

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1200
17 July 1962

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDREDTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 17 July 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. BINGHAM

(United States of America)

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

2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru:
report of the Drafting Committee [3c]

NG
health 2

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1200 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

62-15636

(33 p.)

AGENDA ITEMS 3d AND 5b

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA: (continued)

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

General Debate (continued)

The PRESIDENT: I understand that Mr. Mulas, and Mr. Sigob, representatives of the people of New Guinea, would like to start with a brief statement before the closing statement of the Special Representative.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, special representative for New Guinea under Australian administration, and Mr. Somu Sigob and Mr. Himson Mulas, representatives of the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took places at the Trusteeship Council table.

Mr. MULAS (Representative of the Trust Territory of New Guinea): It has been a privilege for me to be in this Council at the invitation of the Administering Authority. I have learned a great deal from the various member nations in this Council during the questioning and in the debate. I have a lot to tell my people when I go back home, not only of what I heard in the Council but also of what I learned from talking to people outside the Council.

And now, speaking as a medical practitioner, perhaps I may tell you something about medical work in the Territory as I see it.

The work done by the Administering Authority in the field of public health is one of great achievements already accomplished by the Australian Government. This Department, under a director and seven assistant directors, has done tremendous work in improving the health of all races in the territories of both Papua and New Guinea. This achievement, however, has not been done without the inevitable difficulties. But these difficulties are, as I found out myself whilst in the field, mostly those involving tribal customs and beliefs, reluctance and uncertainty about the white man with his medicine, and so on. Such difficulties are, however, becoming increasingly minor problems

(Mr. Mulas)

in the more advanced villages along the coast and in the islands, in comparison with the more primitive interior and mountain villages. This improvement is achieved through hard work in convincing my own people that they should support health work. As things are today, more and more people are coming forward seeking medical attention from the various centres in the Territory. Another very important aspect of medical work I came across in the field is that of persuading expectant mothers to come to the clinics, and mothers to come to the hospitals and have their babies. This, as I said earlier, is still a problem in the highland villages, but there is progressive improvement.

There are about one hundred Administration hospitals throughout Papua-New Guinea. Here I refer only to those that cater for general cases, but there are, of course, those that are used for special cases such as tuberculosis, leprosy, etc.

(Mr. Mulas)

Apart from these Administration Hospitals, there are those run by the various religious denominations. These hospitals are run, staffed and equipped by these various missions with a subsidy from the Administration. I must give special thanks to those kind people who left their various homes around the globe and are doing very good work for the good of my people and country.

I am here not to give any detailed description to the Council about the various activities going on in the Territory. The more recent United Nations Visiting Mission to my island witnessed much more than what I am describing. More modern hospitals are being built one after another, costing in all millions of pounds.

Patients are admitted to hospitals with common diseases such as malaria, pneumonia, respiratory diseases, gastro-enteritis and tuberculosis. Major steps are being taken by the Department to overcome both malaria and tuberculosis. Territory-wide campaigns are going on at present, and I consider that in the years to come these diseases will not be major problems in the health of my people.

Besides healing and improving the health of my people, I am also very grateful to the Department of Health for the training of indigenous personnel in medical work. This training enables young boys and girls to become hospital orderlies, aid post orderlies, laboratory technicians, X-ray technicians, dental nurses and assistants and assistant medical practitioners. So far assistant medical practitioners and various technicians are being trained in the Fiji Medical College, but now the Papuan Medical College is doing all this. This latter centre is situated in Port Moresby for boys and girls from Papua and New Guinea, the British Solomon Islands Protectorate and Netherlands New Guinea. There are now boys and girls in the field working side by side with expatriate officers in the medical field. Among these are twelve assistant medical practitioners graduated from Fiji Medical College, a number of laboratory technicians, X-ray technicians, health inspectors and dental assistants.

(Mr. Kulas)

Before I conclude, I must thank the Administering Authority for the tremendous good work done by its officers in all fields. Devotion to duty by these officers under unfavourable conditions has contributed much in establishing good relations between them and my people. Whatever happens in the long run, this good relationship will remain.

I cannot conclude without saying something about the various United Nations Visiting Missions to my island. I must thank the United Nations for sending such missions to my country because such visits have helped in speeding up progress in the various fields. I wish to say a special word of thanks to the 1962 Visiting Mission under the leadership of Sir Hugh Foot. Sir Hugh, together with the rest of the Mission, will remain in the minds of those who met them as a symbol of the United Nations. We are looking forward to seeing similar missions in the future.

In conclusion, I must thank all the members of this Council who expressed their views during the debate. Their sympathetic attitude towards my people and my country was highly appreciated.

I should also like to tell the representative of the Soviet Union that we are not a poor and suppressed people, as he seems to think. It is true that we are not wealthy and powerful, but we are a contented people and happy with the good progress being made towards the day when we will manage our own country.

Mr. Somu SIGOB (Representative of the Trust Territory of New Guinea):

I am very happy that I have been able to come to New York to attend this meeting of the Trusteeship Council. As you know, I am a native of New Guinea. For many years I was a member of the New Guinea Police Force. I have walked and seen much of my country. I have served in the high, rugged mountain areas of the Highlands and in the flat swamp lands of the Sepik. I was a President of the Local Government Council in my home once; and two years ago I was elected as a member of the Legislative Council. I am in close contact with my people. I feel I know what my people think and what they want.

