



486

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.1290
15 July 1966
ENGLISH

JUL 18 1966
RECEIVED

Thirty-Third Session

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND NINETIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 15 July 1966, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BROWN

(United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern
Ireland)

1. Examination of petitions concerning New Guinea
2. Examination of conditions in Nauru (continued):
 - (a) Annual report of the Administering Authority [4 (a)]
 - (b) Petitions concerning general problems in the Trust Territory of Nauru [6]
3. General Assembly resolution on the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru [9] (continued)
4. Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1967 [7]

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1290 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 6

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING NEW GUINEA (T/PET.8/20 and 21;
T/OBS.8/10 and 11)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Toogood, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of New Guinea under Australian administration, took his place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I think we might take up these petitions one by one. We will deal first with petition T/PET.8/20 and the observations contained in T/OBS.8/10.

I first give the floor to the representative of the Administering Authority in case he desires to make any opening remarks on this petition.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): There is little more I can add to the information which has been set out in T/OBS.8/10 of 13 July 1966. The fundamental thing is that Miss Prasad made an application for a position for which she was not qualified and was therefore not appointed to the position.

It is true that, as is set out in the explanation, under the immigration laws then extant in relation to Papua and New Guinea she was not eligible for residential appointment in Papua and New Guinea at that time. That situation no longer obtains. What does obtain is the situation that Miss Prasad was not qualified for the appointment for which she applied.

I might also say that, as I have pointed out previously in this Council, at any given moment in Australia there are many thousands of students from newly independent countries throughout the world, most of them with the financial assistance of the Australian Government. One of the basic requirements in connexion with this vast number of students living and working in Australia at any one time is that after qualification they should return to their own countries for a period which I think is five years to take back to their own countries the benefit of the skills and qualifications they have obtained by the assistance either of my Government or their own Government. After five

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

years' service back in their own country they can be considered, under proper circumstances, eligible for return to Australia, and Australian citizenship after a further five years.

That is why we have said in this document that it is relevant that Miss Prasad was for some years a student in my country and in the normal course of events and in accordance with this understanding, she would be expected to return, when she got her professional qualification, to her own country, which in this case happened to be Fiji, to bring back to the people of that country the skills she had obtained.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation has read with interest the observations made by the Government of Australia as Administering Authority in connexion with document T/PET 8/20. My delegation's major concern relates to the free entry of nationals of Member States of the United Nations into the trust territory of New Guinea. Is it within the competence of the Government of Australia, as Administering Authority, to bar the entry of nationals of member States of the United Nations into the Trust Territory of New Guinea? We understand that under article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, the Government of Australia

"... shall be responsible for the peace, order, good government and defense of the Territory and for this purpose shall have the same powers of legislation, administration and jurisdiction in and over the Territory as if it were an integral part of Australia, and will be entitled to apply to the Territory, subject to such modifications as it deems desirable, such laws of the Commonwealth of Australia as it deems appropriate to the needs and conditions of the Territory."

Let me hasten to say, before continuing my statement, that my delegation has no intention of reviewing or discussing the policies of the Commonwealth of Australia, particularly as regards its immigration policy. But we would like to know whether, under article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority may apply the widely known "new Australian policy" to the Trust Territory of New Guinea.

Mr. Peek stated in his petition that Miss Prasad was denied entry because "she was not 'eligible for Australian citizenship'". Are we to understand by this that only persons eligible for Australian citizenship may be permitted to enter the Trust Territory of New Guinea for employment or for some other form of business?

In the observations made by the Australian Government as the Administering Authority, the Australian Government wrote:

"At the time Miss Prasad was informed that because of the immigration requirements she could not be considered for appointment in Papua and New Guinea." (T/OBS.7/10, page 1)

My delegation would be greatly obliged to know what are the immigration requirements for entry into the Territory; and further, is there one requirement for Africans and Asians and another for Europeans or persons of European descent?

The head of my delegation has expressed her concern on this question of immigration into the Trust Territory, and we therefore would be grateful if the Australian Government, or its representative here, would be kind enough to give us some kind of answer to our question before we reach a decision on the final disposal of this petition as contained in document T/PET.8/20.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): My understanding of the situation in respect of the Trusteeship Agreement is that the Australian Government not only is free to apply, but has an obligation to apply such laws as it deems it necessary for the appropriate discharge of its Trusteeship obligations to the United Nations, to this Territory, immigration laws being included among them. The basic approach of the Australian Government to immigration into Papua and New Guinea is that when the people of Papua and New Guinea become independent, they will be free, of course, to make whatever laws and whatever regulations they like with regard to entry and domicile, in their own country, of people of any other country or any other race. Until that time, it is one of the aims of the Australian Government not to complicate their situation unduly by admitting people of a large number of different races and nationalities, something which might create nationality problems which might later become acute problems to the people of New Guinea. That has been the basic approach of my Government in this matter.

The changes to which I have referred recently relate to provisions that have been made for the entry of people of any and all races under certain circumstances ---not only under unrestricted circumstances; there is no country in the world that admits people of any other country under unrestricted circumstances and there is no obligation on the Australian Government to admit all and sundry, without let or hindrance, from any other country in the world into the Trust Territory or into metropolitan Australia, nor does any country represented around this country do so.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

People of any nationality and of any race who comply with certain requirements may be admitted to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea; but they must comply with certain requirements, and the requirements to which we have referred in the case of Miss Prasad are certain requirements relating to skills, and all the rest of it, which may be of use to the indigenous people of the Territory.

Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In reading this petition and in listening to the statement just made by the representative of Australia, a certain amount of perplexity arises in our minds. We note that Australia, unfortunately, is imposing on this Territory what amounts to a form of racism. In our view, the refusal to permit this person to engage in educational work in New Guinea is unjustifiable, for we know that people coming from the developing countries of Asia and Africa possess the same degree of competence as those coming from more developed countries and are thus entitled to make their contribution to education. We know too that at the same time Australia is encouraging members of the Australian Peace Corps to go to New Guinea, people who are not familiar with the cultures and civilizations of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Our delegation expresses its regret over the situation outlined in this particular petition.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Our colleague from the Soviet Union has waxed eloquent on the qualifications of people from Asia and Africa. But he has missed the point which I made earlier, that Australia is second to no country in the world in recognizing skills and in bringing to people who do not have the opportunity to get them otherwise the qualifications to capitalize on those skills. I have said before and I say again that of all the countries in the world, including, I think, the Soviet Union, Australia is the country which has the greatest concentration of students of all kinds from Asia.

This is a recognition of their skills. As a result of what we have to offer them, they get qualifications. What I did say was that in repayment to their own people and for the efforts that my Government puts into this

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

situation, what we ask of these people is that they go back to their own countries -- their own newly independent, undeveloped countries -- when they have acquired those skills from us, and spend at least five years working among their own people. Then, after those five years, they are eligible to apply for return to Australia under certain conditions and practice their skills in Australia, if they wish to do so.

The subject of this petition was not, in the terms used by our colleague, a person from Asia or Africa. She was a person from Fiji of Indian descent. She was trained in Australia, she lived in Australia, she was welcome in Australia; and the conditions which I have just spoken about applied to her, that is that if she had a skill which she wished to apply, she should apply that skill first of all among her own people and not seek to apply it among other people. This was part of the understanding under which such training is given in Australia.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

As for entry into Papua and New Guinea nobody is eligible for automatic entry into Papua and New Guinea. No Australian is eligible for automatic entry into Papua and New Guinea. He must comply with the immigration requirements and obtain a permit to enter there.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I thank the representative of Australia for the clarification he has given. If I may quote him -- and I hope correctly -- he said that "the Australian Government will not permit people of various races which might create difficulties in the future". He has told the Council that the Australian Government will restrict the entry of people into the Trust Territory of New Guinea on the basis of race.

This is the salient point I am trying to make here. Does the Administering Authority, whose sole purpose is just to administer the Territory, base entry into the Trust Territory of New Guinea on race? We are not concerned here with whom the Australian Government may permit to enter Australia. That is Australia's concern. We are not even concerned with the new Australian policy. What we are concerned with is that Australia should apply its new policy to the Trust Territory of New Guinea. This is in violation of human rights and of human dignity -- to permit entry into a Territory on the basis of race, out of fear. Out of fear of what? Out of fear that difficulties might be created in the future.

I just wish the Council to take note that the Australian representative here has told us that entry into the Trust Territory of New Guinea is based on racism.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I wish the Council to take note that I did not say any such thing, that the representative of Liberia has distorted what I did say. As an example of what I mean, let me quote this situation -- and the representatives of Liberia knows it as well as I do. There was an incipient problem in New Guinea which arose from the existence of some 3,000 Chinese citizens, people of Chinese descent in New Guinea. Through long residence in New Guinea, those good citizens of that country found themselves no longer wishing or eligible to return to China. They found that their human interests and their business interests lay elsewhere. They were not indigenous people of Papua and New Guinea. They were not in the same position as indigenous people of Papua and

New Guinea. The Australian Government gave special consideration to these people because of the problem with which, through no fault of their own and certainly through no fault of the Australian Government, they found themselves faced.

At the same time, there were people similarly placed, of different race. These were people of mixed race. They might have been mixed European and New Guinean. They might have been mixed Chinese and New Guinean. They might have been mixed Chinese and European. They might have been any mixture. They did not belong. They were not indigenous people in Papua and New Guinea.

The Australian Government, concerned about the plight of these people, then enacted legislation which made Australian citizens of a large section of these people, to give them a place where they could have a citizenship which they could not have in New Guinea where they lived. As a result, as has been pointed out in the observations relating to one of these other petitions, at least 700 and possibly 1,000 of these Chinese citizens of New Guinea have now become Australian citizens with residence in Australia, with property in Australia and with all the rights of the Australian citizens. Similarly, the people of mixed race were given the same rights, and many of them have taken advantage of that situation and they have become Australian citizens in every sense of the word.

If what the representative of Liberia is implying is that Australia will not permit unrestricted immigration to Papua and New Guinea -- if that is the effect of what he is saying -- then I agree. Australia will not permit unrestricted immigration of anyone, of all and sundry, to Papua and New Guinea, any more than the metropolitan countries represented around this table will permit unrestricted immigration of anyone into their own areas.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other observations on this petition?

There being none, I would assume that the Council would wish to decide to take note of the petition (T/PET.8/20) and of the Observations (T/OBS.8/10), to take note also of what has been said today, and to draw the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall request the Secretary-General to inform the Administering Authority and the petitioner of the action taken by the Trusteeship Council and to transmit to them the official records of the present meeting of the Trusteeship Council.

We now turn to the petition contained in document T/PET.8/21 and the observations thereon contained in document T/OBS.8/11. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on that petition on those observations?

Before calling on the representative of China, may I ask whether the representative of Australia has anything to add?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Not immediately, Sir, but I will be quite happy to do my best to answer any questions which the representative of China or any other member of the Council might wish to ask on this petition.

