



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Thirty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 15 June 1965,
 at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

| | |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Agenda items 4 and 6:</i> | <i>Page</i> |
| <i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis- tering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:</i> | |
| <i>(c) New Guinea (continued)</i> | |
| <i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:</i> | |
| <i>(b) New Guinea (continued)</i> | |
| <i>General debate (continued)</i> | <i>95</i> |
| <i>Agenda items 4 and 6:</i> | |
| <i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis- tering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:</i> | |
| <i>(b) Nauru</i> | |
| <i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:</i> | |
| <i>(a) Nauru</i> | |
| <i>Opening statements.</i> | <i>97</i> |
| <i>Agenda item 5:</i> | |
| <i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (concluded).</i> | <i>100</i> |
| <i>Agenda items 4 and 5:</i> | |
| <i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis- tering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:</i> | |
| <i>(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)</i> | |
| <i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)</i> | |
| <i>General debate (concluded).</i> | <i>101</i> |

President: Mr. André NAUDY (France).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Aus-
 tralia, China, France, Liberia, New Zealand, Union
 of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great
 Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized
 agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and
 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United
 Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organiza-
 tion; World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering
 Authorities on the Administration of Trust Terri-
 tories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(c) New Guinea (T/1632, T/1642, T/L.1090) (continued)

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the
 Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:
 (b) New Guinea (T/1635 and Add.1) (continued)

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gunther,
 special representative of the Administering Authority
 for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place
 at the Council table.*

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. Chiping H.C. KIANG (China) thanked the United
 Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of
 Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, and its Chairman for
 their report on New Guinea (T/1635 and Add.1), which
 was an excellent report and had greatly facilitated the
 Council's task.

2. Australia had done a great deal for New Guinea,
 to which it had sent competent men and on which it
 had spent money in a higher proportion than any other
 country having similar responsibilities. The step which
 had contributed most to the Territory's recent pro-
 gress, however, had been the decision taken three
 years earlier to abandon the idea of so-called uniform
 development as a pre-condition of political progress,
 an idea which China had opposed. The 1965 Visiting
 Mission must also have realized that to refuse the
 areas already under administrative control the addi-
 tional staff, money and services which they required
 was to arrest the Territory's development. Rather than
 having to wait for uniform development, the Territory
 should, as a matter of urgency, be provided with
 enlightened leaders as soon as possible. It should be
 noted with satisfaction that the Mission of the Inter-
 national Bank for Reconstruction and Development
 had reached the same conclusion.

3. It was encouraging to learn that the recommenda-
 tions of the United Nations Visiting Mission, to the
 Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962^{1/}
 had been or were in the process of being implemented.
 The special representative had confirmed that the
 Administering Authority had accepted and the Terri-
 tory's House of Assembly had approved the pro-
 grammes recommended in the report of the Bank Mis-
 sion.^{2/} Australia had also accepted the recommenda-
 tion in the report of the Commission on Higher Educa-
 tion^{3/} concerning the establishment of a university in
 New Guinea in 1967; the Territorial House of Assembly
 had already adopted the appropriate legislation and had
 likewise decided to establish an institute of higher
 technical education. It would thus appear that the
 Administering Authority had undertaken to prepare the

^{1/} For the report of the 1962 Visiting Mission, see T/1597 and Add.1.
^{2/} International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The
 Economic Development of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea
 (September 1964).
^{3/} Report of the Commission on Higher Education in Papua and New
 Guinea (Canberra, 1964).

New Guinean people for self-government and independence.

4. The Minister for Territories had informed the House of Assembly in January 1965 that the Administering Authority would be willing to examine any proposals by the House of Assembly concerning the future of the Territory. The newly established Select Committee on a constitution would have to study carefully the present structure of the Territorial legislature and propose such changes as might be required to extend its powers and enable it effectively to exercise its prerogatives. The Administering Authority was doubtless aware of the views of certain elected members of the House on that matter. His delegation considered that the indigenous membership of the House of Assembly should be increased. Every constituency, established on the basis of 20,000 inhabitants in each, should elect its own parliamentary representative to the central legislature.

5. The Select Committee on a constitution should also consider the question of the official members, whose function had been to assist the House in drafting legislation and preparing the budget during the transition period. The presence of those experts no longer seemed to be required, and it might be asked whether the official and special seats should not be abolished by the time of the next general elections.

6. His delegation agreed with the Visiting Mission that it was in the relationship between the executive and the legislature that the greatest need for decision and progress was to be found, and it hoped that the Select Committee would study that question carefully and define clearly the nature of that relationship in the draft constitution which it was to prepare.

