

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1670th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 14 December 1966,
at 10.30 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded) and consideration</i>	
<i>of draft resolutions (continued).</i>	521

Chairman: Mr. FAKHREDDINE Mohamed
(Sudan).

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)* (A/
6304, A/6363, A/6364, A/C.4/L.851)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded) AND CONSIDERA-
TION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)
(A/C.4/L.851)

1. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) said that the problem of Nauru, although it concerned a small Territory with a limited population, was no less urgent or important on that account. Two questions were involved: namely, the economy of the island and its political future.

2. His delegation reaffirmed its sympathy with the aspirations of the Nauruan people; it hoped that their freely expressed wishes would be fully satisfied as a result of further negotiations entered into with the Administering Authority. Considerable progress had been made towards internal self-government following the establishment of the Legislative Council and the Executive Council. As the Head Chief of the Nauruan people had said, there were two essential ingredients for independence: a homeland on which they could live permanently as an independent community, and an economy which should be as viable as possible.

3. The economy of the island was entirely dependent on phosphates, and would be for some time, and it was therefore natural that the inhabitants should claim that all rights to the phosphate deposits belonged to them, however valid the ownership rights of the Powers which exploited the deposits might be. The dispute was no longer a legal, but a political, one and it could only be settled through a compromise which would take into account the present concepts of the international community and the aspirations of those concerned, without being hindered by strictly legal arguments. It should be settled through talks between the Administering Authority and the representatives of the Nauruan people. Although the report of the committee of soil experts was not yet available, it would appear that agriculture could not be developed sufficiently to

enable the people to maintain their present level of living after the phosphate deposits had been exhausted. He had noted with interest that the Nauruans had decided to establish a development planning board or committee to work out a development programme for the island, financed by a new fund, the Nauru Development Fund. Since there was little prospect of developing tourism sufficiently, other industries should be established, including fish canning perhaps, and certain light industries which required a small amount of raw materials but very specialized manpower, whose products were low in number but high in price and could easily be transported by air without excessive work.

4. There remained the problem of the political future of Nauru. Australia had achieved political, economic and social progress in the island and had been able to maintain a relationship of trust with the people, whom it had brought to the threshold of independence. The Nauruans now said that they wanted independence by 31 January 1968, but the Administering Authority felt that it should not be granted until the recently established institutions of self-government were functioning properly. That was a legitimate concern. His delegation hoped, however, that talks between the two parties would lead to a solution acceptable to both.

5. With regard to New Guinea, the efforts made by the Administering Authority to educate the people and to make them understand their political responsibilities had produced good results, and political life was gradually being formed from the local to the national level. With the new Local Government Ordinance, the local government system had been extended considerably and a number of multiracial councils already existed. It was to be hoped that that trend would continue and that the councils would be given greater powers. At the national level, the House of Assembly played a leading role both as a legislative organ and as a means of integrating the Territory. It was in a preparatory and transitional stage and the presence of appointed members as well as the existence of two electoral colleges should end as soon as possible.

6. The economic results achieved were very encouraging. It was essential to encourage the passage from a subsistence economy to a market economy, which alone could raise the level of living of the population.

7. In education, his delegation welcomed the extension of the Administrative College and the creation of a university and an institute of higher technical education.

8. While his delegation appreciated the considerable efforts made by the Administering Authority in various

*Resumed from the 1667th meeting.

sectors, it was aware of the magnitude of the task still to be accomplished before all the purposes of the United Nations Charter were achieved. From statements made by the Australian delegation, it appeared that the future political structure of the Territory would be determined by the conclusions of the Select Committee on Constitutional Development. His delegation was glad to note that the indigenous majority in the House of Assembly was to be increased and the seats reserved for non-indigenous inhabitants abolished. The process should perhaps be accelerated, however, and members of the Assembly given genuine ministerial responsibilities and a greater measure of self-government without being subject to the veto of the Administrator or the Governor-General. The powers of the Assembly in financial matters, particularly, should be increased.