Mr. KIANG (China): I have one or two points which I should like to put to the Administering Authority concerning that petition (T/PET.8/21). I have also read the observations of the Government of Australia (T/OBS.8/11) with regard to it. It seems to us that two points in the petition were not covered by the observations.

In the first place I should like to hear from the Administering Authority how true was the complaint mentioned towards the end of the first paragraph on page 1 of the petition. What I am asking is this. Is it true that the Administering Authority turned down some of the people, referred to as "coloured people", who wanted to enter New Guinea to help in the development of industry and commercial management, while it accepted the British, the Germans, the Italians and the Russians and allowed them to enter the Territory without limitation? I should like to have some clarification from the representative of Australia on this point since it is not covered by the observations.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): First of all, it is not correct to say that British, Germans, Italians and Russians are allowed to enter the Territory without limitation. Any person, whether he be British, German, Italian, Russian or of any other alien grouping, as far as the citizenship laws of the Territory are concerned, must apply for an immigration permit to enter the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. And the permit is issued only subject to compliance with certain conditions, regardless of the country of nationality of the person concerned.

Now, it is true that certain conditions have been laid down with regard to, for example, the Chinese grouping of people in New Guinea. These were laid down because problems arose in connexion with those people, which I have just tried to explain. And, in saying this, I offer, as the representative of China will be the first to recognize, no criticism of these people: these people were of extraordinarily good citizenship; law-abiding, diligent, good people in every sense of the word. But they were not indigenous New Guineans, and they themselves became terribly concerned at times, as I think the representative of China is aware, regarding their status in this emerging country. So, to prevent the growth of a group of nationals of another country of this kind in the emerging circumstances of this country, certain limitations were placed on their entry, and those limitations related to the type of business they were engaged in, whether that business was to be for the ultimate good of the country's development, whether they had kinship ties with people already in New Guinea, and the rest. In other words, they were immigration regulations comparable at most points with the immigration regulations which every country around this table rightly -- and it is the right of every country around this table -- has enacted at various times. There is no automatic right of entry for me, for example, into the United States of America, although we count these people our friends. It is their right to decide how many Australians, and what Australians, shall come to reside in their country at any given time; and it is a right we certainly do not question. Nor do we question the right of the Soviet Union to say to me, or to anyone else, "You may enter our country only under certain circumstances".

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

Now, with regard to this group of Chinese people in the Territory, whose origins went back far beyond the times of our own Administration -- as I understand it, to the German times -- in order to prevent difficulties accruing to the indigenous people, and to prevent difficulties accruing to this particular group of people, certain conditions were laid down -- the sort of conditions which I have just described. At the same time, as I have also said, most generous provisions with regard to Australian citizenship and Australian assistance generally were offered to these people, and they were availed of in the majority of cases by the people to whom they were offered. Now, this policy was not a completely exclusive one. As the representative of China, who knows New Guinea, will agree I am sure, in certain categories of skills, in certain categories of relationship, in certain categories of compassion, and in certain other circumstances, entry was offered to people from this particular group. But, nevertheless, unrestricted entry was not offered.

Mr. KIANG (China): May I now come to the second point on which I should like to hear from the representative of Australia. I am now referring to the first paragraph on page 2 of the petition.

I am interested to know whether the Chinese school referred to in that paragraph was established in 1956. Is it true that there was a school established as early as 1956?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In reply to that question, I must confess I do not know whether there was a Chinese school started at Kavieng in 1956. I do know that there was a Chinese school, certainly at that time and before that time, in Rabaul itself, and that that Chinese school subsequently merged into a completely inter-racial school system, which exists now in Rabaul. But, whether there was such a school in Kavieng in 1956, I do not know. But, purely as a personal opinion, I would doubt, first of all, the fact of the existence of such a school, and I would say further that, if a school of any kind at Kavieng did exist at that time under those circumstances, it was small in size and less formal in its general content and conduct than the average school. But that is purely a personal opinion.

Mr. KIANG (China): I myself was unaware of such a school when I visited the Territory in 1959, so I was rather surprised to read in this petition that there was a school which was established in 1956.

Now, if that is true -- that there is a school which was established in 1956 -- then it means that that school has been operating for quite a period of time. If that is the case, there is no reason why any request for new teachers to go to New Guinea to give classes in that school was not granted by the Administering Authority. That is the point I am making.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): To answer the question in reverse order, I would say first of all that the Special Representative tells me there is no such school existing there now, whether or not it did exist in 1956 and within the period of the visit of the representative of China.

I would also say this. The system of education in Papua and New Guinea is what we would call a secular system of education, and it is a Government system of education. All education in Papua and New Guinea is controlled by the Papua and New Guinea Education Ordinance and, under that Ordinance, control of education policy and recognition of schools is vested in the secular school system, as we understand it, and in the Government of the Territory.

Now, as I explained in another context the other day, there are certain schools run by missionaries which do not reach the standards prescribed by the Education Ordinance, are not, therefore, recognized as conforming to the requirements of the State in respect to education and are not eligible for assistance -- and this could include the importation of teachers -- as are the recognized schools. It might well be that, if this school existed for some years, it was a school of a local kind conducted by a small Chinese community in that area, principally, I suggest, to school Chinese children -- and I have no quarrel with this --- in the basic elements of Chinese culture and the Chinese language, a matter which was not provided for, and deliberately not provided for, in the Government schools under the secular Government-controlled education system of the Territory.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

I remember in this connexion having some small part in policy making or policy advice. This problem did arise with regard to the Chinese community -- whether so much time should be given up during the ordinary school day in the Administration schools to the study of Chinese language and culture. And a decision was arrived at that, having regard to the requirements of the Government school system, special provision could not be made for a sectional group, whether they be Chinese or any other group in the community, at the expense of the normal school system; and that, therefore, Chinese language and Chinese culture, which were applicable only to a particular group in this community, would not be taught as part of the normal school curriculum; but that if the Chinese people wished to make provision, outside the school, for the schooling of their children in the elements of their own ancestral culture and language no hindrance would be placed in their way. And, indeed, I do believe that in those days, in Rabaul itself, special provision was made for the entry of a Chinese teacher, or teacher, under these circumstances, but not as part of the normal school system.