(Mr. Sigob)

The people of New Guinea are grateful for the help the Australian Government has given them. We are thankful for the work of the United Nations and we know they can also help us a great deal.

My people are like birds in the nest. We do not fly strongly yet. We wish to fly, we wish to be taught to fly. In order for us to fly strongly, we must have these things:

First, primary and higher education. The Government and the missions have given us many schools. However, we need more schools and we need more teachers. Our children all want primary education and our future leaders must have a good education in good high schools and in good universities. We are glad the Visiting Mission has asked for this too.

(Mr. Sigob)

Secondly, New Guinea is a poor country but my people are beginning to realize that to make our country strong we must work much harder. We have now planted much coffee, many coconuts and much cocoa, but we need assured markets. We would like the United Nations to help us obtain these markets.

Thirdly, we are happy that many of our people sit down side by side with Australians in the big work of government. We would like to see some of our leaders working alongside the directors of Government departments so that they may learn this important work.

We are pleased to see in the Visiting Mission's report that a House of Representatives has been suggested. It is the wish of my people to share more fully in the government of our country. We would like to see more indigenous elected members, but we wish to develop at our own pace. We do not wish to be pushed too fast. A tree without strong roots will soon fall.

When we have all these things, then we can think about self-government.

We feel that some countries do not understand New Guinea. We would like to see more countries of the United Nations visiting our country so that they can see for themselves what is happening.

I must thank the 1962 Mission for the part it played during discussions with the leaders of my people in New Guinea. We are looking forward to seeing more of you in the future.

Mr. McCarthy (Special Representative): Because the Council has now heard statements by my two colleagues from New Guinea, because it has just seen a film on life and work in New Guinea, and because the Council has heard expressions of the attitudes and approaches to that life and work, by very significant people, I do not propose to make a lengthy closing statement. An additional reason is that the Council has been fortunate in being able to conduct this session on the basis of a report by its Visiting Mission, which, as we know, closely studied the situation in New Guinea and arrived at certain far-reaching conclusions on the basis of that study -- a study which revealed to the Mission's satisfaction abundant evidence of the purpose and energy that Australia has brought to the task of administration which has been entrusted to it.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

With regard to the Visiting Mission's report, I tried to make clear the attitude of the Australian Government: that it respects the views which the Mission has developed on the basis of its careful work; that it appreciates the compliments which that Mission has paid to the Australian administration; that it has already taken most significant action in two of the three major fields to which the Mission has invited particular attention -- and, indeed, had taken a substantial part of that action even in advance of the Mission's examination of conditions in New Guinea; that in respect of the third major field -- constitutional reform -- it has inevitably required more time to give these proposals the very close consideration they deserve; that, however, in relation to the very basis of these proposals -- the formation of common rolls to be used to develop an even more representative legislature than that which has been created up to the present -- it had more than a year ago announced that its planning envisaged significant action in this direction at a time when, as far as it could judge, the response of the people would be sufficiently articulate to point the way of their own choice in their own voices and through their representatives in the Legislative Council.

I shall be brief, too, because the contributions of most of the delegations to this Council have shown that they have considered the New Guinea situation well and have addressed themselves very closely to the report of the Visiting Mission. Most also have paid warm tributes to the excellence of the patient and careful work of the Australian administration. In this connexion I should like to glance back briefly at a few of my introductory remarks to last year's examination of conditions in New Guinea. I then referred to the development of three phases of Australia's work in the Territory: the first, fundamentally one of penetration and exploration; the second, closely following the most difficult period of post-war readjustment, one in which the broad bases of general development were laid, following as a direct result of the first; the third, in which a general pattern of order and orderly progress was becoming clearly visible. I said then that although distinct in their natures these three phases inevitably overlapped and formed a pattern in which the progress of ordered development could clearly be traced.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

The Council's Mission has recognized this. Delegations here have noted it for themselves. The representative of France has said that the Administration's: "patient work is bearing fruit. The maturing was slow, but fruit appears suddenly, and the work which served to prepare all this suddenly becomes evident from one day to the next. ... One suddenly feels that, after long years of careful preparation, an awakening appears which we had not been aware of previously". (T/FV.1197, pages 2 and 3-5)

The representative of China has noted that Australia:

"has tackled this task with such courage, enterprise, drive and conviction that we ought to think twice before finding fault with this Administering Authority". (Ibid., page 16)

The representative of New Zealand, after referring to the size and complexity of New Guinea, concluded that this combination:

"has made it probably the most difficult territory in the history of this Council". (Ibid., page 31)

He went on to note that Australia:

"has since 1945 created an extensive and efficient Administration where none had ever been before. Some of this effort had to be directed simply at the establishment of elementary law and order, but most of it has been spent and directed towards the future, towards building the first step of the developmental pyramid and providing the essential base for further growth. The work ... has been done thoroughly and pressed on vigorously."

(Ibid., page 32)

The representative of the United States has referred to the clear indications from the report of the Visiting Mission that:

"considerable progress has taken place in the three years since the previous Visiting Mission took a trip to the Territory ... The Visiting Mission has paid tribute throughout its report to this progress and to the excellent foundations which have been laid in many fields for further progress".