9. The recommendations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which the Administering Authority had accepted in general, should be incorporated in a long-term development plan to be worked out in association with the local government councils and the House of Assembly. At the same time the means of financing such a plan should be worked out; both public subsidies and private investment would perhaps be required.

10. The people of New Guinea had a right to self-determination and should be allowed to exercise that right in the most favourable conditions as soon as possible. Their political education should be continued, to enable them to participate fully in the development of the country and to form a unified nation. That was the task which the Administering Authority was rightly pursuing, with energy and perseverance, for only the full participation of the people of New Guinea would ensure success.

11. Mr. EL MASRY (United Arab Republic) said that the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/6304) reflected the unbalanced composition of the Council, as a result of which the Council had failed to observe General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 2111 (XX). The Administering Authority had not yet fixed a date for the independence of Nauru, as requested, but was trying to cast doubts on the ability of the people to be independent. That was contrary to operative paragraph 3 of resolution 1514 (XV). The attitude of certain members of the Trusteeship Council had made it difficult for it to carry out its functions in accordance with Article 85 of the Charter.

12. His delegation fully supported and sympathized with the aspirations of the people of Nauru to be independent and to remain a distinct small nation. It fully supported the statement by the Head Chief that the integration or assimilation into a bigger country would mean the complete disintegration and extinction of the Nauruans as a people (A/6304, para. 315). The Nauruan people had decided that it was in their best interests to remain in the land of their birth and steps should be taken by the Administering Authority to restore the island for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation in accordance with operative paragraph 4 of resolution 211 (XX). Phosphate was the sole export of the Territory and it was only just that the Administering Authority, which had exploited the phosphate resources

for several years, at great profit, should bear the expense of the restoration. Moreover, his delegation supported the demand of the Nauruan people that the phosphate deposits should be turned over to them, a demand which was in conformity with resolution 1803 (XVII). The question of rehabilitation should not, however, delay independence; they were two distinct questions.

13. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.851, with regard to operative paragraph 3, but considered that the restoration of the Territory should be carried out by the Administering Authority irrespective of the cost, without any conditions. It would, moreover, be more logical if the order of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 was reversed.

14. Turning to the second part of the Council's report, dealing with Papua and New Guinea, he pointed out that the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the Territory had only forty-four of the fifty-four elective seats in the House of Assembly, while the non-indigenous inhabitants, who constituted less than 2 per cent of the population, had ten seats reserved for them. It was the duty of the United Nations to ensure that immediate steps were taken to abolish those reserved seats and to ensure that the House of Assembly could function as a fully representative body and not as a rubber stamp.

15. It was regrettable that Australia had turned the Territory into a military base. During the past year there had been reports in the Australian Press to the effect that the Boram air base would be used by British bombers and would provide a link with the United States Air Force in Guam and the Philippines and that New Guinea would shortly become a permanent Australian Air Force base and would be Australia's front-line defence base. According to the Canberra Times of 9 February 1966, the Australian Minister for Air had stated that if Australia wished to send aircraft to Viet-Nam or Malaysia, it would use Boram as a stop-over point. The United Nations had not entrusted Australia with the Territory for aggressive purposes. Moreover, it seemed unlikely that Australia would really leave the Territory after spending millions of pounds on turning it into a front-line defence base. Perhaps it planned to make it a seventh state. Mr. Gaudi Mirau, a Papuan member of the House of Assembly, in a statement published in the Daily Mirror of 8 June 1966, had claimed that Australia was involving his country in its conflict in Asia by establishing military bases in the Territory, and had called upon the Australian Government to consult the House of Assembly before it took decisions which made the people of the Territory enemies of their neighbours.

16. Racism was widespread in Papua and New Guinea, as had been shown by a report signed by sixteen prominent New Guineans which had appeared in The Australian of 29 June 1966.

