthropy. He would like to see New Guineans serving in the Fourth Committee as representatives of a sovereign State instead of sitting behind the Australian representative.

38. He asked the Australian delegation when members could expect to see New Guinea join the international community as an independent State.

39. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) thought that it was unrealistic to approach colonial questions as if there was only one kind of colonialism. The situation was not always the same. Where the necessary conditions for viable independence were present but an administering Power was reluctant to relinquish power, pressure needed to be applied. Where an administering Power adamantly refused even to recognize the concept of self-determination, stronger measures and even invasion were justified. Where, however, an administering Power was doing its utmost to prepare a people for independence, what was required was constructive suggestions based on a careful study of all aspects of the matter.

40. There were no restrictions on travel to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. The Administering Authority had nothing to hide. He himself had had an opportunity to speak to the inhabitants, and he was convinced that the Territory was not yet capable of independent existence. He had also had an opportunity to speak with members of various groups in Australia and had found that there was wide concern about the needs of the people of Papua and New Guinea, and the necessity for greater efforts to overcome disease and illiteracy there and to lead the people to self-government. The Australians therefore deserved encouragement in the efforts they were making. He noted, in that regard, that considerable resources had been devoted to the Territory during the last decade.

41. In discussions with the indigenous people of Papua and New Guinea, he had found that their general reaction was to ask for time to prepare for independence. He, for his part, had pointed out to them that the trend in the world was for rapid advance in that direction.

42. He would not discuss the question of foreign military bases, for he considered that that subject should be left to the relevant United Nations organ.

43. There were certain fears that the inhabitants of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea might establish friendly relations with Australia after independence. He did not see how there could be any objection to that if Australia did not use coercion to bring it about.

44. With regard to economic development, it was easy to plan economic projects on paper, but Australia's critics should reflect on the difficulties experienced in their own countries when it came to the practical execution of projects.

45. Mr. ZOHRAH (New Zealand) said that the Trusteeship Council, at its thirty-third session, had been given convincing evidence of economic progress in New Guinea; the Administering Authority, in his view, was to be congratulated, in particular, on the steps it had taken to give effect to the recommendations of the recent Mission from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. That Mission had attached special importance to accelerating the increase in the numbers and output of indigenous New Guinean agricultural producers, and it had been encouraging to learn of the substantial increases in agricultural production reported by the Special Representative of the Administering Authority in the Trusteeship Council (A/6304, para. 158). The figures attained exceeded, in most cases, the target figures suggested by the Bank Mission. Vital to that expansion was the provision of adequate credit facilities for the indigenous producers. In 1965, the House of Assembly had passed a bill to establish a development bank which would provide credit for primary producers and for industrial and commercial undertakings. Provided that the bank was given adequate capital and that the terms on which credit was granted were sufficiently liberal, the new institution could make a decisive contribution to the Territory's economic development. The New Zealand delegation was impressed by Australia's determination to hasten economic development in the Territory, as evidenced by the tripling of Australia's contribution to its finances over a period of ten years. Equally impressive was the fact that the amount of revenue raised in the Territory itself had increased proportionately, providing encouraging evidence of economic growth. As economic expansion gained momentum, the need for investment capital would rise to much higher levels.

46. In the political field, the Select Committee set up by the House of Assembly in 1965 had presented its second interim report and the Administering Authority had acted promptly on its recommendations. The Select Committee, which had a majority of elected parliamentarians and a New Guinean Chairman, was playing a significant role in the process of self-determination and its findings merited the closest study.

47. The Select Committee had spared no effort to ascertain the views of the people of the Territory as a whole. Vigorous steps had been taken to inform the people of the Committee's visit and its purposes in advance, and the Committee had reported that even in remote stations, the people had been prepared for the

visit; the local government councils had often drafted written submissions, and councillors and people had often travelled long distances over many days in order to present their views to the Committee. Ninety-three places in all had been visited by the Committee during its tour.

48. In conformity with the Select Committee's recommendations, the Australian Government had swiftly introduced legislation to increase the number of ordinary seats in the Assembly from forty-four to sixty-nine, to abolish the ten seats reserved for non-indigenous residents and to establish fifteen regional seats open to candidates holding the Territory Intermediate Certificate. The increase in the number of ordinary seats was to be welcomed; it would decrease the size of electoral constituencies and thus allow closer contact between the voters and their representatives. With regard to the regional seats, the Select Committee had found that there was a convincing case for maintaining a special category of member whose special gifts or range of experience would enable him to make a distinctive contribution to the work of the House of Assembly. It had been found that there was no longer an overwhelming demand by the people for a special form of non-indigenous representation, a fact which indicated a healthy trend in opinion. The decision that elections to the regional seats would be conducted on a common roll was also to be welcomed. The existence of special categories of seats was a recognition of particular circumstances of a transitional nature. It was to be expected that they would disappear in due course.

