

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1191  
5 July 1962

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

JUL 6 - 1962

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 4 July 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. BINGHAM

(United States of America)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru (continued)

(a) Annual report of the Administering Authority [3c]

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission  
to the Trust Territory of Nauru [5a]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1191 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.

62-14639

(46 p.)

## AGENDA ITEMS 3c AND 5a

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1589, 1599, 1600; T/L.1039)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU, 1962 (T/1595 and Add.1)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative for Nauru under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

General debate (continued)

Mr. NOYES (United States of America): I should like first of all to commend the Visiting Mission on its most excellent report. The Mission has done its work well and has provided this Council with new and useful information and with a series of carefully thought-out recommendations with which we find ourselves in sympathy. We appreciate the frankness with which the Mission has expressed itself and the constructive nature of the report which it has submitted to us. On behalf of the United States delegation, I should like to express to the Chairman and the other members of the Mission our grateful thanks for their efforts. I am sure that the Visiting Mission's report will contribute in a major way to the work of this Council in dealing with the Trust Territory of Nauru during the current session.

While the Visiting Mission has made a number of minor criticisms on various aspects of the situation in Nauru, it is clear from the Mission's report that on the whole it believes that the Nauruans enjoy favourable conditions and that their interests are being well served by the Administering Authority. We support this view and would like to commend the Administering Authority for fulfilling its responsibilities effectively, as well as for its efforts during the past year.

(Mr. Noyes, United States)

All of Nauru's problems have clearly not been solved, but progress is taking place on many fronts. While encouraging the Administering Authority to press forward with further progress, we feel it is only right that we should acknowledge the high standards of administration and co-operation with the United Nations which are clear in the record before us.

There are a few points mentioned in the Mission's report on which I should like to comment. First I turn to some of the minor points.

The Trusteeship Council is on record as favouring increased responsibility for the Nauru Local Government Council. The Visiting Mission has also made certain recommendations with respect to this matter. My delegation agrees that the Administering Authority has prepared the ground for a step forward and that the time has come for it to turn over increasing responsibility to the Nauru Local Government Council.

We would also encourage the Administering Authority to advance Nauruans to positions of responsibility as rapidly as possible.

We believe that the Mission's recommendation with respect to consultations between the Nauruans and the Board of the British Phosphate Commissioners is reasonable, and we were glad to hear from the Special Representative of the Administering Authority that they were in sympathy with this recommendation.

We have noticed that there is little, if any, discussion in the Visiting Mission's report of the documents in the annex to the report. Many of these include complaints or criticisms of various aspects of the situation in Nauru. We hope that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission may be prepared during this debate to comment on that matter.

(Mr. Moyes, United States)

The most important point in the report of course is the question of the future resettlement of the Nauruan people, and it is this question to which the Mission has devoted the largest part of its report. The main recommendations of the Mission on this matter is that the Australian Government should now formulate definitive alternative plans for future resettlement and should put these plans forward in detailed form for consideration by the Nauruan people. They have suggested that if an island could be found which might be suitable, a specific scheme of settlement on that island should be worked out. On the other hand, to guard against the possibility that no island can be found which would be suitable, they have urged that a detailed plan for settlement of the Nauruans in Australia should also be prepared and that both of these detailed schemes should then be discussed with the Nauruans.

These recommendations of the Visiting Mission seem to us to point a way out of the difficulties which have so far prevented any satisfactory solution to this problem, and it is our hope that the Australian Government would be prepared to undertake this responsibility. We note that the report indicates that the Australian Administration has provided an officer to help the islanders formulate their own wishes and requests. This officer has apparently been of assistance to the Nauruans in preparing the submission which has just been submitted to the Australian Government by the Nauru Local Government Council. Unfortunately, this proposal is so recent that we do not have the benefit of the views of the Visiting Mission or even the Administering Authority in regard to it. But this proposal is, after all, simply a part of a continuing process of consultation between the Administering Authority and the Nauruans. We welcome this process of consultation and feel that it is important that it be continued. We were glad to hear from the Head Chief, Hammar-de Roburt, that he is entirely satisfied with the arrangements for consultation between his Council and the Administering Authority in this matter.