17. The Administering Authority had shown no intention of complying with General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX); it had not fixed an early date for independence, nor had it reported to the Trusteeship Council in that regard. It was clear that its policy was to retain control over the Territory. The Com-

mittee was faced with an important colonial issue and should act accordingly.

18. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, completely rejected the assertion that Australia was using New Guinea for aggressive purposes. Australia was not committing aggression against anyone. Aggression, however, took many forms.

19. The representative of the United Arab Republic had quoted the remarks of only one member of the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea. He had not mentioned certain limited defence arrangements which had been agreed upon, the need for which had become apparent during the Second World War, when Australia and New Guinea had fought together not only so that Australia might survive but also so that New Guinea might survive to follow its own destiny. Nor had he mentioned the resolution adopted by the House of Assembly on 10 June 1966, which had expressed gratitude to the Government and people of Australia for their vast expenditure to ensure that the people of Papua and New Guinea would be able to move towards their destiny without let or hindrance from outside sources; had recognized that the situation of the Territory demanded an expenditure on defence which the Territory itself could not afford; and had welcomed the presence of Australia in the Territory as proof that Australia would come to its aid in case of need, as it had done in the past.

20. On the question of independence, he drew attention to his earlier statement in the debate (1663rd meeting), in which he had referred to the statement made on 7 July 1966 by the Australian Minister of State for Territories to the effect that the Government's basic policy for Papua and New Guinea was self-determination, which meant that if they wished to do so the people of the Territory were free to terminate their present Territory status and take independent status, but that they were free to remain an Australian Territory for as long as they wished. If, when they chose to exercise the right of self-determination, they wished to remain in association with Australia, that would require the agreement of the Australian Government of the day.

21. The principle of "one man, one vote" had been applied in the Territory and there was a common roll and an elected indigenous majority. Seats had been reserved for non-indigenous inhabitants only at the express wish of the people themselves and would shortly be abolished following legislation already enacted by the Australian Parliament. The House of Assembly would be expanded to ninety-four members, which meant that the present indigenous majority would be extended absolutely.

22. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) pointed out that New Guinea was one of the last remaining Trust Territories and that Australia was still claiming that the people were making progress towards independence, although they were not yet independent. The language used by the Australian representative could give the impression that Australia had some sinister designs for incorporating the Territory. If that was so, the United Nations should take a very serious view.

23. Although almost twenty years had elapsed since the Trusteeship System had been established and six years since General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had been adopted, certain colonial Powers, including Australia, had refused to keep pace with the progress of decolonization. It had not been surprising, therefore, to hear the Australian representative, at the 1663rd meeting, once again extol the so-called virtues of his country's administration in Papua and New Guinea and in Nauru. The Tanzanian delegation was disappointed that the Trusteeship Council had largely endorsed the position of the Administering Authority, namely, that the people of the Territories were not yet ready for independence, a position which was diametrically opposed to resolution 1514 (XV). The Administering Authority should be asked to undertake measures to ensure the speedy progress of the Territories towards freedom and independence, and he hoped that the Australian Government would not consider that there was no time limit on that obligation. The Australian Administration was, in fact, abusing and humiliating the people of the Territories and further aggravating the situation. Its actions should be brought under close and exhaustive scrutiny.

24. The Australian representative had informed the Committee that certain constitutional changes were being made in the Territory of New Guinea, but it appeared that the Australian Government still reserved for itself crucial powers in the House of Assembly and continued to allow its colonial administrators to legislate for the people of the Territory. The Australian Government was clearly endeavouring to prepare for the possibility that it might annex the Territory and turn it into a seventh state of Australia. The Canberra Times of 25 August 1966 had stated that it was not desirable to talk of independence and that there was a campaign to spread the idea of association with Australia.

25. The Administering Authority's claims that the Territory was not quite prepared for independence despite the constitutional changes which gave some functional powers to a select group of the indigenous population were merely an excuse for the perpetuation of colonial domination, which denied the people of the Territory their natural right to sovereignty. It was wrong to discuss whether or not the people of a territory were in a position to govern themselves. In so doing, the colonial Powers revealed their racial outlook towards the colonized people.