(T/FV.1198, pages 6 and 12)

The work to which these delegations have referred has pressed ahead under the three broad headings of social, economic and political development. It is

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

not necessary for me to refer any further to the first two fields. The Council's Mission has not only recognized the excellence of the work which has been done in those fields but has made recommendations with which the Australian Government not only does not, in general, disagree but in respect of which that Government has already taken certain most positive action.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

The recommendation which has most attracted the attention of this Council has related to political development, and it is to this aspect of development that I should like now to direct a few remarks and questions which have been prompted in my own mind by the questions and debates in this Council.

Initially, I would reject any suggestion that progress in this field has been slow. Perhaps one example alone will serve to illustrate this. There is now as an elected member of the Legislative Council for Papua and New Guinea a man, still in his middle years, who had never even seen a person from the modern world outside until he himself was almost fully grown. He is a representative of a great group of people who, similarly, had been shut off, through their own environment, from the outside world, and these people elected him by democratic processes. Such progress from the tribal fragmentation and politically anarchy which marked this period -- now scarcely past -- cannot only, not be called slow, but must be recognized as being quite extraordinary.

The question has been raised, very pertinently, as to whom a representative elected body might, up to the present, have represented. I myself will ask that question again and in a slightly different form. Whom were they to represent before the work and planning of the Australian Administration began to develop a New Guinea people which -- and this Council should mark it well -- does not even yet exist as a single entity, or indeed as several well defined entities? Was such a body simply to represent Iolai people who, through the accidents of history, had been in closer and longer touch with outside influences than any other people of New Guinea, and who indeed were and are inhabitants simply of one of the larger islands of the group which make up the Territory, alien not only to the many other groups of that particular island -- themselves being vigorous and comparatively recent newcomers from elsewhere in the Pacific -- but until fairly recently completely unknown to and themselves ignorant of all the people of the main island itself? Was it to represent simply the scattered tribes of the Markham Valley, themselves at constant war with one another? Or the people of the great Sepik River area, speaking many languages, in constant conflict, knowing little even of most of the other people of the area which we now call the Sepik District and

(Mr. McCarthy, Special representative)

nothing whatever of some? Could it in any way represent the people of the great mountains behind Madang? Was it to disregard the existence of more than half a million Highland people, which very existence was unknown even to the Australian Administration until the 1930's and in much of its fragmented detail remained unknown until the recent years of this post-war period? Could it in any way represent the 40,000 fierce and predatory Kukukuku tribesmen who terrorized a vast area spreading from the Bulolo Valley to the Papuan Coast and have refused until just now all efforts to bring order and education among them?

How then could a representative legislature be created without developing into a ready-made instrument for the exploitation of purely tribal interests which alone had guided the thinking of the tribesmen for thousands of years, for the exploitation of ancient enmities, into the philosopher's stone which, through its mere existence would produce not gold, but anarchy, death and disorder?

These questions are not to suggest that the Australian Administration has accepted this state of affairs as an excuse for doing nothing. They are, on the contrary, formulated to suggest that out of disorder it is bringing and has brought order; out of anarchy and a state of war, it has brought peace; where ignorance prevailed, it has let light into the dark places; where illness and death were unchecked, it has distributed the means of healing and health.

As part of this process it has quietly created a pattern of political development which is now showing abundant results. This it has done not only through its Councils, which are providing to a daily increasing extent exercise in the practice of government and familiarity with problems which must be considered at the highest political levels, but through all the processes of its administration. It has fostered and brought into being a political consciousness where none before existed. Far from turning the peoples' minds from political matters, it has constantly turned them to political matters and given them the means not only of formulating, but first becoming aware of the mere existence of their political problems and requirements. This, and more, it has done by the most careful observance of the very spirit of the Charter of this United Nations: the paramount nature of the wishes of the people themselves and the right of those people to choose the form of government which will suit them best. The representative of New Zealand has expressed this well by saying:

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

"The Administering Authority has set out to build this sense of political participation almost literally from the ground up. Self-government is an art which can be learned but not imposed." (T/FV.1197, page 36)

I should like to stress that phrase: "Self-government is an art which can be learned but not imposed."

Thus, it seems to me, is expressed the very core of the problem which the Australian Government has recognized and is continuing to recognize. It is teaching the people the arts of government -- not imposing them. It is an art which the people of New Guinea are learning rapidly under skilful teachers. And the teaching -- and this is probably one of the most remarkable things about this -- has been and is being carried out, as has been made clear by the report of the Visiting Mission and as has emerged in the debates around this table, in no way in response to pressures or desires from inside the Territory. There were and are at present no such pressures.

This brings me now to a brief reference to the phrase "uniform development", which has often been used here and which has been the subject of questions. It is no part of Australia's policy to hold back the development of fully representative organs, the granting of ultimate authority to the people themselves, until the whole Territory is in a state of uniform development. We will not wait until the last Kukukuku has put aside his stone club and his long bow; until the Bainings have trodden out the last flames in the last of their fire dances to the sound of massed drums in the night; until modern roads have been made through the mountains which separate the Telefomins from the rest of New Guinea; until the last limestone mountains west of Mount Hagen have become highways. The Australian policy does not mean any of this. What it does mean surely is that a proper point of balance will have been reached when a significant section of each of the most significant groups in the Territory is able to express its aspirations, to speak for the less advanced and voiceless sections of their tribes, and to develop a framework within which they will work in friendship -- and if not in friendship, at least in understanding -- with the other major groups in the Territory who have been alien to them. It is towards such a goal that the Australian Government is working when it says that self-government should be as broadly based as possible. It is no service to the Territory to reverse by over hasty action the great advances which have been made.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

But if there are differences of opinion between this Council and the Australian Government, or around this Council table, for the most part those differences might be of the kind to which the representative of France has referred by saying: "The subtle difference resides perhaps in what musicians call tempo." (Ibid., page 12) To this, however, should be added, that the Australian Government believes that neither its own voice, nor even that of the United Nations should be heard above the voice of the people themselves.