Mr. KIANG (China): In reply to my first point, the representative of Australia referred to Rabaul. What I am now going to say relates to the situation in Kavieng.

As I understand it, as early as 1959 the Chinese residents in Rabaul had a plan to get a Chinese teacher to go to New Guinea and give lessons in the Chinese language to their children outside school classes. I believe that the Administering Authority agreed to that plan. When I was in New Guinea, in Port Moresby, the Administrator himself informed me that that was so. I assume that these arrangements desired by the Chinese residents of Rabaul created no trouble or problems. Could the representative of Australia confirm that understanding?

At the same time, I should like to ask the representative of Australia the following question: If the Chinese residents of Kavieng were to make a request similar to that made by the Chinese residents of Rabaul, would the Administering Authority give the matter the same kind of consideration?

We all know how much the Chinese community has contributed to the development of New Guinea. I recall that in Rabaul the District Commissioner told me and repeated at one of the public meetings that Rabaul, the most modern city in New Guinea, had been entirely built by the Chinese and that if they should leave it one day, the city would be dead; he told me how much the Chinese community had contributed to the development of New Guinea. I therefore think that the request of the Chinese residents there is legitimate.

I therefore should like the representative of Australia to confirm my understanding that the arrangements made as early as 1959 have given rise to no difficulty.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In replying to the representative of China, I shall have to rely completely on my memory, and what I shall say will therefore be subject to correction. My memory is a bit hazy on details, but I shall state the position as I remember it.

I do remember that, as the representative of China has said, special representations were made and certain special arrangements were set in train -- with what ultimate end I do not recall -- with regard to the situation that he has described. I would also confirm, again from my recollection, that no difficulties

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

or embarrassment for the New Guinea Administration and the Australian Government arose from whatever arrangements were set in train then.

As the representative of China has said, and as I myself have said previously, the Chinese community in that part of the world has been in many respects a model community, hard working, industrious, law abiding, civic minded and promoters of commercial enterprises. Having said that, I do not think that I could go as far as the representative of China has gone and state that if the Chinese community left Rabaul it would die. In fact, I would say the opposite: that if the Chinese community left Rabaul it would go on. Perhaps it would go on in a slightly different way; adjustments might have to be made here and there. But I can assure the representative of China that Rabaul, like other parts of New Guinea, would go on whether or not the Chinese were there. Indeed, many members of the Chinese community have left Rabaul, either temporarily or permanently. They have left Rabaul to go to Australia. Many of my Chinese friends in that part of the world are established permanently in Australia now, having previously been established in Rabaul, or have the best of both worlds and are established both in Australia and in New Guinea.

Mr. KIANG (China): I wish to observe that what I said about the Chinese residents in Rabaul was merely a quotation of a statement made at a public meeting by the District Commissioner.

I am satisfied with the replies given by the representative of Australia. All that I wish to request is that the Council should take note of the observations of the Administering Authority and see that they are communicated to the petitioner for his information.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): I think that that is the very least that the Council could do.

I should like to apologize to the representative of China for not having answered the last part of his question, which escaped me in the flood of words. He asked whether the same conditions would be applied to a similar application from the Chinese residents of Kavieng. My answer must be that that decision would have to be based on a consideration of all the conditions obtaining at Kavieng at any

particular time. Those conditions would not necessarily be the same as those in Rabaul at the time the application was made there.

The PRESIDENT: Since there are no other members of the Council who wish to comment on this petition and the observations of the Administering Authority, I shall take it that the Council wishes, as suggested by the representative of China and agreed to by the representative of Australia, to take note of the petition (T/PET.8/21) and the observations of the Administering Authority (T/OBS.8/11) and of what has been said in this Council today and to draw the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Again in accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall request the Secretary-General to inform the Administering Authority and the petitioner of the action taken by the Trusteeship Council and to transmit to them the official records of the present meeting of the Council.

Mr. Toogood withdrew.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 (a), 6 AND 9

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN NAURU (continued):

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1648; T/L.1108)
- (b) PETITIONS CONCERNING GENERAL PROBLEMS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/PET.9/L.1)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (2111 (XX) (continued))

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R.S. Leydin, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Nauru under Australian administration, and Head Chief Hammer De Roburt and Mr. Joseph Detsimea took places at the Council table.

Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to make a brief statement in connexion with General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX), which refers to the timetable for granting independence to the Territory of Nauru. On the agenda of the thirty-third session of the Trusteeship Council there is a very important item entitled: General Assembly resolution on the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru (2111 (XX)). The members of the Council will, of course, recall that in this resolution reference is made to the most important aspects of the life of the people of Nauru, that is, the granting of independence to the Territory and the conditions under which this can be effected. This resolution, which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly, was presented on the initiative of a number of African countries, namely, Algeria, Ethiopia, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Libya, Togo and the United Arab Republic. It was put forward for the consideration of the organs charged with the trusteeship system, because the African countries, who have felt on their backs all the evils of colonial oppression, have sincerely tried to help the people of Nauru to gain independence. In affirming the inalienable right of the people of Nauru to independence the General Assembly points out in particular in this resolution that the Administering Authority should:

"... fix the earliest possible date, but not later than 31 January 1968, for the independence of the Nauruan people in accordance with their wishes." Furthermore, it requested:

"... that immediate steps be taken by the Administering Authority towards restoring the island of Nauru for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation."