26. The Sydney Morning Herald of 24 January 1966 had reported a clash between administration officials in Papua and New Guinea and indigenous members of the House of Assembly over the functions of parliamentary under-secretaries. The former had claimed that the system was a failure because the men were not sufficiently educated, to which the latter had replied that they had not been given a chance to exercise any responsibility. The members of the House of Assembly had also strongly criticized the manoeuvres of the Administering Authority to retain the ten special electoral seats for which only Europeans could stand.

27. It was the duty of the Committee to refute the untenable claims of the Administering Authority that the people were not ready for independence and

to call upon it to implement fully and without delay the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV).

28. Colonialism was always accompanied by economic exploitation and an interest in the strategic importance of the territory. It was distressing to find that the Australian Government had designs to involve Papua and New Guinea in its own military adventures in the area. The South Pacific Post of 7 February 1966 had quoted the Australian Minister for Air as saying that the chief aim of the Australian Air Force in the Territory was to establish a staging point for aircraft if it was necessary to take them further north to Viet-Nam. His delegation wished to express its indignation at and condemnation of the use of a colonial Territory in such a connexion, and reaffirmed the views it had expressed at the 1492nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly in connexion with operative paragraph 11 of the resolution (2189 (XXI)) which had been adopted. It was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the freedom-loving peoples that no action should be taken by colonial administrations to jeopardize the lives and well-being of the peoples under their domination.

29. It had recently been reported in The New York Times that an Australian in the colonial House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea had proposed that the indigenous people should be drafted for military service in Viet-Nam. All free peoples should pay careful attention to that matter, lest a people suffering under colonialism should be compelled to fight the colonial Power's wars. It was essential that, in calling for speedy measures for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Committee should call on the Administering Authority to refrain from using the Territory and its people for military purposes and from jeopardizing the territorial integrity of the Territory.

30. Since economic exploitation was a basic aspect of colonialism, it was not surprising that there was a discriminatory wage structure in Papua and New Guinea. The wage structure, and all socio-economic relations, were determined by racial considerations. Australians commonly received up to ten times as much as indigenous employees for the same task. The Canberra Times of 23 February 1966 stated that a Papuan with a law degree could earn only \$28 a week as a legal officer in the employ of the Administration, whereas his European counterpart could expect \$70 a week. Such racial discrimination could have dangerous repercussions. It had been stated in The Age, on 24 February 1966, that a recent reduction in the salaries of indigenous public servants had given rise to some bitterness and hatred towards white people.

31. The economic exploitation of the Territory by Australian and other monopolies was also a matter requiring study. It was common now for questions to be raised about the "economic viability" of colonies. The Territory of Papua and New Guinea was a vast reservoir of natural resources and as such had attracted financial interests. On 28 September 1966, the newspaper The Australian had reported the discovery of a gold lode which, even at the present early stage, was considered likely to bring the company concerned profits of \$5 million a year. He trusted that the goal would be exploited in the interests of

the people of the Territory. There were also activities aimed at exploiting the oil potential of the Territory; those activities were being undertaken by Japanese and Australian financial interests and some \$62 million had been invested.

32. The Canberra Times of 15 February 1966 indicated that extensive exploration for copper was under way in the Territory. The paper had also mentioned a difficulty to which the Australian Minister for Territories had referred: the people regarded all minerals as the property of the occupant of the land in which they were found and expected compensation for the exploitation of the resources of the subsoil. Australia would not accept that position, and the indigenous people had been told that, under Australian law, all mineral rights were reserved to the Crown. It was no wonder that Australia maintained that the people were not ready for independence.

33. In their exploitation of colonial territories, administering Powers had always devised various means of controlling the land, and discriminatory laws had been introduced to allow the colonialists or their economic allies to take over land. His delegation would like to see a resolution adopted which would call on the Australian Government to abolish all discriminatory laws immediately.