There are those who say that this voice can be heard now only through a formal instrument created in a pattern which other countries have evolved. But let the voices of New Guinea itself sound the shape of that pattern.

It is not true to say that the voice of New Guinea cannot yet be heard. Before the last reconstitution of the Legislative Council it was heard by the officers who have worked most closely with the people. It was heard by the responsible Minister himself, who travelled among those people simply to determine for himself what their wishes were. It has been heard by your own Mission. I myself have heard it in the many voices of the Highland clans gathered in the valleys and of the island people gathered by the sea.

The representative of India has found fault with the system of elections which was evolved recently to send elected indigenous representatives for the first time to the highest legislative body in the territory. But why should the Indian system of elections necessarily be more efficient than this, or the Australian system more efficient? And the representative of India has referred to the complications of this New Guinea system. Is it more complicated than the system by which the President of the United States is elected? What proof has he that it is less efficient than any other system? In an evolving period, why should the instruments which the people themselves have evolved not be used? This is not to say that this system will continue, but it may well prove, with variations, a system which the people themselves will prefer to graft onto the basic stem of the common rolls which are to be prepared. If they wish to do this, why should they not?

The representative of India, while commending much of the work of the Australian Administration, has referred to what he calls the slow pace of development in this field or that. At the same time, he has criticized the number of Australians in the public service of the Territory, and he would apparently reduce them drastically overnight. How does he reconcile the two requirements to which he has referred?

In another debate in this chamber, I have said that Australia needs no system of outdoor relief for its skilled workers; that itself it can absorb them all, and more, and that it needs them all, and more. But among its people in New Guinea are many of its most skilled and most devoted workers, and this at a time when their main rewards can only be that of satisfying the spirit of service which moves them,

more material rewards at this time being at the best somewhat meagre and uncertain. In this connexion, it has been said:

"The social services so highly praised by the Mission and the numbers of experts needed to maintain them are in fact being provided by the Australian Government. But what is the alternative? A reduction in staff will naturally mean a corresponding reduction in services and it is difficult to see anyone in the Council supporting this ... it would therefore be illogical if the Council, by complaining of the level of Government expenditure and staff, were in fact to imply that the services provided by Australia were too extensive."

That brings me now briefly to the question of money. I have no wish constantly to remind this Council of the great and increasing rate of the Australian grant to the Territory. In my opening statement I quoted the responsible Minister as saying:

"The need for external aid will still be great in the years immediately ahead. Australia is prepared to continue that aid as long as the people of Papua and New Guinea want it." (T/PV.1194, p. 21)

Now let me quote another statement by the Minister for Territories, a promise made by him personally to the people of the Territory:

"So long as you need our help, you can depend on us to give it. So long as you want us to stay, you can depend upon us not to desert you. We believe that Australia and New Guinea need each other and can help each other. Our wish is to work in partnership with you, going hand in hand, doing things together for the benefit of this country and all its people."

In the face of such promises, in the light of the simple fact of the provision by Australia of the bulk of the financial means which the Territory requires, what formula has been suggested to guide the deliberations of the Territory legislature to recognize the fact that the Australian Government has some duty to its own tax payers who provide the money on which the development of the Territory depends, or that that Government has a duty to ensure that that money is spent wisely toward the discharge of its international obligations in the Territory?

This leads me now to a brief remark regarding reporting and making conclusions on the one hand and the necessity for doing on the other. Your Visiting Mission has reported honestly and thoughtfully, and it has drawn certain conclusions in and from that reporting. I have expressed the Australian Government's appreciation

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

of this. For my own part, I have reported the Australian Government's performance and projected performance in relation to much of what the Mission has recommended. Now, and in no critical vein, I would ask this: that the Mission and this Council compare the ease and speed of reporting and advising with the difficulties of doing. It is on the people who "do" that the heaviest share of the burden falls, from those who work in their offices at the truly endless tasks of administration which generally have no results which can be seen and felt and touched in ways which reward the senses with the visible and tangible expressions of accomplishment to those who tread the valleys or make their silent and lonely ways through the soundless moss forests to the rugged and almost inaccessible peaks which rise above them.

But for these workers, even for the response of the indigenous people themselves, the Soviet representative has no single word of encouragement. Of him, the leader of your own Visiting Mission only last week observed:

"He has ... shown that he has respect neither for the interests of the people nor for the facts." (T/PV.1198, p.31)

I believe that I have now, in various forms, placed before this Council during its examination a sufficient record of Australian achievements and purposes in New Guinea. Much has been achieved there. More yet will be achieved in complete fulfilment of the trust which Australia has accepted. You may be assured that in working towards that fulfilment now the Australian Government will be giving the closest and most continuing attention at all levels of administration to the matters raised in the report of your Visiting Mission and, on its behalf I would like once again to express our thanks for the most memorable way in which that Mission performed its task.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Special Representative.