It also called upon the Administering Authority:

"... to report to the Trusteeship Council at its thirty-third session on the implementation of the present resolution."

The events which have occurred since the adoption of that resolution show, however, that not all those recommendations, by far, have been carried out by the Administering Power, and that would explain the behaviour of the Australian delegation at this session of the Trusteeship Council when it categorically refused to carry out so simple a request of the resolution as that for the presentation of a separate report on the implementation of the General Assembly resolution regarding Nauru.

With regard to the first of the provisions of the resolution, that is, the fixing of a date for the granting of independence to Nauru, the material which is available to the Council shows that the Administering Power has not made any precise statement about a time-table for the establishment of independence for Nauru. It has explained this omission in a very unconvincing way. As before, the Australian colonizers are trying to cast doubt on the ability of the people of Nauru to develop independently, and this aspect has been referred to in the world Press. Thus, The New York Times of 5 April 1966 stated:

"The future of Nauru is now uncertain. Australia doubts that such a small territory could be successful as an independent country."

Similar views were expressed at a time when the representatives of the people of Nauru directly stated that the Territory was ripe for independence. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation fully supports the viewpoint of the representatives of the indigenous population of the Territory, on behalf of whom the Head Chief of Nauru, Mr. De Roburt, stated on 2 December 1965:

"We cannot understand the position of the Australian Government, which refuses to fix a date for Nauruan independence. We consider that we are prepared and ready for independence, and we have presented very well-framed arguments to show that independence should be granted in 1968."

The course of the discussion of this question at the present session of the Trusteeship Council clearly shows that for a long time the people of this Territory has been ready to deal with its own affairs. Realizing the fruitlessness of their attempts to delay the movement of the Nauruan people towards independence, the Australian colonizers still retain control over the important spheres of Nauruan political and economic life. The activities of the Executive Committee which has been set up in Nauru have not been very effective, because this Committee acts under the guidance of the Australian Administrator, and the Administering Power also has control over the mining of the phosphate deposits. It can be seen from the information that has been given by the Special Representative of the Administering Power that there are no plans or intentions now to hand this basic means of production to the Nauruans for them to keep it under national control. The Australian colonizers also control the hiring of personnel for the mining of the phosphate deposits.

Regarding the lack of action by the colonizers in the setting up of a date for the independence of Nauru, I should like to draw attention to the illogical position of Australia. The Australian representatives say that the granting of independence should take into account the wishes of the indigenous population in relation to other territories, but the people of Nauru have quite clearly expressed their wish to receive independence in 1968. However, Australia refuses to acknowledge this as a basis for the setting up of an exact date for the granting of independence to those people.

Regarding the requirements of resolution 2111 (XX) for the taking by the Administering Power of immediate steps to restore the island of Nauru for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign State, this also has been ignored by the Australian colonizers. There is still a plundering of the natural riches of the people of Nauru which are contained in the topsoil of the island. The Times of London of 21 January 1966 states that it has been established, in connexion with

(Mr. Ustinov, USSR)

the export of phosphates from Nauru, that half of the island has been destroyed. It is easy to see from this that the maintenance of Australian trusteeship over the island and the plundering of its mineral resources could lead to the Nauruan people being completely deprived of its territory.

The Soviet delegation has already pointed out to the Council that the Administering Authority is not making any effort whatsoever to make the land fertile again in order to make it possible to produce agricultural products and to produce even the most elementary foodstuffs. It can be seen from the statements of the Australian representatives that projects along this line have not yet acquired a definite form and have resulted so far only in fruitless discussions. Even the Australian Press acknowledges that the administering Power is not fulfilling its duties with regard to Nauru. The magazine New Guinea stated in October 1965:

(Spoke in English)

"Australia has behaved and is still behaving towards Nauru as an imperialist nation in the worst sense of the word. Whatever excuses of ignorance we may have had in the past, there are none now. We are able to exploit Nauru simply because we are bigger and more powerful."

(Continued in Russian)

The Soviet delegation considers that the Trusteeship Council should recommend Australia to take immediate steps to implement resolution 2111 (XX) and thus implement its duty towards the people of Nauru, which is heroically struggling to attain the great goal of independence.

All of us at this session welcome the Head Chief of the Nauruan people and wish him every success in the struggle to obtain independence for his country. We request the Head Chief to convey to the people of Nauru that the Soviet Union supports the heroic struggle of his people and will continue to give assistance to peoples fighting against colonialism and striving for independence. We consider it our special duty to help the peoples liberate themselves from colonial domination. We shall continue to demand the immediate granting of independence to all colonial countries and peoples.

Mr. LEYDIN(Special Representative): The representative of the Soviet Union has referred in the early part of his lengthy statement to the fact that a separate report is not being submitted in reply to resolution 2111 (XX). This is not news to the Council, of course, because I drew attention to it in the opening statement when I invited the Council to accept all of my opening statement as providing the information which the resolution called for.

It does seem to me that when the future of a people is being considered, and when a responsible body such as this Council is called upon to advise on its future, it could have no better basis for considering what it is to say and to advise than a full and detailed account of what has transpired in the Trust Territory since its last session. This is what my opening statement set out to do.

If a separate report were to be compiled, I think it is true to say that it could hardly be bettered than by rewriting the opening statement, assuming, of course, that the opening statement is a correct and detailed and informative account of what has happened in the Trust Territory. And I believe it is just that.