34. To sum up, the Administering Authority should be called upon to abolish all discriminatory electoral laws, to abolish all discriminatory practices in the economic, social, health and educational fields, to refrain from using the Territory as a military staging area and, above all, to take immediate steps to organize elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage, the vote being restricted to the indigenous population, and thereupon to fix an early date for independence.

35. The Administering Authority had stubbornly refused to implement General Assembly resolution 2112 (XX). The freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples of the world must expose colonialism and condemn its perpetuation as a crime against humanity. Australia had been entrusted with the administration of the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru for the purpose of bringing the people to freedom and independence. The United Nations should investigate the reasons why Australia had not completed that task when practically all other former Trust Territories were now independent States. The Territories should not be left in the hands of a Power which was planning to absorb them. His delegation would oppose all such efforts and demand that the peoples under Australian administration should be given their freedom. If necessary, the United Nations could be invited to organize a referendum to find out whether the people wanted independence. His delegation was convinced that all peoples wanted freedom and were not willing to barter it away for so-called economic progress. He had no doubt that the peoples of Papua, New Guinea and Nauru would choose freedom if they were given an opportunity to express their wishes.

36. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had accused Australia of sinister designs for incorporating the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. Australia had no such designs;

if it had, it would have put them into effect long ago and would not have introduced a common roll, universal suffrage and a freely elected legislature with an indigenous majority. In elections to the House of Assembly, there were no restrictions on the people's choice; they could vote for any party and for any person with the necessary qualifications to stand for election. If Australia had had designs on the Territory it would not have adopted legislation recently to increase the elected indigenous majority in the legislature. He found it strange that no recognition was given to the existence of the very electoral system on which the Committee had vigorously insisted in the case of other Territories. He would also point out that there was not a single political prisoner in Papua and New Guinea. There was freedom of association, the growth of trade unions and political parties was encouraged and there was complete freedom of speech. He wondered how many delegations present could honestly say that the same was true in their own countries.

37. With regard to the question of land, he would point out that there was no country in the world in comparable circumstances where less of the land of the indigenous people had been alienated. In Papua and New Guinea, the figure was less than 3 per cent, and much of that had been taken over for the construction of schools and hospitals for the benefit of the indigenous people. The only land problem which existed concerned the modernization of the indigenous system of land ownership.

38. The question of mineral rights was certainly of considerable interest in the Territory at the present moment. There was no question of depriving the people of the Territory of royalties; the question was whether royalties payable should be used exclusively or to a greater extent for the benefit of the particular individuals occupying the land in question, or whether they should be used for the benefit of the indigenous people of the whole Territory. As he had pointed out in the past, every penny of revenue raised in the Territory, including such royalties, was spent in the Territory.

39. The Tanzanian representative had indicated that a considerable sum had been spent on activities aimed at exploiting the oil potential of the Territory; it should be said, however, that the sum had been spent entirely on exploration and no oil had yet been discovered.

40. The Tanzanian representative claimed that foreign monopolies were exploiting the Territory, but the problem was in fact to obtain enough foreign capital to explore and develop the Territory's resources. The House of Assembly of the Territory had recognized the need for such capital.

41. With regard to the reported proposal by an Australian member of the House of Assembly that the inhabitants should be asked to serve in Viet-Nam, he defended the right of the elected member in question to make any proposal he wished in a free parliament, but would observe that the proposal had not been adopted or even seriously considered. As far as the position of the Australian Government was concerned, the Australian Defence Act provided that indigenous forces in the Trust Territory should not be required

to render any services except under Article 84 of the Charter, according to which the Administering Authority might make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from a Trust Territory in carrying out obligations undertaken towards the Security Council and for local defence and the maintenance of law and order in the Territory. No action of the kind suggested by the Australian member in the House of Assembly had been contemplated or was contemplated now by the Australian Government.