7. His delegation regretted that the system of parliamentary under-secretaries had not produced satisfactory results, for that might shake the confidence of the people in a ministerial system. The Australian Government should re-examine that system and try to train New Guineans for key posts in the Public Service. The Visiting Mission had very rightly stated that the Administering Authority should choose from among the inhabitants of the Territory those whose personal qualities recommended them for certain important posts in the Public Service, where experience and personal qualities were more essential than theoretical knowledge.

8. The special representative had announced that by the end of June New Guinea would have seventy-three local government councils, representing 861,500 inhabitants. However, the Administering Authority should try to provide those councils with additional resources and allow them to assume broader powers, particularly with regard to such matters as health, education and road construction. Also, the time had come to set up in the larger centres local authorities responsible for the Administration and financing of the most important public services. In that connexion, the Administering Authority and the House of Assembly should give urgent consideration to the recommendations of the International Bank Mission appearing in annex I to its report. His delegation had learned with interest of the statement made by Mr. Guise, the leader of the elected members of the House (T/1635 and Add.

1, para. 215), especially in the light of the clear statement by the Australian Minister for Territories that his country had no intention of imposing on New Guinea any preconceived ideas concerning its future administration. His delegation took the statement to mean a shift of emphasis towards policies of giving greater responsibilities to the New Guineans.

9. As far as the Territory's economic development was concerned, the Administering Authority would have to place greater emphasis on investment, land reform and increased participation by the people in economic activities. The report of the Bank Mission made it abundantly clear that if Australia wanted the Territory to attain the goal of economic viability at an early date, it would have to increase the financial assistance which it was providing, taking into account first and foremost the interests of the inhabitants. According to the Mission, £A20 million would have to be invested over the next five years in new plantations and livestock development, forest exploitation, transport services and tourism, and the establishment of new industries. As Australia was willing to accept foreign capital, it should not be too difficult to find the necessary financial resources.

10. The problem of land tenure should also be vigorously attacked. Although the inhabitants had to some extent taken it upon themselves to deal with that problem, the House of Assembly and the Administering Authority should join forces in converting the overly complicated traditional system of land tenure into a modern system conducive to the Territory's economic development.

11. In the final analysis, however, everything depended on the participation and will to act of the indigenous inhabitants. The Commission on Higher Education and the International Bank Mission had both reached the conclusion that education in the Territory should be organized in such a way as to train the skilled manpower required for development, to create a climate favourable to progress and to increase production while at the same time raising the level of consumption. The Territory's economic development could proceed much more rapidly if the Territory were well provided with intermediate personnel and skilled workers, who could in certain cases receive in-service training.

12. Great strides had been made in primary education, but secondary education and technical training, which were still in their infancy, should be rapidly developed. The Administering Authority had just decided to establish a university and an institute of higher technical education, which could be expected not only to play an important part in the development of the Territory but also to become a powerful factor of unity. Higher education should be adapted to the particular conditions prevailing in the Territory.

13. Referring to the Australian representative's remarks that New Guinea was not Africa and not Asia, he quoted the following passage from the report of the Commission on Higher Education:

"As for ambition, the world today is full of peoples who are doing things which, 30 years ago, their best and most radical friends thought they could never do; they often do not work smoothly or according to our

ideas, but on the whole the essential tasks of governance get done. . . . New Guinea is not Africa but it would be rash to assume that we have any more time than Africa had." ^{4/}

14. Mr. SALSAMENDI (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) pointed out that in spite of the commendable efforts of the Administering Authority in the educational field, there still remained much to be done in New Guinea. The Administration's expenditure on education during the period under review had been three and one half times the expenditure in 1959/1960, but that represented no more, in percentage terms, than 16.6 per cent of total government expenditure, compared with 18 per cent during the previous financial year. Further efforts were therefore necessary in that field.

15. The total number of pupils in the primary schools had more than doubled since 1960, but more than 38 per cent of school-age children did not attend school. In 1964, primary school education had been made compulsory in three areas; it was to be hoped that it would soon be extended to the whole Territory, where, in general, the enthusiasm of the children was such that no compulsion was needed to secure their attendance. The enrolment of girls had decreased slightly, and it was hoped that efforts would be made to reverse that trend and also to deal with the serious problem of the high proportion of pupils abandoning their studies before completing standard VI.

16. Although the number of junior secondary schools had increased, there had been a decrease in the number of high schools and their enrolments. However, a larger number of children were receiving education at Australian secondary schools. The problem of wastage was even more serious in secondary schools than in primary schools. It was therefore necessary that efforts aimed at developing secondary education in the Territory should be intensified, and that the number of students should be increased in order to train the necessary cadres. As, moreover, the number of girls represented only 20 per cent of the total of students receiving secondary education, it was to be hoped that measures would be taken to improve that situation.

17. With respect to technical education, although the number of schools had risen from thirteen to sixteen and the number of students from 598 to 788 between 1963 and 1964, that type of education was still inadequate.