If the representative who has criticized the actions of the Administering Authority under this heading suggests to the Trusteeship Council that all matters other than the bare question of independence should be disregarded, then perhaps a portion of my opening statement can be regarded as irrelevant to the general question. But is that the case? Is independence or self-government

or any such important question to be considered alone and unsupported by the general condition of the people, or is the Administering Authority to be required by the Trusteeship Council to answer faithfully to the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Trusteeship Agreement, which is still in force and which still imposes those conditions?

Consequently, my delegation thinks it proper in reporting to this Council under a heading such as this to cover all aspects of the present conditions in the Territory and all matters so far as it is reasonably able to do which affect the immediate and perhaps the long-term future of the Nauruan people.

For that reason I thought it proper in my opening statement to draw the attention of the Council, with reasonable brevity I trust, to the continued happy conditions which generally exist in the Territory and to which the attention of the Council has been repeatedly drawn by the Council's Visiting Missions. The details given in the opening parts of my statement brought the story up to date. And I am sure, in considering the important question raised by resolution 2111 (XX), the Trusteeship Council was glad to have recent information which confirmed what might be regarded, as I suggest, as the enthusiastic reports of the various Visiting Missions.

Health and other public services, of which perhaps education is the most important, are part of that picture. But even they, important as they are, fade into insignificance beside a question of what has been called, perhaps not too accurately, rehabilitation of the worked-out mining lands. The Council knows through the lips of the Head Chief and from other sources, including the Administering Authority, which has faithfully reported on these matters from time to time, of the concern of the Nauruan people. The worked-out portion of their homeland has been referred to by some authorities -- I believe the Visiting Mission -- as a shell. If that is a correct description, or even having regard to the fact that it is a report which comes before the Trusteeship Council, is not that a matter to which reference should be made or a report expected by the Trusteeship Council under resolution 2111 (XX)?

In so far as it was humanly possible, the opening statement of my delegation informed the Council in detail of what the position was in that respect. And

what is the position? That in a relatively short time after the last session of the Trusteeship Council, in close and constant consultation with the Nauruan people -- and it is perhaps not I who should remind the representative of the Soviet Union that they are the people to be considered in this matter -- the Administering Authority appointed a committee of experts to examine the matter and to advise the Nauruan people and the Administering Authority upon it.

That kind of investigation cannot be hastily and irresponsibly carried out. It takes time. In due course, as I reported in my opening statement, the report was lodged with the Australian Government and the newly established high legislative authority in the Trust Territory, the Legislative Council. Neither authority -- neither the Australian Government nor the Legislative Council -- has yet had time to consider the report, a report on a question which touches most deeply and intimately on the future of the Nauruan people.

I reported that fact to the Trusteeship Council in my opening statement and promised that copies of the Committee's report would be submitted in due course. And that, I suggest, is a matter which very cogently and relevantly comes within the scope of the kind of report called for by resolution 2111 (XX).

I wish to show all the respect I can to the Trusteeship Council's time, and therefore I shall not go through the remainder of the opening statement in the same way. But as the Council knows, in pursuance of arrangements and detailed agreement following detailed discussion with the indigenous people of Nauru, the Legislative Council and the Executive Council have now been established in the Trust Territory. All possible and reasonable steps have been taken, in the time available, to give them the maximum of power that is practicable, having regard to their own repeated requests, and to establish responsibility under the Trusteeship Agreement. All the power that it is possible to transfer at this stage, having regard to those matters, has been transferred. This too has been reported.

I emphasized in various comments I made to the Trusteeship Council that these are newborn statutory bodies; they have just been created, among other reasons, for the purpose of providing, as requested by the Nauruan people, experience in the processes of government and in the day-to-day administration of the island. This has been repeated by the Head Chief and his colleagues time and time again as opportunity offered. These bodies are serving their purpose very well indeed, but they have hardly had time to gain momentum. This also has been reported to the Trusteeship Council in pursuance of the request contained in resolution 2111 (XX).

In the Soviet representative's long address to the Council he charged the Administering Authority with an attempt to sow doubts about the practicability of granting independence to the Trust Territory. He quoted certain newspapers to support that charge. I do not propose to comment on quotations from newspapers. The journalists who wrote those articles have their opinions, and in most countries, I suppose, they are entitled to express them. But I certainly do not take responsibility for what any journalist says anywhere. However, as a former Administrator of Nauru, I may be permitted to express resentment

at the charge that the Administering Authority, presumably in some kind of sinister way, should attempt to sow doubts concerning this important matter. Throughout the long years of its administration of Nauru, Australia has deliberately and as a matter of policy avoided any attempt to split the people on important questions and has faithfully, throughout the years -- and I am certain that no exception can be shown to this -- recognized the elected representatives of the Nauruan people, facilitated their discussions with their people when that was necessary -- and it was often not necessary because the Nauruans have their own arrangements -- and accepted as the view of the Nauruan people the view that was put forward on their behalf by the Head Chief of the time and his council of colleagues. It is idle and, I suggest, uselessly emotional to use phrases such as "attempting to sow doubts". But of course doubts will arise in the minds of many reasonable people concerning such an important question -- and here I am not attempting to assess the merits of the opposing sides, if there are opposing sides. This is indeed an important question, having regards to the extremely difficult circumstances in which the Nauruan people will find themselves not merely because of the exhaustion of the phosphate deposits, but because of the difficulties imposed by nature. One of these is the limited area of the island; another, and perhaps an even more important difficulty, is its isolation, a condition which was underlined and brought to the notice of the Trusteeship Council by its own 1962 Visiting Mission. Is the Visiting Mission to be regarded as attempting to sow doubts in a sinister way, or is it to be regarded as a group of honest men who analyse the problem in order to enable the Trusteeship Council to come to a decision?

