



UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP LIBRARY

COUNCIL JUL 18 1961

UN/SA COLLECTION



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1174  
17 July 1961

ENGLISH

Twenty-seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 17 July 1961, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

U TIN MAUNG

(Burma)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru:  
report of the Drafting Committee [4e]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1174 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

61-18186  
(26 p.)

## AGENDA ITEM 4e

## EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1026)

The PRESIDENT: The conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee are contained in the annex to the report, and we will consider them paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I would request that you take a vote on each of the paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection, the Council will take a vote on each paragraph.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): For reasons stated at previous meetings of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet delegation considers that the inclusion in this paragraph of the sentence "The Council considers that these proposals are generous and form a useful basis for further discussion.", is, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, unsuitable for the report submitted by the Drafting Committee on Nauru. We therefore formally wish to submit an amendment which would delete this sentence from paragraph 2 of the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. VELLODI (India): In regard to paragraph 2, my delegation also has some difficulty and our difficulty is also in regard to the sentence referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union. As we have had occasion to state during our intervention in the debate, my delegation has always taken the line that the Trusteeship Council, at least at its present session, has not been called upon or is not expected to take any definite stand on the proposals which the three Administering Authorities have made in regard to the resettlement of Nauruans in the metropolitan territories. We are perfectly aware that these proposals have been made with the best of intentions and in conformity with the recommendations made by the Trusteeship Council last year. We are also aware that the Nauruans themselves have said -- and here I have Mr. Gadabu's statement in this Council -- that the offer was a generous one. So we have no objection to having mention made in the recommendations to the views of the Nauruan people, but we certainly have difficulty and cannot go along with any recommendation in which there is a definite assertion by the Council that it considers these proposals generous. We feel that the Council is not called upon to say whether they are generous or not generous at this stage, and certainly not to say whether it forms a useful basis for further discussion.

Mr. Gadabu told us that resettlement in Australia would be at the expense and sacrifice of their national identity as the Nauruan people. So we see some reluctance in the minds of the Nauruan people in accepting this proposal at this stage. This has also been confirmed by Mr. McCarthy who said that the Nauruan people are not yet ready to accept this proposal.

Therefore, while we certainly appreciate the offer made by the Administering Authorities, as I said earlier, we would have difficulty in accepting the sentence quoted by the representative of the Soviet Union, namely: "The Council considers that these proposals are generous and form a useful basis for further discussion." Accordingly, from that point of view we would support the amendment suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union to delete that sentence from paragraph 2. However, as I said earlier, we have no objection to some reference being made somewhere in paragraphs 2 to 7 that the Nauruan people -- and here we have Mr. Gadabu's statement -- have said that the offer is a generous one.

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

If I may, Mr. President, at this time I should like to make a suggestion in regard to paragraph 3, with your permission. We should like, if the other members of the Council would agree, to make an amendment to the first sentence of paragraph 3. At present it reads:

"The Council notes that the proposals put forward by the three Governments have been discussed with the Nauruan people but that the latter have not yet accepted these proposals." (T/L.1026, annex, page 1) We are quite prepared to introduce the idea in that sentence that these proposals have been considered generous by the Nauruan people. But before I move any formal amendment to that effect, I should like, if possible, to hear the views of the other members of the Council. As I said earlier, however, I would support the amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union to delete the sentence in paragraph 2.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraphs 2 and 3 are more or less linked together, I take it that the Council wishes to consider the two paragraphs together, and we shall bear in mind the comments which have just been made by the representative of India and the formal proposal which has been advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I merely wish to say that my delegation also supports the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union and supported by the delegation of India. I think for the reasons which have been adduced most succinctly by the representative of India we find ourselves in agreement with this position, and I hope that this will not raise any difficulties for members of the Council. I think that the Administering Authority is not particularly anxious to have its acts or these proposals qualified in one way or another, or to have an adjective placed before the proposal to qualify it in one way or another. I hope that they will not object to that and that we can easily agree on this point.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America): In view of the fact that the Trusteeship Council has over a period of years recognized the probability that the people of Nauru would eventually have to be settled elsewhere, it seems to my delegation that this is not an unreasonable statement; that the suggestions that have been made form a useful basis for further consideration. It seems to me that is not a very strong commitment on the part of the Trusteeship Council: merely to say that these proposals form a useful basis for further consideration. I should hope for that reason that we make some reference to them in any case.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I said earlier that I might formally move an amendment to paragraph 3. Before doing so, I should like to elaborate the views of my delegation.