18. During the period under review, the number of primary school teachers had increased from 4,325 to 5,471, the latter figure including 4,693 indigenous teachers. As, however, the attendance at the teacher-training schools had decreased, priority should be given to the training of larger numbers of fully qualified teachers and the improvement of the qualifications of teachers already in service.

19. UNESCO had noted with satisfaction the recommendation of the Commission on Higher Education that a university and an institute for higher technical education should be established. It was absolutely necessary that a territory of more than 1.5 million inhabitants

should be in a position to train its own cadres without being obliged to depend upon scholarships for studies abroad. The number of scholarships was, moreover, quite inadequate, totalling only twelve in 1964. As the Territory needed highly qualified personnel in every field who would be ready to assume responsibility when self-government was attained, a high degree of priority should be given to the establishment of the new university.

20. Although no accurate figures were available to indicate the percentage of adult illiteracy, it was certainly very high. It was therefore desirable that the current programmes in adult education should be intensified and that literacy campaigns should be launched in certain pilot areas of the Territory.

21. The Secretariat of UNESCO had been in consultation with the Australian Government on proposals for educational development based on recommendations of the Commission on Higher Education and of the Mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Those proposals related, in particular, to the training of secondary school teachers, the development of higher technical education, the introduction of adult education programmes and the extension of science teaching at the primary and secondary levels. Within the limits of its programme, UNESCO was ready to offer the Territory all the assistance which might be called for.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the Administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(b) Nauru (T/1641, T/L.1091)

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:

(a) Nauru (T/1636)

OPENING STATEMENTS

22. The PRESIDENT, speaking as Chairman of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, thanked the members of the Mission for their co-operation and for their selfless devotion in carrying out their task. He also thanked Mr. Brian Hickey, the representative of the Administering Authority, and Mr. Reginald Marsh, the special representative of the Administering Authority, for their assistance. The Visiting Mission had received a most cordial, attentive and generous welcome, particularly from the people of Nauru, whose warm reception was evidence of the esteem and the confidence which they felt for the United Nations and the Trusteeship Council.

23. Nevertheless, there were also some shadows in the picture, for the Nauruans were most anxious about their future and had been greatly disappointed at the failure of the conversations which had taken place with the Administering Authority. The Visiting Mission had heard the claims of the inhabitants, had noted the contents of the documents they had presented to it and had listened to the explanations of the Administering Authority. Pending the result of the new negotiations which were to take place and in the hope that some ground for agreement would be found, the Mission had not wished to prejudice the course of events. Its report

^{4/} *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

(T/1636) accordingly summarized as clearly as possible the state of affairs prevailing at the time when it had been in Nauru and conveyed to the Council the contents of the documents in which the claims and views of the people of Nauru were set forth. The report reflected, in general, the sympathy which the members of the Mission felt for the concerns and the aspirations of the Nauruans, whose spokesmen had proved themselves both worthy and capable. In the meantime, the planned negotiations had taken place, and it was to be hoped that they had been fruitful and would open up favourable prospects for the future of the inhabitants of Nauru.

24. He indicated that paragraph 89 of the report, dealing with phosphate dust, had been deleted and that a new text of the paragraph would be circulated to the members of the Council very shortly.^{5/}

25. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) congratulated the members of the Visiting Mission on their report, which was the reflection, not only of their industry, but also of the careful consideration they had given to the problems facing the Territory. In Nauru, as in New Guinea, they had earned the respect of all those with whom they had come in contact.

26. The Australian Government and the Administration of Nauru, as well as the Nauru Local Government Council and the people of the island, had studied the report with the closest attention. As the Mission had observed, the main problem for Nauru arose from the fact of its entire dependence upon one economic asset. Moreover, the remoteness of the island, its small area and small population had led to proposals, over the years, for resettling the population elsewhere. In that connexion, paragraph 42 of the report, in which reference was made to the "Nauruans' demand for complete sovereignty over any territory in which they might be resettled" should be corrected. In fact, the Nauruans had decided to leave matters of defence, external affairs, quarantine and civil aviation in the hands of the Australian Government.

27. At the present time, the state of affairs on the island was, in general, quite satisfactory. Most problems had been solved. A standard working week had been introduced, and the wage structure was satisfactory, with arrangements for review at regular intervals. The fully integrated schools were providing education on modern lines, and many scholarships were open to young Nauruans for studies in Australia. Also, the inhabitants had the advantage of a health service providing free medical attention.

28. Progress had also been made in the political field, but the particular situation of the Territory called for particular solutions which could only be reached through consultation and negotiation. Such consultation and negotiation were continuing uninterruptedly, and a new phase had just been completed. There were, indeed, still problems to be solved, but definite advances had been made, and some basis for understanding had been found.