In connexion with the preparation of the draft report on New Guinea, the Chair announces the appointment of the delegations of Bolivia and New Zealand as members of the drafting committee.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Although, Mr. President, you were entrusted by the Trusteeship Council with the task of appointing the members of the drafting committee, we consider that any of your proposals will require approval by the Council. I do not doubt that your proposals will have the support of the majority of the Council, but we would wish to draw attention to two circumstances.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

In the first instance we consider that until the membership of any nation has been advanced here in the Council, the Council should be consulted. We must say that as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, no one has consulted us regarding appointment to membership in the Drafting Committee. We consider that you now are not the representative of the United States; you are not a representative of a colonial Power, but an official of the this Council -- its President -- and you must therefore observe at least a minimum or an appearance of objectivity.

As for the Soviet delegation we would also wish to point to the fact that we consider that the membership of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea should include only representatives of non-administering Powers. That is why we fully support your proposal to include Bolivia, but we do not consider that the representative of New Zealand, as a representative of a State closely connected with the Administering Authority and who happens to be a part of the Administering Authority in regard to another Trust Territory, is likely to contribute constructively to the work of the Drafting Committee.

We deemed it necessary to make these reservations.

AGENDA ITEM 3c

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1039 and Add.1, L.1051)

The PRESIDENT: We will turn now to the report of the Drafting Committee on Nauru which is set forth in document T/L.1051. The Chair would like to consult the Council as to its pleasure in dealing with this document; specifically, with regard to whether it wishes to deal with the document as a whole, as was done in the case of the report of the Drafting Committee on the Pacific Islands, or paragraph by paragraph?

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We do not object to considering the report of the Drafting Committee on the Territory of Nauru, on the whole, except for the fact that we would wish to make an amendment to paragraph 3. Perhaps we could then put to the vote separately paragraph 3 or possibly the whole of section I dealing with the most important issue, namely, the future of the Nauruans.

If you will permit me we should wish now to make a few brief comments on the report of the Drafting Committee on the whole. Unfortunately, we note that as the basis for its recommendations the Drafting Committee took not the proposals presented by the Nauruan people but the proposals of the Visiting Mission. With respect to the proposals of the Nauruan people themselves, the Council is invited merely to note with interest what these proposals were. With regard to the proposals of the Visiting Mission on the creation of a Nauruan centre in Australia, that proposal in paragraph 1 is presented in such a fashion as if this would be the most plausible or feasible alternative since there are doubts in the minds of some of the members of the Visiting Mission that it might be possible to find a separate island for the Nauruans. Accordingly, it is stated so in paragraph 1 that as an alternative proposal the Administering Authority will have to draw up a concrete plan for the formation of a Nauruan community centre in Australia. We know that the Nauruans are calling for something else. They are calling for the giving to them of a new island and they are objecting to the settling of Nauruans in Australia. The Soviet delegation therefore cannot support such a recommendation and it will vote against it.

We would wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that at the present time no definite attempt is being made to consolidate this plan with the formation of a community centre in Australia. Although approaches to it are already being enacted, at the present session an attempt is being made to establish this as an alternative proposal; and at the next session we might well expect that the Administering Authority will tell us that all technical and other possibilities have been exhausted, that the Administering Authority has endeavoured but did not find an appropriate island for the Nauruans and that therefore the first alternative lapses and the other

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

one remains. In other words, one cannot do anything other than to create a Nauruan community centre in Australia. The Soviet delegation cannot agree to such an approach to this problem. We consider that the question of the future of the Nauruans must be decided upon by the Nauruans and in line with the interests of the Nauruan people on the basis of the proposals that were advanced by the Nauruan population itself.

As for paragraph 3, the Soviet delegation proposes the following amendment. Instead of the words "notes with interest" at the beginning of paragraph 3, we suggest the word "endorses". Thus, the paragraph would read:
(spoke in English)

"The Council endorses the proposals submitted by the Resettlement Sub-Committee of the Nauru Local Government Council to the Government of Australia on 19 June 1962..."

(continued in Russian)

We consider that the Trusteeship Council, if it is indeed being guided by the interests and the wishes of the people of Nauru, must not simply "note with interest" and set aside the proposals of the Nauruans, but must endorse them.

The Special Representative of the Administering Authority in his concluding statement on New Guinea reiterated the absurdity, which was earlier stated by the representative of the United Kingdom, to the effect of who is taking and who is not taking into account the interests of the indigenous population. Here you have a concrete test of your sincerity and frankness in the defense of the interests of the indigenous population. We present this amendment that the proposals of the Nauruan people be endorsed. This is not a proposal of the Soviet delegation, mind you, this is a proposal of the Nauruan people; and we hope quite frankly and honestly to support or endorse these proposals. We are presenting this amendment. We shall insist upon its being voted on the basis of a roll-call so that it may be clear for all as to who are the real friends and who are the false friends of the peoples of the Trust Territories.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

As for the conclusions and recommendations in other sections of the report of the Drafting Committee, we are obliged to note that they are totally inadequate. In the best instance, earlier recommendations are repeated, hope is being expressed that the Administering Authority will continue its efforts, etc. and no recommendations are made to the Administering Authority to change the existing situation. For instance, nothing is being proposed, in any effective sense, to return to the indigenous inhabitants of the island of Nauru all its natural resources so that the people of Nauru themselves might manage their own country and might dispose of their natural resources.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Instead of that, there appears to be a meek hope that discussions might be held annually with the representatives of the British Phosphate Company.