49. He had been interested in the passages of the Select Committee's report dealing with the question of the control of internal revenue. It was desirable that the House of Assembly should rapidly acquire real responsibilities in the management of the Territory's finances, though while the Administering Authority furnished about two-thirds of the Territory's financial resources there was some justification for the Australian Government's retaining an interest in the Territory's expenditure. What was sought at present was no more than participation in the disbursement of locally raised revenue. He had noted, in that connexion, the recent statements by the Australian Minister for Territories regarding Australia's determination to widen the measure of financial autonomy of the Territory and to extend the whole area of self-government.

50. New Zealand's consistent preoccupation in the Fourth Committee had been to see the people of dependent Territories brought to the exercise of self-determination without delay. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and had consistently sought the application of its principles. It should not be overlooked, however, that paragraph 5 of the Declaration contained in that resolution proclaimed that all powers should be transferred to the peoples of dependent Territories "in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire". It was the people's wishes which should be decisive in the last analysis. It was clear from the report on constitutional development drawn up by elected representatives of the New Guinean people that, at the present juncture, it was not the desire of the people of the Trust Terri-

tory of New Guinea to seek the immediate transfer of all powers to them. That incontrovertible fact could not be overlooked. The Administering Authority had affirmed its intention, whenever the New Guineans decided otherwise, of complying with their wishes. In April 1966, the Minister for Territories had stated that it was the prerogative of the Territory's people to terminate the present status and seek independent status if they so wished.

51. With regard to Nauru, there was little to be said about social and educational conditions: the people enjoyed a high standard of living, as was appropriate in the case of a people blessed with a rich natural resource. As far as political development was concerned, the Legislative Council called for in General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX) had been set up and had moved vigorously to confront the problems facing the Nauruans. An Executive Council had also been functioning for some six months. Those two bodies had been established in response to the request of the Nauruans themselves and were conceived as a step towards self-determination. As for the political future, the whole question was being discussed with representatives of the Nauruan people and he wished to reaffirm that it was not the purpose of the New Zealand Government or of the other two Governments involved to deny self-determination to the proud and able people of Nauru.

52. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he would like to correct some of the statements made by the Liberian representative. It was not a fact that schools in New Guinea were segregated. Racial discrimination in the schools was outlawed by legislation. There was, for example, an excellent high school at Rabaul attended by some 225 children, who were distributed in roughly equal proportions among four groups — Europeans, Chinese, indigenous children and children of mixed race. That was one of many schools where such a situation was to be found.

53. With regard to hospitals, it was not true that paying wards were restricted to Australians. They were open to people of all races who wished to pay. The Liberian representative had spoken as if the large hospital at Port Moresby, which had cost almost \$2.5 million just to build and equip, was unique. The fact was that there were similar hospitals at a number of other centres in the Territory.

54. The Liberian representative had suggested that the Australian grant to the Territory was not used to build schools. In fact, a large percentage of it was spent on schools. The schools were built by the Administration, except in a few cases where local governments, by their own choice and with the assistance of the Administration, built their own schools.

55. The purpose of the new regional seats open to candidates with a minimum educational qualification had been explained by the New Zealand representative. The constitutional reforms of which he had spoken had been the result of two years of study by a Committee of whom the majority were elected indigenous members of the House of Assembly. Following that study, in which every effort had been made to contact as many of the inhabitants as possible, the Committee had submitted its report and the Australian Govern-

ment had acted on its recommendations, including the recommendation for the establishment of regional seats. Those seats were open to people of all races holding the Territory Intermediate Certificate, and they had been proposed because the people of the Territory wished, for the time being, to ensure that a number of people with certain educational qualifications were elected to the House of Assembly. The Liberian representative apparently presumed that only Australians would qualify, but in fact there were now 7,000 indigenous children in intermediate schools in the Territory.

56. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that the Australian representative had not told the Committee how many indigenous people held the Intermediate Certificate. At any rate, he was prepared to wager that those elected to the regional seats would be predominantly Australians. He failed to see why any educational qualifications should be required, and why, if the indigenous people wanted Australians to serve in the House of Assembly, they could not be elected to the ordinary seats. He doubted whether there were more than a handful of indigenous people, if there were any at all, who would be eligible for election to the "regional seats".

57. With regard to hospitals, he had seen one fine hospital at Port Moresby, but he knew of no other comparable hospitals in the Territory. He had seen some hospitals which were extremely poorly equipped.

58. The Australian representative still had not indicated how the Administering Authority's grant to the Territory was spent and had not pointed out that at least 80 per cent of it was paid to Australians in one form or other. In reality, it was a means of providing employment for Australians. If it was asserted that \$78 million was given to the Territory without any conditions attached, he would deny that assertion; moreover, he maintained that the amount put in was less than the profits derived from the Territory.

59. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he was surprised by some of the statements of the Liberian representative, because, during his visit to the Territory, that representative himself had visited a number of hospitals in different parts of the Territory which had cost \$2.5 million to set up.

60. It was certainly not true that 80 per cent of the Australian grant went back to Australians. He did not know what percentage of the grant was accounted for by salaries paid to Australians, but the purpose was certainly not to keep Australians in employment; Australia itself could easily absorb all the skilled people it had and it was hard to recruit people for service in the Territory. Those who went to New Guinea did not do so for monetary reasons, or they would be better advised to remain in Australia.

61. He must stress that the establishment of seats with an educational qualification attached had not been sought by the Australian Government, but had been requested by the people of the Territory. As far as the number of indigenous people qualified was concerned, he could not give exact figures, except to say that, in Papua, some 150 pupils had obtained the Intermediate Certificate in the past year. He knew that the number of indigenous people who would qualify for the

regional seats was substantial and would continue to increase.

62. To guard against possible misunderstanding, he would like to stress that election to the regional seats, as well as to the ordinary seats, would take place on a common roll; thus all voters would participate in the elections to fill any seat, of whatever category.

63. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Australian representative's statements did not alter the fact that there were special seats set aside for Australians in the House of Assembly of the Territory. At present, there were ten seats set aside for Australians. That meant, roughly, that there was one member in the House for every 300,000 indigenous inhabitants of the Territory and one for every 1,600 Australians. Yet the Australians spoke about equality of rights. It was also a fact that no law passed by the House of Assembly could go into effect until it had been approved at Canberra.

64. The Australian representative had said that there were several thousand pupils in intermediate schools, but had not been able to answer the Liberian representative's question regarding the number of indigenous people holding the Intermediate Certificate. In an article in an Australian newspaper, it had been pointed out that, after sixty years of administration of Papua and fifty years in New Guinea, Australia had left 95 per cent of the inhabitants illiterate. The Australian representative had not said how many of the people had received higher education or how many held administrative posts. The fact was that there were no indigenous people whatever in the senior posts in the Administration. The Australian representative was trying to throw dust in the eyes of the members of the Committee.

65. The House of Assembly was a rubber-stamp organ and had no rights of its own. As was admitted in the Australian Press, the House of Assembly was led by appointees. It was not in a position to reflect the real wishes of the people regarding independence. Australian statements made it clear that there was no intention to give the Territory independence for twenty or thirty years. As the representative of Guinea had said, the Fourth Committee's concern was to see the representatives of Papua and New Guinea sitting among them in a seat of their own and not behind the Australian representative.

66. The Trusteeship Council had become an organ where everything was covered up. There was nothing but praise for Australia in the statements of the representatives of the United States and New Zealand reproduced in the Council's report.

67. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) wished to point out that Australians did not elect Australians to the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea. He would reply in due course to the other assertions of the Soviet Union representative, including those he had made at the previous meeting.

68. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that he would like to reply to the statement of the USSR representative, who had taken it upon himself to refer to New Zealand statements. It was difficult to accept the championing by the Soviet representative of the principle of "one man, one vote". He would next be advocating that the New Guineans accept the qualifying principle adhered to in the Soviet Union: that is, "one party, no choice". The Soviet representative's reference to the House of Assembly as a rubber-stamp body was an insult to that organ, which had been elected democratically by all the people of New Guinea on the basis of a common roll, and to its representatives present in the Committee room. The Soviet representative also disregarded the recommendations made by the Select Committee, which had been set up by the House of Assembly and was composed largely of elected representatives. That Committee had sought the views of the people throughout the Territory before drawing up its recommendations. It would be dangerous for the Fourth Committee to depart from the basic principle that in advance towards independence, what was required was that the people of the Territory should be able to express their view on the future freely and not that those wishes should conform to a certain predetermined pattern. The principle of self-determination should not be amended or qualified to suit the doctrinaire purposes of the Soviet delegation.

69. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that his country was familiar with elections held under the conditions of colonialism. He could assure the Soviet Union representative that the Australian delegation could not throw dust in his eyes. The basic problem was that the Trusteeship Council had become a forum devoted mainly to singing the praises of Administering Authorities. He urged his colleagues to exercise the utmost vigilance with regard to the activities of that organ.

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING ST. VINCENT (AGENDA ITEM 23)

70. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing concerning St. Vincent from Mr. Milton Cato, Political Leader, Labour Party, St. Vincent. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided that the request should be circulated as a document.

It was so decided. 1/

71. The CHAIRMAN said that he hoped that the Committee would be prepared to take a decision on the request without waiting for the circulation of the document. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the request for a hearing.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.

^{1/} The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/680.