29. He introduced to the members of the Council three of the persons who were taking part in the negotiations: Mr. Reginald Marsh, special representative of the

Administering Authority for Nauru; Mr. Hammer De Roburt, Head Chief of Nauru and leader of the Nauruan delegation; and Mr. Buraro Detudamo, an elected member of the Nauru Council and a member of the Nauruan delegation, who was the son of the former Head Chief who had died recently and to whom he wished to pay a sincere tribute.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Marsh, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, took a place at the Council table.

30. Mr. Marsh (Special Representative) said that, as in the past, in his opening statement he would give a broad appreciation of developments over the past year and, in addition, would circulate in written form,^{6/} as part II of his statement, factual information to bring up to date the information given in the annual report of the Administering Authority now before the Council.^{7/}

31. The year ending 30 June 1965 had been an important year for the Trust Territory of Nauru. It had seen the visit of the Visiting Mission, further material and social progress, the expansion of the phosphate industry and improvements in the living conditions of its employees and their families and, finally, a decision to establish a legislative council and an executive council and to allow the Nauruans to participate in the running of the phosphate industry.

32. In regard to the future of the Nauruan people, he recalled his statement at the Council's thirty-first session (1232nd meeting) to the effect that, notwithstanding the Nauruans' rejection of the proposal for their resettlement on Curtis Island close to the Queensland coast, the Australian Government had decided to acquire certain tenures on Curtis Island so that it could honour its offer to the Nauruans should an agreement for their resettlement on that island be reached with them. However, at the discussions of July 1964, the Nauruans had stated that, in the absence of satisfactory resettlement proposals from the Australian Government, they had decided to remain on Nauru; they had requested the constitution of a legislative council to replace the existing Local Government Council, with a view to their being equipped to govern themselves by 1968, and had demanded greater benefits from the exploitation of the phosphate industry, as well as a larger share in the control of the industry itself.

33. At the July 1964 conference the Australian Government, on behalf of the Administering Authority, had made proposals with regard to the phosphate royalties which should be paid to the Nauruans, and it had been agreed to hold further discussions after the proposals had been referred back to the Nauru Local Government Council. In April 1965 the Australian Government, at the express request of the Nauruans, had abandoned the idea of acquiring Curtis Island, although it continued to think that the resettlement of

^{5/} Circulated by the Australian delegation to members of the Council only.

^{7/} Commonwealth of Australia, *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations: Administration of the Territory of Nauru, 1st July 1963 to 30th June 1964* (Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1631).

^{5/} Subsequently circulated in document T/1636/Corr.1.

the Nauruan people in a new home would enable their interests to be better safeguarded.

34. During the discussions of June 1965, which had just been concluded, Head Chief Hammer De Roburt, Councillor Austin Bernicke, the Secretary of the Nauru Local Government Council, and Councillor Detudamo had made submissions on the following six questions: the ownership of phosphate, the rate of royalties, the rate of extraction of phosphate, the establishment of a legislative council and subsequent independence, the proposal for legislative and executive councils and the rehabilitation of Nauru. These submissions were so important that they would be circulated to members of the Council as annex I to the statement he was now making.^{8/}

35. With regard to the ownership and extraction of phosphate, the Nauruans had stated that it had not been established that any right to extract phosphate had been legally acquired, and they had submitted that the Administering Authority could not take, by ordinance or otherwise, powers to extract phosphate without the prior consent of the Nauruan people. They had maintained that payment of royalties was due to them by right and not as a concession. Since the mining of phosphate was being effected by the Administering Authority through the British Phosphate Commissioners, and in the light of the amount of phosphate already extracted, it was, they had said, the duty of the Administration to provide all facilities for such extraction and to cover its cost. As it had been recognized ever since 1919 that the exercise of trusteeship over a Territory was fundamentally for the benefit of the people of the Territory, it followed, in their view, that the profit derived from exploitation of the natural resources of Nauru should accrue to the Nauruans. They had considered that the Administering Authority had the further duty of preventing any exploitation prejudicial to the interests of the inhabitants, and of providing them with the means of educating themselves; and that the cost of fulfilling those obligations should obviously not be defrayed from the Territory's resources, which should not be depleted to the point of exhaustion. The Nauruans had requested that they should be fully consulted on all aspects of the phosphate industry, and had said that they were prepared to negotiate with the Australian Government concerning management of the industry and remuneration for such management.

36. In regard to political development, the Nauruans had requested the establishment, before 31 January 1966, of a legislative council and an executive council, and the granting of their own independence on 31 January 1968. The legislative council, with the Administrator as its president, should consist of a majority of Nauruans elected from the Nauru Local Government Council, together with official members appointed by the Administrator as heads of the departments of the Administration (Health, Education, Police, and Nauruan Affairs). It should have power to make all laws required for the good government of the island—except in regard to land, control of the phosphate industry,

and phosphate royalties, those three questions being reserved to the Administrator in consultation with the Nauru Local Government Council. The executive council, with the Administrator as president, should consist of the Head Chief, the Secretary of the Nauru Local Government Council, the Official Secretary and such other official member as the Administrator might require to be present for the transaction of particular business.