We consider most of these proposals to be inadequate, inasmuch as they do not meet the genuine requirements of the Nauruan people and unfortunately make no provision for the immediate implementation of those principles which are contained in the Declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. For this reason, the Soviet delegation is unable to support these conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked for the floor in order to make a proposal which I hope will be acceptable to the representative of the Soviet Union, in the hope of facilitating the quick approval of the draft resolution now before us.

Firstly, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the contents of the Charter of the United Nations, it seems to me that the rule on self-determination is acceptable to all of the Members of the United Nations Organization. However, I have certain reservations in connexion with the practical application of this rule which, of course, has nothing whatsoever to do with the possibility which exists for the people of Nauru to conduct their own affairs. Rather, it has something to do with the quantitative aspect of this entire matter. I am not certain whether anyone could set forth, in minute fashion, a manner in which this principle could be applied. In any case, I do not wish to express any particular personal opinion.

The proposal which was submitted by the peoples of Nauru may be of a definitive character. At the same time, it may be possible that, with the co-operation of the Administering Authority, they may agree on another solution of a transitional character. That, of course, we cannot foretell. Nevertheless, bearing in mind these preliminary remarks, I should like to take this opportunity to offer an amendment for the Soviet representative's suggestion.

I have taken note of the Soviet representative's amendment in connexion with paragraph 3, which reads:

(spoke in English)

"The Council endorses the proposals submitted by the Resettlement Sub-Committee of the Nauru Local Government Council to the Government of Australia", etc.

(continued in Spanish)

I would like to amend this Soviet suggestion to say:

(spoke in English)

"The Council endorses the principle contained in the proposals", etc.

(continued in Spanish)

Naturally, this refers to that same principle of self-determination which is contemplated and set out in detail in the Charter and in the General Assembly resolutions. I do not believe that any member of the Trusteeship Council can disregard the validity of this principle in relation to the future of the peoples of this Territory. I do, of course, have some doubt in my mind regarding the practicability of the application of this principle, considering that we are dealing with a population of 2,500 inhabitants. However, it is not our duty to express ourselves in that regard. In their future meetings, the Council and the Fourth Committee will have to bear in mind the possibility of a practical solution in regard to this principle in such a way as to protect the identity of the peoples of Nauru.

In offering this proposal, I do so because I want to remain true to a principle which my delegation has always defended, that is, this very principle of self-determination. Therefore, if there is no categorical objection by members of this Council, I should like to propose formally this amendment to the amendment offered by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If we may, we should like to obtain a clarification from the representative of Bolivia. He speaks of a principle of self-determination, of self-government. Of course, this basic principle has been enshrined in many United Nations documents. It is not clear to us, however, whether the representative of Bolivia visualizes a single principle or the many principles that are contained in these documents, since these proposals also involve the formulation of principles on the basis of which the practical problem of the future of Nauru should be solved.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

It seems to us that reference should be made here to those practical principles which were advanced by the representatives of the Nauruan people. The Soviet delegation supports those proposals unreservedly and it is for that reason that we have introduced this amendment. We consider our amendment to be a more definite expression of an endorsement of these principles and, for that reason, we prefer our own formulation. It is obvious that these proposals contain concrete principles which should be applied in the solution of this matter. There is here no mention of some common, general principle which has already been approved and endorsed by numerous organs of the United Nations. Therefore, we wish to stress the practical aspect of the desires of the people of Nauru.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Since I appreciate the Soviet representative's ability, I shall not now enter into a detailed discussion of whether the singular or plural of the word "principle" should be applied here. I shall only repeat my amendment. It would read:
(spoke in English)

"The Council endorses the principle contained in the proposals", etc.
(continued in Spanish)

Now, if we were to employ the word "principles", rather than the singular, that would not change the sense of my amendment. The proposal that was put forward by the Sub-Committee on Nauru offers us the possibility that this principle of self-determination, in its political, economic and judicial aspects, must and should be respected in the redevelopment of the population of the Territory of Nauru. Therefore, the principle is of a generic character. It is a general principle. It encompasses all of the principles of which this document speaks and in this way, I feel, would satisfy all delegations.

We must bear in mind that the Administering Authority has not expressed itself with regard to this principle. I do not want to initiate a discussion of this position but it seems to me that we ought to respect the positions of the various Governments in the Trusteeship Council. But this principle, in all of the resolutions of the General Assembly and in the very Charter of the United Nations, gives the population of Nauru a perfect right to insist upon a solution on the basis of this legal generic principle, which we have a duty to uphold and respect.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

Therefore, I would like us to try to fit ourselves in with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union; but in fairness to clarity we must refer to one principle. This principle of self-determination -- and this brings very much to the foreground the suggestion of the peoples of Nauru, the desire to govern themselves in all aspects, which is what this principle means -- this principle of self-determination is a generic principle; it is the key to the proposal which has been forwarded by the peoples of Nauru. Therefore, what we, in effect, are doing in this Council is to reiterate once again the positions of all our delegations when we voted on resolution 1514 (XV) and other resolutions which were follow-ups to that resolution.