It is true, as the Soviet representative said, that the Nauruan people, through the lips of their distinguished Head Chief, say that the time is ripe, or that it will be in January 1968. The Administering Authority, for its part, is more cautious and suggests waiting until these newborn statutory bodies have had time to fledge their feathers, to grow in strength, to plumb the depths of some of the more difficult problems that harass any government. The Administering Authority, for its part, is a little more cautious and says: Let us wait and have discussions some time after the establishment of these two Councils. But even here there is not the kind of conflict which, may I suggest, would gladden the heart of the Soviet representative. It is true, the Head Chief

has told the Council in plain terms at this meeting that while the Administering Authority speaks of talks two or three years after the establishment of the Legislative Council, the Nauruan people speak of talks in 1967 -- and I think he told the Council at last year's session, in reply to an enquiry by the representative of the United Kingdom, that the Nauruan people would prefer to have these talks eighteen months after the establishment of the Legislative Council. But though the Head Chief says the Nauruan people speak of talks in 1967, and though he so informed the Trusteeship Council, he also has said that he expects no problem in this regard -- and I suggest that that is a statement which should be given its proper weight by the Trusteeship Council.

The political progress that has been made in the last twelve months -- or the last six months, perhaps we can say -- has been disparaged by the representative of the Soviet Union. Perhaps one can understand that there would be two schools of thought, perhaps more, on the kind of arrangements that have been made in the Nauru Act. I can understand that criticism might be attracted by the power of disallowance and by the exclusion of certain powers from the Legislative Council, such as those involving the phosphate industry.

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

But of course, as I said earlier, the Administering Authority remains responsible for the peace, order and good government of the Territory, under the charge imposed on it by the Trusteeship agreement. Therefore, there must be some reserve power left to the Administering Authority so that it can look the Trusteeship Council in the face and declare itself able at all times to discharge its obligations until such time as it is relieved of the trust.

As to the exclusion of such powers as those relating to the phosphate industry of which the representative of the Soviet Union made much, surely the is completely ignoring the wishes expressed on a number of occasions and given written and concrete form, of the indigenous people. They have made it quite clear that they do not wish the Legislative Council at this stage to have powers relating to the phosphate industry. And the Head Chief has explained to this Council, I believe, that this is because it is not felt by his people to be appropriate that the official members, who make up part of the Legislative Council, should have the right and authority to discuss matters which the Nauruan people regard as of particular intimacy. Consequently, those powers were excluded on the initiative of the Nauruan representatives and, as I said, at their request.

I draw to a close so as to avoid committing the Council to a further use of its time, but I think I should make reference to the comment made by the representative of the Soviet Union on the lack of effort by the Administering Authority to make any kind of preparation for the production of foodstuffs, or even, I believe he said, to ensure a proper supply of foodstuffs.

I invite the Council's attention to the reports of the Visiting Mission, which are a complete reply to the last portion of that comment by the Soviet representative.

As to failing to make the efforts to ensure agricultural production, it is forgotten, surely, that is only comparatively recently that the Nauruan people has decided, to the regret of the Administering Authority, not to seek resettlement but to remain on Nauru. At the time it made that decision it was accepted -- or at least there was not very much discussion prior to that -- that the worked-out lands could not reasonably be restored, that it was not practicable to restore them. But following the decision of the Nauruan people to make its

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

permanent home on Nauru, and at its own specific request, the Administering Authority has arranged, as I said earlier, to appoint a committee to examine the possibility, the feasibility, of restoring the worked-out fields -- an event, I imagine, which would be a necessary precedent to any significant agricultural development on this small -- and I risk the Head Chief's displeasure in using this word -- and hitherto relatively barren island. And I emphasize "relatively".

I hope that I have shown the Trusteeship Council that my delegation has in effect -- and that is what matters -- not the form surely -- given a full and proper report to it as called for by resolution 2111 (XX). I hope that it will be believed by the Council that I have refuted the attempts to suggest that the Administering Authority is indifferent either to the resolutions of the General Assembly or to the wishes of the Nauruan people, but, on the contrary has filled the twelve months which ensued after the last session of the Trusteeship Council with intense activity and is at present poised for further important discussions touching on the future operation of the phosphate industry and on the feasibility of restoring the worked-out lands with the Nauruan representatives.

I suggest, with respect, that the Trusteeship Council should find that not merely a satisfactory report, but also a satisfactory and promising position.

May I, in conclusion, remind the Council of what the Honourable Minister said in closing the debate on the second reading of the Nauru Act:

"It is satisfying to be able to place before the House proposals which have been agreed to by the representatives of the Nauruan people." That is the first sentence of the Minister's statement, and he went on to say:

"This does not end the process of constitutional development.

Experience of the Legislative Council and of the Executive Council will be watched with great interest and with sympathy, and at the appropriate time discussions will take place regarding the possibility of further movement towards greater Nauruan responsibility in the affairs of the island."

The PRESIDENT: Might I just point out -- and this is solely in the interest of good and orderly business -- that I gave the floor to the delegation of Australia just now in what I took to be the exercise of an immediate right of reply to what had been said by the previous speaker. I would remind delegations, if I may, that there is of course the opportunity later on in this debate, and at the end, for winding-up statements.

Having said that, may I repeat my thanks to the Special representative for setting these matters out so clearly.

Is there any other representative wishing to speak?

Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to continue with the idea that we are just beginning a general debate on the Territory of Nauru, and that therefore we could perhaps have the opportunity of exchanging opinions. Also, I should like to make a comment concerning the explanation given by the Special Representative. I am very grateful to him for his very detailed communication.

I should like to assure the delegation of Australia that our delegation does not consider the statement we have made to be our only or our final statement on the subject. We intend to speak subsequently and to go into a detailed analysis of the report of the Administering Authority. We spoke today because there are two separate items on the agenda of the Council connected with one and the same Territory. I spoke on one of those items today since our delegation considers that the question concerned with the General Assembly resolution is a very important one, and I believe that even the representative of the Administering Authority would not deny this.

As to certain comments made by the representative of the Administering Authority, particularly his comment to the effect that our conclusion concerning the doubts cast by the Administering Authority on the possibility of the Nauruan people dealing with its own affairs was dictated and motivated by a communication we read in the foreign Press, that is not altogether the case.

In this connexion, I should like to quote a statement made officially by Mr. McCarthy at the past session of the General Assembly. I consider this statement as casting a shade of doubt on the ability of the Nauruan people to govern themselves. Mr. McCarthy stated at the past session of the General Assembly that

(Spoke in English)

"It was difficult to see how a population of 2,800 could find the machinery for independent government in the best circumstances, and even less when that population was on an island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean." (A/C.4/SR.1593)
(Continued in Russian)

In my view, it is no news to this Council that this is a very small island, located quite far from the continent, and in a remote spot in the Pacific Ocean. But it is no secret to the Council, and to the Members of the United Nations that this small people has demonstrated great talent and great ability; we know that these are very enlightened people and there is a high degree of literacy in the island. We have spoken with representatives of the people, and they created an excellent impression on us. It seems to me there should be no doubt that they are fully able to deal with their own affairs; and it is the duty of the Council to help them in every way possible to accelerate their accession to independence.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Australia who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): This is not so much in right of reply as to correct the representative of the Soviet Union again.

He has the advantage over me in that he has the summary records of the last session of the Fourth Committee. If I might borrow them from him, if they are in English, I should like to read the sentence immediately before the one he read out.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

I find that they are not in English, Mr. President, but later in this debate I will read one or two sentences which immediately preceded those which the representative of the Soviet Union just read out. I was speaking, I recall well, to the resolution which formed the subject of his statement here today, I think I was speaking to paragraph 3 or paragraph 4 of that resolution, and what I made clear in speaking to that was that I was speaking simply in a philosophical vein to facts which must be taken into consideration or which might have a bearing on questions of independence in such circumstances as these and that, I think, speaking purely from memory, is clear from the sentence immediately or almost immediately preceding what was read by the Soviet representative and what I subsequently went on to say. I was speaking to the whole problem of independence for small islands -- not only of Nauru. For example, one might have applied those same remarks to Pitcairn Island, similarly isolated, if not more so, even smaller than Nauru, with seventy-eight people, or, I think, through a recent population explosion, eighty-one people instead of seventy-eight, subject to correction from you, Sir. Those remarks were intended to apply equally well to such an island as Pitcairn Island, as I think the representative of the Soviet Union well knows.

Now, continuing in the same philosophic vein, whether he would contend that isolated Pitcairn Island, with seventy-eight or eighty-one people, in the circumstances in which it finds itself, is not subject to that sort of speculation, I do not know. But I do repeat that I was speaking to the whole subject of islands and small populations in isolated circumstances, and do reserve the right to quote further from, and enlarge on, this particular statement later in the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other speakers on this item?

There being none, we shall pass on to the last point of this afternoon's agenda, which concerns the arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1967, at which point the Special Representative would perhaps withdraw.

Mr. Leydin withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 7

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISPATCH OF A PERIODIC VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS IN 1967

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council will remember that, at the end of yesterday's meeting, I had indicated that I might have some announcement to make with respect to the arrangements for this next visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. As is customary, I understand, on these occasions, I have carried out the usual consultations with delegations to ascertain informally the views of individual members of the Council. The result of these consultations is that the following composition of this mission would be agreeable to the majority of members of the Council: Australia, France, Liberia and the United Kingdom.

I understand, secondly, that a draft resolution on the terms of reference and other points in connexion with this mission has been tabled and that it will be circulated over this week end. I suggest that, unless any member wishes to speak now, we should postpone the substantive discussion of this question until next Tuesday, but I would request that the delegations named might consider in the interval the question of whom their Governments would wish to appoint if the composition I have indicated is formally approved by the Council, so that if possible names may be inserted in the draft resolution when we come to reach a decision on it next week.

Does any member of the Council wish to speak to that point now, although as I have indicated it would be preferable, I think, to postpone the substantive discussion until next Tuesday?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I have a question on a point of procedure. Is it necessary actually to obtain the names of the representatives of the Governments concerned within the period of time mentioned by the President? It is often difficult for Governments to say some six or seven months in advance, as would be the case here, who will be available to take part in such a Visiting Mission. If my recollection serves me aright, in the past when names have been submitted and have had to be changed, that has caused the convening of an extraordinary meeting of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: I did in fact use the two very important words "if possible". I am well aware of this difficulty which certain delegations have. However, if it was possible to submit these names it would obviously be desirable. We shall have to determine the extent to which it is possible to do so when we consider the draft resolution next week.

The reason why it is desirable to have the names, if it is possible to do so, is that the officers, and in particular the Chairman, have to be elected by the Trusteeship Council in due course.

Since no one else wishes to speak, I shall now adjourn the meeting. The Council will meet again at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon to continue the general debate on the Trust Territory of Nauru.

The meeting rose at 5.5 p.m.