37. The Nauruans had submitted that the worked-out phosphate lands should be rehabilitated by the Administering Authority and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO); the latter should investigate the most efficient means of restoring the land. The Australian Water Resources Council should assist in measuring the Territory's water resources.

38. In regard to resettlement, the Nauruans had said that they could not accept the alternative offered to them.

39. At the conference, the Australian legal advisers had stated—in a statement the text of which his delegation would circulate to members of the Council as annex II to his present statement^{9/}—that there was a sound legal basis for the rights exercised by the British Phosphate Commissioners and that the Nauruans' objections thereto were without substance. With regard to the rate of royalties and the rate of extraction of phosphate, the Australian delegation had suggested that those two questions should be examined jointly. He recalled that in the course of the 1964 discussions the Administering Authority had proposed, in the light of the increase in the rate of output, which had reached 2.5 million tons, that the royalties paid to the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund, the Nauru Landowners Royalty Trust Fund and the cash royalties for landowners should be increased from 2s.8d. to 4s. per ton and that those paid to the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund should be increased from 1s. to 3s. per ton; the Nauruans had argued that royalties should be increased to 14s.8d. per ton, but their suggestion had not been accepted. Subsequently the British Phosphate Commissioners had reconsidered the position, and the Administering Authority had pointed out to the Nauruan delegation that there was no obligation for the Authority to pay royalties, although it was certainly bound, under the Trusteeship Agreement, to safeguard the interests of the inhabitants and had accordingly paid them in 1947–1948, on an output of about 260,000 tons, a royalty of 1s.1d. per ton and in 1963–1964, on an output of 1.6 million tons, a royalty of 3s.8d. per ton.

40. The Administering Authority had also pointed out that the Nauru Council had been consulted on the subject. In accordance with the changing situation and in the light of the arguments advanced by the Nauruan representatives at the 1964 talks, the Authority had proposed that political advancement should be accompanied by progressive changes in the phosphate arrangements: once the legislative council had been set up, discussions could take place on the future basis of operation of the

^{8/} Circulated by the Australian delegation to members of the Council only. Subsequently, in accordance with a decision of the Council (see T/SR.1262, para.14), circulated also as a Council document (see T/1643, annex I).

^{9/} Circulated by the Australian delegation to members of the Council only. Subsequently, in accordance with a decision of the Council (see T/SR.1262, para. 1), circulated also as a Council document (see T/1643, annex II).

phosphate industry, and the Nauruans could be brought into partnership, after a period of some two years, in the operation of the industry; the broad basis would be that the Nauruans would receive 50 per cent of the financial benefit of the industry, and negotiations would take place with them on other questions, such as the rate of production.

41. The Nauruans had indicated that they were rigorously opposed to the extraction rate of 2.5 million tons per annum which had been mentioned in the 1964 talks. It had been suggested to them however, that they should reconsider their attitude on that point, since an examination of the figures would show that a high extraction rate would not prejudice their interests. On the contrary: on the basis of an extraction rate of 2.5 million tons, royalties would cease after twenty-five years (the life of the deposits) but the capital sum accumulated, at 5 per cent per annum compound interest, would be £50 million; whereas, with an extraction rate of 1.6 million tons per annum the capital sum would after thirty-eight years (the life of the deposits at that rate) be only £32 million. The capital accumulation would be some 52 per cent greater in the first case than in the second. If the royalty rate was substantially higher, the figures were even more dramatic: on the basis of an extraction rate of 2.5 million tons, the payment to the Long-Term Fund of a royalty of 16s. per ton would yield a capital sum of £99 million at exhaustion. On a 50 per cent partnership basis, the financial benefit at 2.5 million tons per annum would be still greater. Assuming an annual extraction rate of more than 2 million tons for the period 1965-1967 and a progressive increase in the rate of payment during that period from 10s. to 25s. per ton, each Nauruan family could receive in 1967 about £1,800 per annum, tax-free, and, by 1990, assuming a population of 9,000, about £3,000 per annum. A lower extraction rate would prolong the life of the phosphate deposits by thirteen years only and that would not solve the problem. The additional funds which would accrue to the Nauruans from a higher extraction rate would give them more freedom to choose what they wished to do when the deposits were exhausted. That was why the Nauruans had been advised, in their own interest, to accept an extraction rate of 2.5 million tons per annum.