We are aware of the views expressed by a representative of the Nauruan people in this Council. Mr. Gadabu spoke rather strongly about the proposals when he said that resettlement in Australia would be at the expense of sacrificing the national identity of the Nauruans. That was a strong statement. At the same time, however, he did give the impression to some of us that this chapter was not closed and that, if the proposals which the Nauruan people had put forward for finding some other island off the coast of Australia did not bear fruit, it was possible that the Nauruan people would consider the present proposals of the Administering Authorities. To that extent, therefore, my delegation would not regard this chapter as closed.

However, I believe that we must also bear in mind that a Visiting Mission of the Council is proceeding to Nauru next year. Paragraph 1 of the resolution which we adopted on Friday

"Directs the Visiting Mission to ascertain as fully as possible the wishes of the Nauruan community regarding its future" (T/L.1027) and to make recommendations thereupon.

It is in this context that my delegation feels, and feels rather strongly, that we should not give any impression at this stage that the Trusteeship Council regards one or other alternative as a useful basis for further discussions. Certainly we are aware that there will be further discussions between the Administering Authorities and the people of Nauru. At the same time, we are aware that the Visiting Mission will also look into this matter in detail. That is why we feel that the sentence in paragraph 2 is perhaps not very appropriate.

I come now to our amendment to paragraph 3. With our amendment the first sentence of that paragraph would read as follows:

"The Council notes that the proposals put forward by the three Governments have been discussed with the Nauruan people but that the latter, while they consider the proposals generous, are not yet ready to accept them."

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I believe that it is generally recognized by the Trusteeship Council that these proposals are generous. I would therefore have no objection at all to the wording as it stands, which I think is probably the best way of stating the point.

However, I do think that the amendment just proposed by the representative of India probably meets the point of substance. It admits that the Nauruans themselves have recognized that these proposals are generous, and after all the Nauruans are the people mainly concerned. It is probably just as valuable to note this in the way proposed in the Indian amendment as to say what the Council feels about it. In any case, in the second sentence of paragraph 3 the Council notes that these proposals continue to be under consideration. That is a matter of fact.

What are the two points involved? First, are these proposals generous or not? The amendment of the representative of India would have the Council note that the Nauruans themselves, the people affected, consider the proposals generous. Second, should these proposals be further considered? They certainly must be. Paragraph 3, with the Indian amendment, would cover both those points. Therefore, although I was not a member of the Drafting Committee, I should think that the substance might be met by the amendment which has just been put forward.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I do not think that the Administering Authorities -- this is certainly true of the Australian Government -- are particularly concerned that the Trusteeship Council should express an opinion about whether or not these proposals are generous. That is perhaps not quite the point. It may well be a useful suggestion that we note the view of the Nauruan people that they are generous, and leave it at that.

But, as the United States representative has said, the Drafting Committee took into account the background of the Council's discussion of this matter, the fact that the Council had on previous occasions expressed strong interest in the possibility of resettlement. I should have thought that, having now been informed of exact proposals to that end, the Council should not merely take note of the proposals, but also express an opinion -- which, after all, is non-committal enough -- that these proposals form a useful basis for further discussion.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

I do not think that the Council would want to imply that the proposals do not form a useful basis for further discussion. Why, therefore, not say so?

Perhaps the suggestion for changing the wording from one paragraph to another, while retaining the idea of "a useful basis", would meet one or two of the objections raised by the representative of India.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America): I continue to feel that it would serve a useful purpose for the Council to express some view on the utility of a continued consideration of this question. If, however, the Council should decide not to do so, I wonder whether the two amendments could not be considered together -- that is, the deletion of the sentence in paragraph 2 and the revision of the sentence in paragraph 3. The two paragraphs are closely related.

Mr. VELLODI (India): On the procedural point, I would support the suggestion made by the United States representative that the two amendments should be considered together. We believe that the two go together and if we did not link them we might get into all kinds of difficulties.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any objections to the procedural suggestion which has just been made?