42. Both the Tanzanian representative and the representative of the United Arab Republic had, he thought, paid insufficient attention to the question of the wishes of the people. The House of Assembly was intended as a democratic medium for the expression of the people's wishes, and their wishes were being expressed there with increasing force and with increasing maturity. In his view, just as the Administering Authority had an obligation to respect the wishes of the people, the United Nations should see that the views of the United Nations or sections of the Organization were not forced on the people if they were not in accord with the wishes of the people themselves.

43. Australia's critics in the Committee had quoted many passages from Australian newspapers. He would only wish to point out that, good as the Australian newspapers were, they had no monopoly of knowledge and not everything that appeared in the Press was necessarily correct. What was important was that arguments for and against the Australian Government's policies were freely aired in the Press; that was in keeping with Australia's understanding of the meaning of free speech and freedom of the Press. The same situation prevailed in the Territory itself.

44. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Australian representative had ridiculed the suggestion that Australia had designs on the Territory, but that fact had been mentioned in the Australian Press and was implied in some of the statements of the Australian representative himself.

45. He hoped that the Australian representative had not intended to compare a colonial situation with the situation in independent States. At any rate, he had dwelt on the existence of a so-called elected legislature. The fact was that the House of Assembly of the Territory had no real powers; nor, as had been pointed out in The Age, had the embryonic Cabinet created in the Territory by the Australian Government. The House of Assembly was no more than "window-dressing" and the Administering Authority wielded all real power.

46. From what the Australian representative had said he understood that the people of the Territory would not be called upon to serve in a colonial war in which Australia was engaged in another part of the world; he hoped that the Australian representative could also give assurances that no bases in the Territory would be used for the purposes of a colonial war.

47. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that there was no implication in anything he had said that Australia had designs for annexing the Territory. He had quoted a statement by the Minister for Territories to the effect that it was for the people to decide whether they wished independent status, and that, if they expressed

the wish to remain in association with Australia, such a request would be for the Australian Government of the day to consider. The point was that such a possibility would only be considered if it was the expressed wish of the people and there was no question of Australia seeking to encourage any such wish.

48. He did not see how the introduction of elections on the basis of "one man, one vote", a common roll, and an elected parliament with an indigenous majority could be described as "window-dressing". Once the vote was given to the people, it could not be taken away again. It was disheartening to him to hear political advances for which the Committee had been pressing over the years now described as window-dressing. Naturally, the powers of the House of Assembly would not be complete until the Territory had achieved independence, and the people had decided that the time for independence had not yet arrived.

49. Australia was not waging a colonial war anywhere. Where Australian forces were in action, it was against aggression, and aggression directed not against Australia but against all South-East Asia and ultimately against the whole world.

50. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he was obliged to reply once again to the Australian representative in order to keep the record straight. The fact was that officials of the Administration were campaigning in the Territory for annexation. The existence of such campaigns must be taken into account in speaking of the "people's wishes". The reason why it was asserted that the people were not ready for independence was that the annexationist campaign had not yet met with sufficient success. He hoped that the Committee could be given an assurance that such campaigns would stop.

51. He still maintained that the House of Assembly was a piece of window-dressing. Elections on the basis of "one man, one vote" were not significant if the people elected had no power to represent the people and legislate for them. The embryonic Cabinet which had been created, even though the majority of its members were Australians, had no real powers. Similarly, the House of Assembly exercised no effective power. If the House of Assembly exercised effective control over the Territory's affairs, he wondered why Australia considered independence out of the question.

52. His delegation considered the war in which Australia was engaged to be a war of aggression against the peoples of Asia, but that matter was perhaps not one for the Committee to discuss. The point was that the Territory and its people should not be used in any war being waged by the colonial Power.

53. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) said that the cogent, factual statement made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania represented the position of his own Government and people. He would like it to be indicated in the records that the Tanzanian statement should be regarded equally as the statement of the Zambian position. His country and the United Republic of Tanzania were united on all international issues and in the quest for the elimination of foreign domination and the achievement of self-determination for all peoples. The Government and people of Zambia

wished to see the people of Papua and New Guinea attain self-determination and genuine independence at the earliest date.

54. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the remarks of the representative of Zambia. With regard to the powers of the House of Assembly, he had quoted many sources in support of what he had said in his statement at the 1663rd meeting and he would refer in particular to the recent steps taken to transfer 130,000 acres belonging to indigenous people of the Territory to Australian companies and plantations. The indigenous representatives in the House of Assembly had asked that the indigenous owners of the land should receive 5 per cent royalties in compensation for the land leased. Under Administration pressure, that proposal had been rejected, and instead legislation had been adopted providing for compensation at the rate of one dollar per acre per annum. That fact was a further indication of the lack of real power of the House of Assembly.

55. With regard to military bases, there were 200 airfields and other installations in the Territory. The matter had been discussed in the Australian Parliament. There was ample evidence that the whole Territory was being converted into a military base.

56. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that Australia's claim to the effect that it was engaged in philanthropic activity and was carrying out a civilizing mission in the Territory was an old colonial argument, one that had been refuted by history. The Australian representative spoke of gradually bringing the people to a state of political maturity. France had once taken a similar position but had later come to adopt a more realistic attitude. In the Guinean delegation's opinion, the idea that some people were politically mature while others were not was one of the most repugnant theories of colonialism. He stressed that Australia would be unable to halt the process of decolonization, which was irreversible.

57. It was essential that the Fourth Committee should bear in mind the fact that Australia was deriving considerable profits from the Territory and was not concerned with the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants.

58. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) said that he had been surprised to hear the House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea so denigrated by certain representatives, especially in view of the fact that two members of that body were present in the Committee. He pointed out that no legislation concerning New Guinea could be enacted without the assent of the House of Assembly.

59. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that it was undeniable that the House of Assembly was extremely limited in its functions and was a rubber stamp of Administration policies. No member of the House of Assembly, except a special member, was permitted to introduce legislation entailing budgetary expenditure. For instance, the people of the Territory had tabled a public service bill and Canberra had disallowed it.

60. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that any member of the House of Assembly could introduce a bill and members had in fact done so.

61. The Bill concerning the payment of royalties to indigenous inhabitants for the lease of land, to which the Soviet Union representative had referred, had in fact been passed in the House of Assembly.

62. He wished to inform the Chairman that two members of his delegation, Mr. Le Pani Watson and Mr. Nicholas Brockham, who were long-standing elected members of the House of Assembly, had expressed a desire to make brief statements to the Committee. Mr. Brockham was one of the nine indigenous members of the Select Committee on Constitutional Development, which, after conducting extensive consultations throughout the Territory, had made recommendations regarding the House of Assembly. Australia had recently adopted legislation on the basis of those recommendations.

63. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania), referring to the United Kingdom's representative's remarks, said that it was not so long since the United Kingdom had told the Committee that the Parliament in Southern Rhodesia had full powers. The world now knew that what the United Kingdom meant by full powers differed from the usual meaning given to that expression.

64. The statement in the Trusteeship Council's report that the next step in constitutional development was to bridge the gap between a fully representative parliament and a fully responsible government (A/6304, para. 103) showed clearly that the powers of the House of Assembly were limited.

65. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said, in reply to the Australian representative, that the Soviet Union delegation had already shown that the powers of the House of Assembly were rigidly restricted. Under Australian legislation, the Governor-General had the right to veto any law adopted by the House of Assembly, which was not entitled to consider such questions as land distribution, immigration and conditions under which local labour was engaged.

66. His earlier remarks had concerned a Bill, introduced by indigenous members of the House of Assembly, under which indigenous landowners would receive 5 per cent of the profits earned by mining companies exploiting their land. That Bill had been rejected. The Act to which the Australian representative had referred provided for compensation to be paid to indigenous landowners at the rate of \$1 per acre per annum. It was obvious that that law had been adopted in the interests of Australian and foreign monopolies.