42. With regard to the political advancement of the Territory, the Australian delegation had proposed that a joint advisory committee representative of the Nauruans and of the Administering Authority should be set up to make recommendations on the powers to be held by the legislative council and the Administrator's council. In two or three years' time there would be consultation on the possibility of further political progress.

43. Turning to the question of rehabilitation of the land, he said that the British Phosphate Commissioners had estimated that the restoration of worked-out phosphate land with soil brought from Australia would cost a minimum of £128 million. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) had also studied the question and likewise considered that the cost of the operation would not be justified. However, an expert committee could be established to make a full-scale investigation with the assistance of an FAO expert.

44. The resettlement of the Nauruans elsewhere appeared therefore to be the only answer to the problem. Consequently, the Australian Government hoped that the Nauruans would reconsider their decision not to leave their island.

45. Following the latest discussions, it had been agreed that a legislative council and an executive council should be established by 31 January 1966. The legislative council would have wide powers in all fields except defence, external affairs and the phosphate industry; its ordinances would be subject to approval by the Governor-General. An advisory committee comprising two Nauruans with their advisers, two Australian Government representatives and the Administrator of Nauru would be set up forthwith and would make recommendations to the Local Government Council and the Australian Government regarding the constitution and the operation of the two councils. In response to the Nauruan delegation's request that a target date of 31 January 1968 should be set for independence, the Australian delegation had expressed the view that time should be allowed for the Territory to acquire some experience of government and that further discussions on the subject should take place in two or three years' time.

46. The discussions concerning the phosphate industry would resume as soon as the legislative council had been established. Royalty rates had been tentatively fixed for 1964-1965—with retroactive effect—and for 1965-1966. The rate for the latter period would be 17s. 6d. for an extraction rate of 2 million tons per annum. The Australian delegation had given the Nauruans an assurance that the operation of that rate of extraction would not prejudice any Nauruan request for a reduction in the extraction rate after 1967-1968.

47. The two parties had agreed to establish at the earliest practicable date an independent committee of experts to examine the question of rehabilitating the land on Nauru. Furthermore, the Administering Authority would pursue, in co-operation with Nauruan representatives, any proposal that might give promise of enabling the Nauruan people to resettle elsewhere on a basis acceptable to them and one which would preserve their national identity.

48. On the question of the phosphates, the Nauruan delegation had maintained its view that the British Phosphate Commissioners could not work the phosphates without the agreement of the Nauruan people, while the Australian delegation had restated its view that the rights of the British Phosphate Commissioners were undeniable.

49. He was confident that the Council would be pleased with the considerable progress which had been made in the Territory, which the Visiting Mission had observed.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (T/PET.10/37, T/L.1093, T/L.1094) (concluded)*

50. The PRESIDENT referring to the petition contained in document T/PET.10/37 concerning the Trust

*Resumed from the 1253rd meeting.

Territory of the Pacific Islands, which had been left in abeyance, and to the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet delegation (T/L.1093) and the United Kingdom delegation (T/L.1094), said that there were no differences of opinion in the Council as to the manner of dealing with the petition. Since the representative of the Administering Authority had indicated that his Government agreed to an investigation of the charges contained in the petition, he asked the Soviet and United Kingdom delegations not to press for a vote on their draft resolutions. He suggested that the Council should invite the World Health Organization to undertake the investigation and to report on its findings to the Trusteeship Council. Those findings would of course be inserted in the Council's report and brought to the attention of the petitioner.

It was so decided.

51. The PRESIDENT paid a tribute to the spirit of compromise and moderation shown by the members of the Council.

52. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had facilitated consideration of the petition and that, at the 1253rd meeting, the special representative had answered, to the expressed satisfaction of several members of the Council, all the questions put to him in connexion with the petition. His Government continued to deny the allegations made and would welcome the dispatch to the Territory of an impartial investigating committee.

53. Dr. COIGNEY (World Health Organization) said that the observations submitted by WHO on the health situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1638) were based on a study of the annual report of the Administering Authority¹⁰ and the conclusions reached by the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964.¹¹

54. In accordance with article 2 (e) of the Constitution of the World Health Organization and article VIII of the Agreement between the United Nations and WHO, the Director-General of WHO would give the Council all the assistance requested of that organization.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1633, T/1638, T/L.1089 and Add.1, T/L.1092) (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (T/PET.10/L.8, T/PET.10/L.9 and Corr.1) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

55. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished, in exercise of his right of reply, to refer to the explanations given by the United States representative at the 1253rd meeting. At that

meeting, Mr. Dickinson had said that the Soviet delegation, because it was afraid of it, had belittled the Congress of Micronesia. How could the Soviet delegation fear that body, however, when that delegation was asking that the Congress should be given legislative and executive powers over the whole Territory and that the High Commissioner's right to veto any proposal made by the Congress should be withdrawn?