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Reluctant though I am to differ with the representative of India on this point, I must request that the Soviet amendment be considered separately.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I certainly would not wish to create procedural difficulties in the Council, but I wonder whether it would be in order for me to ask for priority for my amendment, if paragraphs 2 and 3 are to be taken together.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I wonder whether we might reach substantial agreement on this matter by carrying the point a stage further. I have no specific wording in mind, but before we take the amendment proposed by the representative of India perhaps we could formulate some amendment to the second sentence of paragraph 3 in which we might more specifically include the idea that these proposals constitute a basis for further discussion.



(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

Most of us, I believe, feel that these proposals must be further discussed and that they do provide a useful basis. The effect of passing the Indian amendment and then omitting the sentence from the previous paragraph would wipe that out, and I think this would be a pity.

Would it be possible for the representative of India to think of a slight amendment to the wording of the second paragraph which would indicate that we welcome further discussion on these proposals?

Mr. VELLODI (India): We have no objection. I believe the present recommendations fully meet the point in regard to further discussions of these proposals. Where we have difficulty is for the Council to make any indication at this stage as to whether these proposals are generous or whether they form a useful basis for further discussions.

I think it goes without saying that these proposals will be considered further, and that is, I believe, covered at present by the second sentence in paragraph 2. Where we have some difficulty is in categorically stating that these proposals form a useful basis for further discussion, because it does seem to leave out any other basis for further discussions. When you say that any particular proposal might form a useful basis for further discussion, there is at least in our mind a slight discrimination against any other proposals. To say that a particular proposal might form a useful basis gives the impression, at least to my delegation, that the Council feels that this proposal perhaps is better than any other proposal which might come forth.

We have heard from the representative of the Nauruan people that they have made certain specific proposals. Although we do not know the details, the Australian delegation has said -- and we appreciate that -- that these proposals will also be considered, that is, the search for another island off the Australian coast. Therefore, we find that there are other proposals. There is a proposal put forward by the Administering Authorities. There is a proposal submitted by the Nauru Local Government Council to the Administering Authorities. That is why we have this difficulty in going along with the suggestion.

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

I fully appreciate the point which has been made by Sir Hugh Foot, but I regret very much that my delegation will have difficulty accepting any wording which would give the impression that a particular proposal will form a useful basis for further discussions. Certainly this proposal will be considered further; and, as I said earlier, it is quite possible that at one stage the Nauruan people themselves might consider this proposal probably the best alternative. However, for the Council to say at this stage that one of the two proposals should form a useful basis will create difficulties with my delegation.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): I have a suggestion which may meet the point of the representative of the United Kingdom without causing too much embarrassment to the representative of India. If the Indian amendment is accepted, the first sentence of paragraph 3 would read:

"The Council notes that the proposals put forward by the three Governments have been discussed with the Nauruan people but that, while the latter considered the proposals generous, they are not yet ready to accept them."

Perhaps we could amend the second sentence to read:

"The Council notes that these proposals continue to be regarded as a basis for discussion and are under consideration by the Nauruan people, who, however, still hope that a place may be found", etc.

This may be a way out of the difficulty, because it does not really commit the Council but just notes a fact.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I am grateful to the representative of New Zealand, and my delegation will be quite prepared to accept that amendment of the second sentence of paragraph 3.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further comments?

In the absence of any other comments, I put paragraph 3, as amended by the representative of India and subsequently by the representative of New Zealand, to the vote.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote the amendment of the Soviet Union, which would delete the following sentence in paragraph 2:

"The Council considers that these proposals are generous and form a useful basis for further discussion."

The sentence was deleted by 6 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): There is one drafting point, Mr. President, in connexion with paragraph 2 before you put it to the vote. If we look at the second sentence in paragraph 2, we see the following words:

"The Council notes that in response to that recommendation, the three Governments have thus far been unsuccessful in their search".

I do not think you can really say that the Administering Authorities have been unsuccessful in their search in response to a recommendation, because we did not recommend them to be unsuccessful in their search. I would suggest that the following is a better word:

"The Council notes that, in response to that recommendation, the three Governments, having thus far been unsuccessful in their search for other islands for the resettlement of the Nauruan community" -- delete the word "and" and continue -- "have made proposals".

I think it is a drafting point, but I believe that it makes the position rather clearer.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any objections to the drafting points which have been raised by the representative of New Zealand?