Now, this is the point of view of my Government; and it is with this idea in view that I have offered this for your consideration. If there are no other delegations that are interested in speaking on this, and after I have replied to the representative of the Soviet Union, I would like to insist -- insist, I say -- that we maintain this drafting in as clear a manner as we can. We have talked of basic principles. If there are now other principles in mind, they should be clarified, and we should call a spade a spade.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I referred on an earlier occasion, in discussing this point, to the status of the proposals submitted by the Nauruan Local Government Council to the Government of Australia. That status is, of course, that of a document or set of proposals submitted to the Administering Authority. The Council has been informed of the existence of these proposals, but the proposals have not been submitted to the Council, as such. This, I think, must be kept very clearly in mind, because it is not, in my submission, the place or the function of the Council to express any opinion at this stage on those proposals. The Council is certainly entitled to note the fact that they have been submitted, and to note further the fact that they will form the subject of further discussions with the Nauruan people. This it can do.

But my delegation would find great difficulty in accepting, as far as we are concerned, any wording -- even a modified expression -- such as would contain the word "principle".

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

If, also, there is any implication of endorsement or support by the Council of these proposals, I think, whatever the opinions of the members of the Council may be, individually, on the value of the proposals; it is not for the Council, as such, to express an opinion on them at this stage, because they have not been submitted to the Council. The Council will, of course, be informed of the result of the negotiations; and this point is also taken care of in the text of the Drafting Committee. That, I think, is as far as the Council ought to go or can properly go.

Can we not leave the text as it is: "the Council notes with interest ..."? This is already a significant phrase, and I think it pays due regard to the present status of these proposals.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I am very sorry to have to disagree with the representative of Australia after having listened to his opinion. In reality, Mr. Hood presented us with a previous matter. He says to us as follows: This proposal, in effect, does not exist because it has not been formally presented by the Government of Australia for the consideration of the Trusteeship Council.

May I recall that there has been a document in which this proposal is fully contained -- that is to say, the points of view of the peoples of Nauru. In addition thereto, the Chief of the population of Nauru has, in effect, presented this proposal to the Council before coming to the Administering Authority. Therefore, the thesis presented by Mr. Hood would be more or less as follows: that the Trusteeship Council can take note only of such questions as authorized by the Administering Authority. That is to say, only with their consent can we give an opinion or not on such-and-such offer or such-and-such item.

When the representative of the Administering Authority first mentioned this question, he said that this question was being considered by the Government of Australia.

Finally, we will all recall that when we asked the Chief of the population of Nauru a question -- I think it was a question put by the chief of the Visiting Mission as to whether his proposal excluded the possibilities which had been referred to by the Visiting Mission -- the reply given by the

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

Chief of the Nauruan population was in the negative. At the same time, he did indicate that it stood. On the one hand, we have the Chief of the population of Nauru telling us one thing, and then the problem is presented by the representative of the Administering Power. After listening to the representative of Australia, we arrived at what conclusion? That we cannot give an opinion on these matters -- simply because the representative of Australia does not consider that these proposals have been formally presented.

Now may I ask him what other formalities exist which will enable us to consider or give an opinion on this or that subject in the minds of all the members of the Council? The delegation of Australia really places us in a very difficult position. I think, the Council must give an opinion.

If these proposals do not exist, I wonder why they were referred to by the representative of the Administering Power.

Mr. KIANG (China): Since it is getting very late, I think we should request the President to put whatever proposal we have in front of us to a vote in order to facilitate the procedure of the Council.

At the same time, I would like to make one observation with respect to the proposal of the representative of Bolivia. I can very well appreciate Mr. Salamanca's motive in submitting his proposal in a spirit of so-called compromise. I do not know whether we need this kind of compromise at the present stage on a matter of this kind; but I must say, I can very well understand the inspirations which have brought about the Nauruan proposals on the part of the Nauruan Local Government Council.

I also want to say that I think the principle which the Bolivian representative has in mind is the declared objectives of the Trusteeship System, and nothing else. Now, if that is the case, the Council's function is to exercise its supervision over the administration of the Trust Territory for the ultimate attainment of the declared objectives of the Trusteeship System.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

Now, that is very well understood. We do not have to confirm this, to re-state that principle anywhere in our report; it is understood. I do not know why we should, all of a sudden, come to affirm this principle. We are actually working on the basis of that principle.

I come now to a more important point. First of all, in so far as the status of document T/1600 is concerned, we have stated very clearly in our general debate that since the Mauruan leaders were to discuss the far-reaching proposals contained in document T/1600 with the Australian Government in August, the Council should not express a final opinion on the matter at present.