56. His delegation flatly rejected the United States representative's insinuations that the Soviet Union was not interested in the people of Micronesia and disregarded their wishes. It had consistently supported proposals that the Congress of Micronesia be given legislative and executive powers because it was concerned for all peoples throughout the world who were under the colonial yoke and sought by all means to help them to achieve independence. The diversionary manoeuvres of the United States representative would not help the Administering Authority to evade its responsibility. Slandering the Soviet Union would not alter the fact that Micronesia was not yet independent.

57. The United States representative had been surprised that the Soviet delegation should ask why the word "independence" was not mentioned in the preamble to the Order No. 2882 establishing the Congress of Micronesia. However, if there was truth in that representative's assertion that there was no hidden meaning in the omission of that word, why, then, was the word not mentioned in the document? The United States delegation had mentioned the Charter and, in particular, Article 76 b, but twenty years had elapsed since the Charter had been drawn up and it was reasonable to ask whether the Administering Authority was or was not leading the Territory towards independence. If the United States Government planned only self-government for the Territory, it should say so, or declare formally that it had no intention of annexing the Territory.

58. The United States representative had also expressed surprise that the Soviet delegation had accused his Government of failing to take sufficient notice of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. He had not, however, said what, in his opinion, were the essential elements, and the other elements, of that Declaration. He had, to be sure, emphasized certain provisions of the Declaration but had taken them out of context. The United States representative must say whether his Government recognized that paragraphs 3 and 5, in particular, applied to the Territory and whether it was giving effect to the provisions of those paragraphs. That representative made abundant use of ambiguous expressions to give the impression that his Government approved the principles set out in the Declaration, and affirmed that any proposal for action made by the Special Committee with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands must be in the form of proposals to the General Assembly that the latter should make recommendations to the Security Council. It was to be asked what purpose was served by such legal technicalities. The history of decolonization had shown that no country should or could disregard the wishes of the General Assembly, and in particular its resolution 1514 (XV), or the recommendations of the Special Committee. It might be asked what reason there was

¹⁰/ United States of America, 17th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964, Department of State Publication 7811 (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1633).

¹¹/ For the report of the 1964 Visiting Mission, see T/1620.

for proceeding in such a devious way, and whether the United States Government was afraid of the Security Council, which was the very organ which had entrusted the Trusteeship Council with the task of examining conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The idea of the Trusteeship Council requesting the Security Council to concern itself with the question was in no way unusual.

59. The truth about conditions in the Territory could not be concealed by unleashing a torrent of abuse or by resorting to insolence and rudeness. The truth was that the people of Micronesia were not administering their own affairs and the Administration had the right to veto the decisions of the Congress of Micronesia. None of the questions which the Soviet delegation had put to the representative of the United States at the 1253rd meeting had been answered satisfactorily.

60. The era of colonialism had passed; the world was living in a period when every country must provide public opinion with a clear explanation of its policies in all fields.

61. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that if insolence and rudeness had been introduced into the Council, it was the Soviet delegation that had done so. The Soviet delegation charged the United States was enslaving the people of the Trust Territory. That was an insult to the intelligence of the other members of the Council, who knew full well, from the Visiting Missions that had gone to the Territory, that those people were not enslaved. He doubted that the people themselves were impressed. They knew full well they were not enslaved. No amount of repetition of that word would make it so.

62. It was true that a representative of the Territory had said, in reply to a question from a member of the Council, that he would prefer independence as the future of the Territory but on condition, he had added, that that ever became possible. He had in that connexion expressed real concern—a concern of the Micronesian people—as to whether the economic requirements for independence would ever be possible in such a small and poorly endowed Territory.

63. The representative of the Soviet Union persisted in saying that the United States delegation refused to speak of independence for the Territory. That was simply not true; his delegation had said over and over again that it was dedicated to the principles laid down in the Charter, to which it had remained faithful for twenty years, whether others had or had not. It consistently affirmed that Article 76 b of the Charter expressed the precise aim of the United States, namely, the progressive development of the people of the Territory "towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to . . . the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned . . .". He wished to stress that last phrase.

64. The representative of the Soviet Union had said that he was not satisfied with the statement of the United States delegation with regard to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. As far as the United States was concerned, the most essential element of that Declaration was paragraph 2, which stated: "All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely

determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development". It considered, however, that other passages of the Declaration did not apply to the Territory: for example, paragraph 1, which referred to "alien subjugation, domination and exploitation". As for paragraph 3, the word "pretext" meant a false reason for doing something. However, inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness would never be used by any honourable country—the United States included—as a pretext for delaying the attainment of independence of a Trust Territory. To the extent that paragraph 5 limited the free choice of the people of the Trust Territories, it was incompatible with the Charter, specifically Article 76, which spoke of self-government or independence; and with General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), according to which a Territory reached a full measure of self-government by emergence as a sovereign independent State or by free association or integration with an independent State. The United States did not try to determine for dependent peoples, whether they were administered by the United States or others, what their future should be. The choice was theirs to make.