Since I hear no objection, I take it that they are agreeable to the Council.

I now put paragraphs 2 and 3, as amended, to the vote.

Paragraphs 2 and 3, as amended, were adopted by 12 votes to 1.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I just wish to make the position of my delegation quite clear in the matter. As I said at the beginning, I considered that this sentence which we have deleted from paragraph 2 was perfectly sound and justifiable, and I voted for its omission only because the amendments made to paragraph 3 seemed to me adequately to have covered the situation.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: Does anyone wish to make any comment on paragraph 6?

Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia): We have nothing against this particular paragraph containing a recommendation that the Administering Authority should seek further technical advice. I would merely like to direct the attention of the Council to the statement of the Special Representative that only very recently did the Australian Government again seek the expert advice of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. I thought that I should just place that on record.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Does anyone wish to make any comments on paragraph 7?

Mr. VELLODI (India): It is not a very serious amendment that I am suggesting. We find in this paragraph the last phrase "including the development of the fishing industry" somewhat unclear -- and here I should like to speak for the Administering Authority. We have a later paragraph in the recommendations where we note with satisfaction that something is being done about the fishing industry. In paragraph 7 the impression is given that the fishing industry is what it was a year or two years ago, and I would myself make the suggestion that that phrase be deleted: "including the development of the fishing industry".

Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia): I wish merely to state, on behalf of my delegation, that we would have no objection to the deletion of these words.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I would be quite prepared to go along with the representative of India on this point, but I was wondering if, in view of the fact that the question of the fishing industry has been raised in the Council many times, both in the past and at this session, and many representatives have stressed the importance of this industry in the island, we could not say "particularly the development of the fishing industry". I do not know whether that is of any great importance, but I do know that many representatives have referred to this subject. However, I have no strong views on the point and I would not wish to press for a vote on such an amendment.

Mr. VELLODI (India): As I said in the beginning, I suggested the deletion of that only for the reason that it seemed to me that since, in a later paragraph in the report, we take note with satisfaction of the development of the work that is being carried out with regard to the fishing industry, it would not be quite appropriate for us to give an impression, in the general section on the future of the Nauruans, that nothing is being done. However, if that suggestion does not find much favour, I am quite prepared to withdraw it, or to make a slight alteration in that suggestion by saying "including the further development of the fishing industry".

Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I simply wish to say that the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic is already covered in the French version of the text, which uses the word "notamment", the equivalent of "particularly".

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I have also noted that, in addition to what the representative of Belgium has just said, paragraph 19 contains the same sort of recommendation which I had wished to see in paragraph 7. Therefore, I would have no reason to press it to a vote, and I would agree with the representative of India that it would be as well merely to delete the phrase.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the deletion of the words "including the development of the fishing industry", the paragraph will be so amended.

Paragraph 7 as amended was adopted unanimously.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with paragraph 8 I would request that separate votes be taken on the three separate parts of the paragraph. The first part reads from "The Council notes" down to the words "that the Nauruan people be assisted to be self-governing in all of their domestic affairs". The second part is the next sentence, beginning "The Council urges" down to "of the people". The third part is the remainder of the paragraph.

The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

The second part of the paragraph was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The third part of the paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I should like to ask for a clarification of paragraph 9, which refers to the appointment of a "highly qualified administrative assistant, one of whose functions will be to help the Nauru Local Government Council in its work." If I remember correctly, during the question period and in the preliminary statement of the Special Representative the impression was given that the administrative assistant had been appointed with the main function of helping the Local Government Council. We were not aware of any other functions which he will perform, or at least we have not heard any statement about any other functions. I would therefore like to ask the Special Representative or the representative of Australia whether he can clarify the matter. It is not a very important point but if the answer is not quite satisfactory, we may have a small amendment to suggest.

Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia): I have consulted with the Special Representative who confirms the impression held by the representative of India that the chief function of the administrative assistant will be to help the Nauru Local Government Council. However, we hope that there will be other spheres in which this highly qualified administrative assistant can help and we would not wish to exclude this possibility, although it is true that his chief function will be to assist the Nauru Local Government Council.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I am grateful to the representative of Australia for that confirmation, and I would therefore suggest an amendment to make the sentence read "The Council notes with satisfaction the appointment of a highly qualified administrative assistant whose main function will be to help the Nauru Local Government Council in its work."