Now, the Drafting Committee has submitted a document, toward the end of the third paragraph of which it states very clearly that the Council hopes that the results of this negotiation will be communicated to the Trusteeship Council at an early date and in time for consideration by the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. I think the provision is very, very clear, and I must congratulate the Drafting Committee, the two members of the Drafting Committee, for their report, and particularly for this very clear statement of the facts, and very lucid pronouncement on the steps that the Council should take with regard to this proposal.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

I think it is really superfluous to add anything to this paragraph. All that the Council should do is either to change the whole situation by deciding to say that the Council endorses the proposal, or else to leave the wording of the present paragraph of the Drafting Committee as it is. My delegation will not be able to vote for any proposal to amend this paragraph, but will vote for paragraph 3 as it stands.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I was going to propose an amendment to clarify the first sentence of paragraph 3, but having heard the statement of the representative of China I wonder whether that would be a very fruitful course. My amendment was based on a belief that the formulation in paragraph 3 is not a full or completely fair summary of what I understand the proposal of the Nauruan people to be. Therefore, simply to make this paragraph a fairer summary, I will still go ahead and propose the following addition to the first sentence of paragraph 3. I propose a comma instead of a full stop after the words "treaty of friendship", and then the addition of the words "this proposal being based on the assumption that a suitable island near Australia is found to be available".

Now, I add those words not just "out of the blue" but with the observation that if you look at document T/16CO, which contains the Nauruan proposal, you will find that this precondition is set out in the document itself. This amendment is therefore merely a clarification.

Having disposed of that point of clarification, I address myself to the two proposals for more serious amendment of the formulation put forward by the Drafting Committee. I intend to vote against both of these proposed amendments, if they are pressed, on the ground that the formulation of the Drafting Committee is the best expression of the situation with regard to these proposals at the present time. We note them with interest, we ask that they be further discussed, we call for further information as soon as possible. That, it seems to me, is as far as we can go now. We cannot endorse these proposals at this stage because they are conditional on the finding of a suitable island and they are conditional on certain other arrangements being made for the establishment of a sovereign state off the coast of Australia -- a matter which raises all

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

sorts of problems of international law and other questions. This stage may be reached in due course but it has not been reached yet. At the moment this particular formulation seems to meet the situation quite adequately.

In saying that I shall vote against any amendments because I think the text as it stands is quite satisfactory, I realize that I leave myself open to the charge that I am voting against a proposal made by the Nauruan people; in other words, that I am setting myself in opposition to the wishes of the people of the Territory. This, to anyone who sees the situation, would, I think, be a quite false interpretation and I am sure the Nauruan people themselves would realize that I was making no such judgement upon their proposal at all.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I am not sure that we are going to be able to resolve this important matter in the short time that remains to us this morning. It may be that we shall need some further time to think about it.

I would like to make three points. The first is that certainly we respect the views and wishes of the people of Nauru. As the representative of New Zealand has said, I think that is common to us all. Secondly, it is very important to say, as he has said, that the Nauruan proposals are conditional on a suitable island being found. I do not myself think it is essential that that be put in an amendment, as the representative of New Zealand has proposed, because that is the basis of the proposals themselves and the basis of the discussion which has taken place in this Council; but certainly I would have no objection to the additional words which he has suggested. However, I have a more serious concern. It is another principle, and I think a very important principle, certainly in administration, that you should never lead people to expect that something can be given to them which it may not be possible to give to them. I would be most reluctant, on the basis of honesty with the people of Nauru, to add the words proposed at the beginning of this section. If it were that this Council would endorse at this stage the recommendations without qualification, then I believe we would be doing a grave disservice to the people of Nauru by leading them to believe that a sovereign state could be established when indeed no such possibility may exist. I strongly feel, for reasons of honest dealing, that we should not make the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

I also wish to mention another point, a quite minor matter which I mention in order to dispose of it. May I turn to section 16 of the draft before us. There reference is made to the Sacred Heart Mission Secondary School. Yesterday, when we were dealing with a petition, we decided to allow that petition to be covered by our recommendation in the report now before us. I do not propose any amendment of the draft before us in this respect, but I would merely wish to put on record that I trust the Administering Authority will bear in mind the recommendation which was made unanimously by the Visiting Mission on the question of further financial assistance to this school.

I mention that point in order to leave it and come back to the main point here. I believe that it would be positively wrong to make the amendment which has been proposed by the Soviet delegation.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened most attentively to the views expressed by the representative of New Zealand in regard to the draft we have been discussing. The only thing I can at this moment state is this, that we must bear in mind what he has indicated, that the population of Nauru presents these general proposals only on condition that an island is available. In taking note of this, we must also remember that the negotiations between the people of Nauru and the Administering Authority will still be going on, and therefore we have to give some kind of opinion on this matter.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

I have listened to the representative of the Soviet Union very attentively; he said that he would insist on a vote on his proposal. As we seem to think there is some discrepancy between his point of view and the point of view which I personally offered for the consideration of the Trusteeship Council, then I, in my turn, have to insist that my amendments should survive, those related to the Soviet amendment. If the majority of the Council does not accept those amendments, we can vote on them because it is a matter of principle on which it is not possible to compromise.

Mr. KILWAI (India): It is now 1 p.m. We have discussed paragraph 3 of this document, especially "notes with interest" and "endorses" and the amendment submitted by the representative of Bolivia. It seems to my delegation that it is not yet time to have a vote taken on this matter. I would therefore propose that we take a decision on this matter at our next meeting.

Mr. HOYES (United States of America): I am perfectly prepared to wait until the next meeting.

The PRESIDENT: If that is the wish of the Council, and it appears to be something of a consensus, the next meeting of the Trusteeship Council will be held tomorrow morning at 10.30 a.m. when we will attempt to dispose of this matter in time for the Drafting Committee on New Guinea to proceed to its labours.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.