65. At the Council's 1253rd meeting, the representative of the Soviet Union had tried to put words into the mouth of the United States delegation. It had proposed that the United States delegation should state four things that it would not do. The Soviet representative had repeated one of them at the present meeting. This led him to suggest a statement which the representative of the Soviet Union might make. The first point of the suggested Soviet statement might be: "On behalf of the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet representative states that his delegation will not in the future attempt to decide for the people of Micronesia what their future will be."

66. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), rising to a point of order, said that the Soviet Union, which consisted of fifteen sovereign, equal and freely associated republics, did not administer any Trust or Non-Self-Governing Territory and that its activities could not be discussed in any way in the Trusteeship Council. He therefore asked that the United States representative should limit his statement to the item on the agenda.

67. The PRESIDENT made a further appeal to all delegations not to depart from the item under discussion.

68. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that what he had been saying was relevant to the agenda item under discussion. He had a two-point statement, the idea for which had been suggested to him by the representative of the Soviet Union. The latter had jumped to a strange conclusion, perhaps from a guilty conscience. The statement he, as United States representative, had suggested the Soviet Union make referred to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and not to Soviet territories. The second point of the suggested Soviet statement might be as follows: "The Government of the Soviet Union undertakes that it will no longer employ this Council for the use of anti-colonialism for the cynical purposes of propaganda."

69. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Government did not find it difficult to say that it would never decide for the people of Micronesia what their future would be. That was something which it never had done and never would do, and in that respect it differed from the Government of the United States. He noted that the United States representative had not always refuted the justified charges of the Soviet delegation concerning the annexationist aims of the United States with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; that was something which the United States representative would find it difficult to do in view of his Government's policy. It was, after all, obvious that the United States wanted to use the Territory for military purposes, and the Trusteeship Council for propaganda purposes, whereas the Trusteeship Agreement imposed on it the obligation to administer the Territory in conformity with the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations.

70. The Soviet Union had never used the Trusteeship Council for purposes of propaganda, but it had used and would continue to use every means at its disposal to eliminate colonialism from the world as rapidly as possible.

71. The representative of the United States had implied that paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was incompatible with the principles of the Charter. He himself would point out that to eliminate that paragraph would make the Declaration meaningless. The United States representative had also asserted that paragraph 1 of the Declaration did not apply to the Territory. Such an assertion was incomprehensible. He had added that, by contrast, General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) did apply to the Territory and that it was incompatible with resolution 1514 (XV). The United States representative seemed to forget that resolution 1541 (XV) related only to Non-Self-Governing Territories.

72. He found it deplorable that the Trusteeship System, which had originally been conceived as a means of bringing the people of the Trust Territories rapidly to independence, had in twenty years become a means of slowing down the process of liberation and of preventing the Territories from enjoying freedom. The colonial Powers were trying to continue the fight against progress and to perpetuate their domination. By its indecision, the Trusteeship Council was discrediting itself in the eyes of the peoples of Asia,

Africa and Latin America. The colonial problem could perhaps be finally solved, especially in so far as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was concerned, if it was brought before the Security Council, where the United States would have to face not only the Soviet Union but also the representatives of the people of the Territory. The Soviet delegation's proposal along those lines (T/L.1092) was not for purposes of propaganda but was practical in character; he asked whether the United States delegation was prepared to support it.

73. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) thanked the Soviet representative for his assurance; he hoped the future would bear him out. He wished to assure the Soviet representative that the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America were not deceived as to Soviet purposes.

74. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the representative of the United States had not answered his question. The Soviet Union, for its part, abided by the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. The Soviet Union was a socialist State which was fighting against the exploitation of man by man and of one nation by another. As the United States was, by contrast, an imperialistic country, it could not change its policy.

75. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said he was glad to answer the question of the Soviet Union: he opposed the Soviet draft resolution (T/L.1092) which would refer the Territory to the Security Council. This was not a new proposal. Its purpose was to give the Security Council the idea that the Trusteeship Council had found something wrong in the Territory. The Soviet delegation, as a member of the Security Council, knew full well that it could itself ask that Council to take up the Territory. He did not think the Soviet delegation would succeed in getting the Trusteeship Council to make that request for it.

76. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took note of the desire of the Western Powers not to have the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands examined in the Security Council. The Soviet delegation, through its proposal, was inviting the Trusteeship Council to display courage so as finally to break out of a vicious circle. His delegation would press its proposal. However, the United States representative's reply was satisfactory in so far as it clarified matters.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.