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall put to the vote the paragraph as amended in accordance with the suggestion made by the representative of India.

Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I do not know whether, in paragraph 10, we should speak of "higher positions." I think it would be better to say "high positions" because in this connexion there is no relation to anything else. It is for the Council to decide, but I think "high positions" would be a better wording.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I shall put the paragraph to the vote as amended accordingly.

Paragraph 10, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. VELLODI (India): My delegation has difficulty in going along with paragraph 12. I do not think it is necessary to make a long statement, but we have not been convinced in any way that the Nauruans have not taken advantage of the training facilities offered by the Administering Authority, so we cannot support this paragraph.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America), Chairman of the Drafting Committee: In the course of the discussion of this paragraph in the Drafting Committee it became apparent that one of the main reasons why the Nauruan people were not qualifying in adequate numbers for positions of responsibility was apparently their own lack of interest. Although the Administering Authority places extremely generous facilities for training at the disposal of the Nauruan people, they just do not seem to take full advantage of them and that is why the paragraph was worded as it was in the Committee's report.



Mr. VELLODI (India): From what the representative of the United States just now said, it would appear that in the Drafting Committee there was some further information given on this point. Just for my own information I would request the Special Representative to tell us whether there were scholarships and fellowships offered which were refused by people of Nauru. It is not the same thing as not finding a sufficient number of people to take the scholarships. Are there any instances of scholarships having been refused to eligible candidates who, because of their lack of interest, declined these scholarships? I am not aware of any such instance. For my own information I should like the Special Representative to tell us about it, and if the answer is not satisfactory my delegation will have no alternative but to vote against this paragraph.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): It might be worth observing in connexion with what the representative of India just said that our understanding of this paragraph of the Drafting Committee is that this contains, of course, no reflection on the Nauruans. It is not intended to do that. There have in fact been, I am informed, no cases in which a Nauruan has declined to take advantage of the scholarship training offered. This kind of arrangement is a mutual one. It depends, on the one hand, on the offers made available, and on the other, on the full knowledge of the Nauruans themselves of the scope and extent of those offers. I think that is the intention of the paragraph, and that would certainly be the understanding of the Administering Authority.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I fully share the views expressed by our colleague of India; and in view of the fact that paragraph 13, which urges the Administering Authority to assist the holders of scholarships afforded in 1959, and who have failed in their studies, to make further special efforts to help and provide additional guidance to such students; and also in view of the fact that paragraphs 11 and 10 speak of the necessity of training Nauruans for higher positions in the Civil Service and with the Phosphate Commissioner, it seems to me that this paragraph 12 is absolutely redundant and unnecessary, and in a sense might carry a certain implication which was never in the minds of the members of this Council. For this reason I would propose formally that we delete it.

Mr. SOIANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): As a member of the Drafting Committee I simply want to say that when my delegation accepted paragraph 12 we did not by any means intend to introduce any sort of an accusation against the Nauruans, and say that they had not taken full advantage of the training facilities. We simply wanted to call upon them to take full advantage not only of the present opportunities, but even of future opportunities which the Administering Authority may provide them with. You can see that in the previous paragraphs, Nos. 10 and 11. We even wanted to use a different word -- not "hopes". We wanted to use the word "trusts". However, we were told that "hopes" was a customary word. These then were the reasons why my delegation agreed in the Drafting Committee to paragraph 12.

Paragraph 12 was deleted.

Paragraph 13 was made the new paragraph 12.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): My delegation abstained on this paragraph. I wish merely to express the reservation of the Administering Authority in respect of the arrangements which are contemplated in the wording of the second part of paragraph 17.

Paragraph 18 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 20 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 21 was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 22 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. DIEZ de MEDINA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): As regards paragraph 23, the third line "urges the Administering Authority to give further serious consideration to this matter ...". In connexion with this phrase, my delegation suggests that we should change the text to read as follows:

"to seek an immediate solution" rather than "give further serious consideration".