67. The Australian representative had said that the Territory could attain independence whenever it wished to do so. It was known, however, that Australia was carrying on a propaganda campaign throughout the Territory in an effort to convince the indigenous inhabitants that they were not yet ready to manage their own affairs and that independence would be against their interests.

68. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) pointed out that he had not said that the House of Assembly exercised full powers. He had merely wished to indicate some of the powers which the House of Assembly possessed which had not been mentioned. His delegation was a

member of the Trusteeship Council and endorsed that body's report.

69. The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham might address the Committee as petitioners.

70. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) pointed out that his colleagues were not petitioners but members of the Australian delegation.

71. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation thought that the Chairman's suggestion was correct. In his view, it was inappropriate for people from a colonized country to come to the Fourth Committee and speak on behalf of the colonial Power. He therefore asked the Australian representative to accept the Chairman's suggestion and not to set a dangerous precedent.

72. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that it would not be proper for the Chairman to call on any individual member of the Australian delegation. He could, however, give the floor to the representative of Australia and Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham could then address the Committee. He stressed that he had no objection to hearing them.

73. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana) said that he would like to hear Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham. In view of the fact that the situation was unique, he felt that they might be invited to speak as special guests of the Fourth Committee.

74. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) asked whether, since Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham came from the Territory under consideration, members would be able to put questions to them.

75. The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative. It was his understanding, however, that it would rest with them to decide whether they wished to reply to the questions.

76. Mr. SY (Senegal) pointed out that the list of members of delegations did not include the names of Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham. He did not think, therefore, that they could be regarded as members of the Australian delegation.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been aware of that fact but had thought that that would not present any difficulty since the Australian representative had said that Mr. Watson and Mr. Brockham were members of the Australian delegation.

78. Mr. WATSON (Australia) said that he wished to thank the Fourth Committee for the efforts it was making to help the people of the Territory. The people of Papua and New Guinea were a diverse people; some 700 languages were spoken in the Territory and there were hundreds of tribes and thousands of clans and sub-clans. That fact should be taken into account by the Committee in its consideration of the question. In the view of the people of the Territory, it was not easy to build a new nation. Before the Whites had come to settle in the Territory, the people had owned their land and had had a subsistence economy. Hence it was not easy for them to change to the conditions of modern life.

79. The indigenous inhabitants were playing an increasing part in the administration of the Territory's

affairs and were thus receiving valuable training. The people of New Guinea and Papua had faith in the Administering Authority. Some newly independent countries took the right path while others went astray. So far as his own people were concerned, they expected the Committee to assist the Administering Authority in guiding them along the right lines: it would be regrettable if the Committee were to press the Administering Authority to do the opposite.

80. What his people required now was manpower and economic assistance. If the Administering Authority continued to retain the Territory under its administration after those needs were met, his people would call on the United Nations to help them to achieve independence. They received a grant from Australia and Australian citizens were helping to satisfy the need for manpower.

81. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) said that, according to an article which had appeared in the South Pacific Post on 6 September 1966, Mr. Watson had been chosen to succeed Mr. John Guise, the leader of the elected members of the House of Assembly, and had retreated from his original clear-cut stand in favour of independence.

82. Mr. BROCKHAM (Australia) said that one important recent development in the political life of his country had been the work done by the Select Committee on Constitutional Development. That Committee had travelled extensively in the Territory and had ascertained the views of a large cross-section of the community. In drafting its recommendations, the Committee had given careful consideration to what was most suitable for all the people of the Territory. He thought that the Australian Government had accepted most of those recommendations. While some members might think that the Territory was making slow progress, the important thing was that solid foundations were being laid for a future government that would be politically and economically sound.

83. Mr. EL MASRY (United Arab Republic) asked Mr. Brockham whether the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory enjoyed the same rights in Australia as white Australians and whether they were free to settle permanently in metropolitan Australia.

84. The CHAIRMAN said that since there were no further speakers, the Committee would adjourn until 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.