While the submission of the Nauruan proposal to the Administering Authority brings this process of consultation to a new stage in respect to one of the alternatives envisaged by the Visiting Mission, it does not seem to my delegation that it is in any way inconsistent with the recommendation of the Visiting



(Mr. Hayes, United States)

Mission that the Administering Authority should take the responsibility for preparing detailed schemes of settlement and resettlement on the basis of the two basic alternatives. The Administering Authority will, we are sure, take into account, in preparing such schemes, any and all proposals or expressions of view put forward by the Nauru Local Government Council in respect to each of these alternatives. We would be content at this stage simply to endorse the Visiting Mission's conclusions and recommendations on this matter.

It is obvious that the Nauruans have faith and confidence in the Australian Government. It is equally obvious that the Nauruans are fully aware of the difficulties of their situation. The Australian Government has given ample evidence of its desire to work with the Nauruans toward the end of finding an equitable and acceptable solution to this vexing resettlement problem. My delegation believes that so long as these attitudes obtain, we can have confidence that a satisfactory solution will be found in ample time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Visiting Mission has asked to speak in order to respond to the inquiry put to him just now by the representative of the United States.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I am very glad that the representative of the United States has raised the question which he did early in his speech about the statements of the Local Government Council included in the annex to our report. I think that we should have explained more clearly what these documents were, how they came to us and how we dealt with them, and I am very glad to have the opportunity to do so.

When we arrived in Nauru, our main purpose was, of course, to have full discussions with the Local Government Council as the elected representatives of the people. We therefore made our main purpose a series of discussions with the members of the Local Government Council, and I think that it was the day before we had our first meeting with the Local Government Council that they presented an agenda to us with statements and working papers as a basis for our

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

discussions. We therefore entered the discussions with a number of documents before us, and the principal documents that were before us are included in the annex to our report.

Having received these working papers which set out the views which the Council wished to discuss with us, we then entered on lengthy discussions of the points they wished to raise. The elucidation, explanation and clarification of their views went forward in the series of meetings which we had with them and, following that, very full discussion on this main question of future settlement. We as a mission considered the representations put forward to us both in the documents and in the subsequent discussions. I think that all the points raised in the document are covered and dealt with in the recommendations which we have included in our report, but in the report we had in mind more the discussions which had taken place directly over the period of days with the members of the Local Government Council rather than dealing specifically point by point with the points raised in the working paper presented to us.

I think that it is legitimate criticism that we have not referred back in our report to all the points specifically as raised in the documents included in the annex, but all the questions raised there were fully discussed and indeed, I think, it could be claimed are fully dealt with in the report before us.

I am very glad to have the opportunity of explaining the status of these documents.

Finally, I should say that, having discussed all these matters with the Local Government Council and having dealt with all the matters raised with us in our report, the question then arose whether these working papers presented to us by the Local Government Council should be included in our report or included in an annex to the report. We all felt that it was important that these documents which the Council had prepared should be brought to the notice of the Trusteeship Council, and we had no doubt at all in our minds that it was right that these documents should be brought here in the form of an annex to our report although they are not specifically petitions to the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): In considering the question of Nauru this year we are perhaps doubly fortunate. First of all, we are fortunate in having before us the report of the Visiting Mission which investigated conditions in the Trust Territory almost three months ago. The Mission was so strong a one that its members hardly need any tribute from me. But, headed by their Chairman, all have had that varied experience of the problems of dependent territories which can be -- and in this case obviously has been -- so fruitful in drafting a report. The representative of France has anticipated me in commenting on the quality of this report, but clear and concise writing is not so common in United Nations bodies that we need be afraid of a little repetition. With its eminently practical assessments and recommendations, this report is clearly destined to be one of those documents -- and we can all recall earlier instances -- which stand out like milestones in the progress of a territory towards the goals of trusteeship.