Mr. VELLODI (India): I should like to support the amendment made by the representative of Bolivia. While I have the floor, I should also like to make the position of my delegation quite clear regarding lines 5 and 6 of this paragraph. We do not ourselves consider that the difficulty as that posed by differences in language is a serious one. This is just to make a reservation on behalf of my delegation.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I think that I should say that, although I have no first-hand knowledge of the situation and the problem and the difficulties, with the greatest respect, I do not feel on behalf of my delegation that I should support the amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia, with the support of the representative of India. The practical difficulties, I can imagine, are in fact very great. To force children to be educated in a language which is not their own primary language can be a very grave mistake. I therefore felt some doubt about the wording of the original draft, but it is the policy of my delegation always to support the Drafting Committee wherever possible. Therefore I would have been prepared and am prepared to support the wording as it originally stood. But I would not be in favour of making the change which is now proposed.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): This matter, as I recall, was pretty carefully explained to the Council by the Special Representative during the discussion of conditions in the Territory, and it is a matter of practical concern.

It is the policy of the Administering Authority that there should be an integrated school system wherever the jurisdiction of the Authority runs; that is the policy. The difficulties in this respect arise from the presence of the Gilbert and Ellice Islanders, and I need not repeat all that was given to the Council in that respect by the Special Representative. The inclusion of this paragraph as drafted would not perhaps greatly disturb the Administering Authority because I think we have made our position clear enough. But it would be difficult for us to give any acceptance to an amendment which would require anything of an immediate nature to be done or even reported upon. This is one of the matters again which the Visiting Mission will be able to have a look at for itself on the spot. Regretfully I would have to oppose an amendment in the sense suggested.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I want to make just one short point in connexion with what Sir Hugh Foot said. We believe that there is no question of forcing anyone to study in a language which is not theirs because the Council is aware, and we have heard this from the Special Representative, that the medium of instruction in all the three primary schools is English. It is possible that in a very low class such as the first or second grade, occasionally the local language is used. It has been confirmed that English is the medium of instruction. That is why I made this reservation on behalf of my delegation, that we do not consider that the differences in language are serious ones. We are aware, and I agree with the representative of Australia, that there may be difficulties.

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

We are certain that the Administering Authorities want to bring about an integrated school system. But the amendment suggested by the representative of Bolivia says merely that they should seek an immediate solution, and I cannot myself see any serious objection to such an amendment, merely asking the Administering Authorities to seek an immediate solution. If it is the policy of the Administering Authorities to try to bring about an integrated school system, I think it is in order for the Council to say that this should be done as immediately as possible.

Mr. DIEZ de MEDINA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): From my point of view I should say that I agree with the representative of India, and that is what I wanted to put before the Council.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I accept the correction. I am grateful to the representative of India for what he said, of which I was not fully aware. Nevertheless, there are differences, I imagine, arising from the fact that the mother tongue of the people concerned is different and that it does pose real difficulties, which I have no doubt he recognizes. I would myself suggest to the Council that if we ask for further serious consideration to be given we are going far enough. The wording now does suggest that there is an immediate solution, which indeed there may not be, and if we enjoin the Administering Authority to give further consideration to this matter, I have no doubt it will be done and I should have thought it was sufficient. But still there is not much difference between us and maybe we can proceed to settle the matter. I confirm my view that I would prefer the original wording in the draft.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America): I wonder if I may ask for some clarification as to just where this amendment fits in and what words it replaces. As I understand it from the interpretation, the words concerned are "seek an immediate solution" and it is not quite clear to my delegation whether that is to replace the words "give further serious consideration" or whether it replaces other words as well. If that is the case, it would read "urges the Administering Authority to seek an immediate solution to this matter with a view to overcoming the reported difficulties", and so on. May I ask if that is a correct interpretation.

Mr. DIEZ de MEDINA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The amendment is to substitute "seek an immediate solution" for "give serious consideration". Not to say "give further serious consideration" but to say "seek an immediate solution".

The PRESIDENT: As I hear no other comments, I shall put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia.

:The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 23 as amended was adopted by 8 votes to none with 5 abstentions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The views of the Soviet delegation on paragraph 24 of the recommendations of the Drafting Committee on Nauru were clearly put forward at a previous meeting. As you know, the Soviet delegation took exception to a number of points made in this paragraph. At that time, however, we did not draw attention to one additional shortcoming of this paragraph. In the second sentence of this paragraph a portion of the text of Article 76b of the Charter was retained, but we fail to understand why, having retained one portion of that text, the Drafting Committee deemed it necessary to delete a clear Charter provision which is to be found in the Charter in black and white. The Soviet proposal is a formal amendment to the effect that in the second sentence of this paragraph one word be included so as to make the proposal read as follows: "The Council believes, however, that, pending its final solution, this problem of the future of the Nauruan people should not be allowed to prevent their progressive development towards self-government" -- and this is the amendment -- "and independence; and considers that it is necessary to establish realistic targets reflecting a proper sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory", and so forth.

In order to save the Council's time, moreover, I should like to look ahead. I would request separate votes on the two parts of paragraph 24, the first vote to be on the first sentence and the second vote on the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): I should like to point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that he has misquoted the Charter on this particular amendment. The words in the Charter are "self-government or independence", and the interpretation, at least as it came across to me, was "self-government and independence". This may have been a fault in interpretation, but if the amendment is being used in terms of the Charter, it would perhaps be wise to have it in accurate terms of the Charter. However, whether it is "and independence" or "or independence", my delegation will vote against this amendment on the grounds of simple common sense, because no matter how independence is interpreted -- and it is interpreted very widely in this Organization -- to look at a resolution which talks about independence in cold blood for 2,400 people seems to me to get to the state of complete absurdity, and I regret that I cannot join the representative of the Soviet Union in his folly.

Mr. ACLY (United States of America): I think that another factor is involved here: the old question of what we mean by the word "independence". There are various interpretations of that word. I think that all of us accept the wording of the Charter without question, but we do have various interpretations, as I have said, of the word "independence". Several of these interpretations were set forth last year by the Committee of Six which went into this question rather thoroughly in connexion with the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Therefore, my delegation would have no difficulty at all in accepting the use in this paragraph of the actual wording of the Charter -- provided, of course, that the term "or independence" and not "and independence" is used -- with the reservation that "independence" may mean different things to different people.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to correct my statement of my amendment. It should read "or independence" and not "and independence".

Mr. VELLODI (India): Since my delegation proposes to go along with what the New Zealand representative regards as the "folly" of the Soviet Union, I think that a word of explanation is necessary.

We certainly agree that the Charter should be quoted accurately, and I am glad that the Soviet Union representative has corrected his amendment so that the phrase will read "self-government or independence". In this connexion, I should also like to say that, whatever the future may hold for the people of Nauru, my delegation considers that, particularly in the light of the last part of paragraph 24, where we refer to resolution 1514 of the General Assembly, the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter, the amendment suggested by the Soviet Union representative is quite in order for inclusion in the Council's conclusions on this Territory.



The Soviet amendment to add the words "or independence" after the word "self-government" in the second sentence of paragraph 24 was adopted by 10 votes to 3.

The first sentence of paragraph 24 was adopted by 12 votes to 1.

The second sentence of paragraph 24, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I wish to make two observations.

First, as regards the Soviet amendment which the Council has adopted and which I voted against, I would point out that the inclusion of the words "or independence" in the second sentence of paragraph 24 is quite plainly in conflict with the intention and meaning of the first sentence of the paragraph, in which explicit recognition is given to the particular circumstances of the Territory, including its small size and the waning nature of its economy. I think that that contradiction is quite apparent. I do not wish to use strong terms, but I think that it carries the seeds of absurdity.

Secondly, I am bound to point out that the Administering Authority, both in this connexion and in more general connexions, has always very frankly and honestly stated its position with regard to the establishment of target dates for political development. On Friday I read out to the Council a public statement on this question which had been issued by the Minister for Territories. That is the position of the Administering Authority. It would not be honest if I or the Australian Government allowed anyone to think that the Administering Authority would be in a position, so far as can be foreseen, to bring back any positive assurances to the Council on the Council's recommendation in the direction of the establishment of target dates in the political field.

I shall therefore have to abstain from the vote on paragraph 24 as a whole. Indeed, I should perhaps oppose it because of the self-contradictory nature of part of it.

Paragraph 24 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 5 of the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1026, page 1.) was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The next meeting of the Council will be held on Wednesday at 10.30 a.m. A second meeting will be held at 3 p.m. if necessary.

On Wednesday the Council will have before it for consideration five reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions, as well as the following items: the adoption of the chapters on conditions in the Trust Territories, the adoption of the Council's report to the Security Council, and the adoption of the Council's report to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.