We have also been fortunate in having with us at the table the Head Chief of Nauru, Mr. Hammer de Roburt. The day before yesterday Mr. de Roburt received what might be called his baptism of fire. None of us could have envied him this ordeal, but all, I think, admired him for the calm and effective way in which he underwent it. He has shown himself an able and conscientious leader of the Nauruan people. His presence here has done much to focus our attention on the issues that matter.

The Mission's report and Mr. de Roburt's statements have between them laid out clearly before us the wishes of the Nauruan people -- as they are gradually being revised and defined -- and the practical realities which must be faced in fulfilling those wishes. These are the two sides of a problem which we have never had to face in such an acute form in this Council. The position of Nauru under Trusteeship is unique. It is a tiny and very isolated island with an indigenous population of only 2,400, and a population moreover which can enjoy an acceptable standard of living only by the exploitation of a single natural resource which dwindles year by year. Such a position naturally presupposes unique arrangements for the future. Generalizations based on other territories, and the usual maxims on decolonisation may be of comparatively little use. Like the Nauruan people themselves, we are faced with a situation in which the past offers no guide. Like them, we should approach decisions on the future with care, with imagination and above all with the flexibility that will enable us to revise our views in the light of experience as the situation develops.

In the fifteen years since the three Administering Powers placed Nauru under international Trusteeship, its exceptional circumstances, though often referred to in this Council's debates, have remained largely implicit. Hitherto, the aim of the Trusteeship Council has been more simple. It has tried to ensure that the handful of people on Nauru should enjoy as fully as possible the benefits of the Trusteeship System and, when the time comes for them to decide, that their future should be in accordance with their freely-expressed wishes. This preliminary aim has, I think, been conscientiously discharged. No administration could please every one of its critics, but the record in Nauru has been so consistently commended by past United Nations Missions as to allow no grounds for doubting its good faith and its earnest efforts to improve the well-being of the Nauruans.

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

The last Visiting Mission concludes that:

"... the interests of the people have so far been well served by the Administering Authority". (T/1595, page 40, para. 144)

This is a conclusion which follows justly from the Mission's own observations and from a reading of the Territory's Annual Report. Medical, educational and social services have reached a standard not often found elsewhere in the Pacific, or, indeed, anywhere else. Political progress has been steady and productive. The Nauruan Local Government Council is demonstrating a responsible concern for Nauruan welfare as the views expressed here by Mr. de Roburt have made very clear to us. The groundwork has been well laid. The time has obviously come for further advances, and all of us must welcome the announcement by the Special Representative that one of the primary tasks of the incoming Administrator will be to examine the means of further political devolution. The recommendations of the Visiting Mission on a constitutional conference provide one valuable starting-point in this respect. So also does the acceptance by the Administering Authority of the Mission's proposal to add a formal, annual conference to the informal meetings customarily held between the Nauruan representatives and officials of the British Phosphate Commission. Although the latter is a highly technical undertaking, with world-wide ramifications, a closer association can bring nothing but benefit to both sides.

All this is the normal pattern of political progress which we look for in all Trust Territories, or indeed in any other Territories. But in the case of Nauru this normal pattern, though it is to be welcomed and stimulated, is over-shadowed by a crucial and still unresolved question: the future of the Nauruan people itself. As the representatives of Bolivia and India -- in fact, almost all the members of the Council -- have pointed out, the need for long-term planning for the Nauruans' future has now become the overriding issue. Until it is settled, very little else can be. Political progress becomes uncertain when no one yet knows what the ultimate form of government will be; economic progress is unsettled by the coming change in the entire basis of the Nauruan economy; educational progress could become irrelevant in a different environment.



Speaking of education, I must say that I find the references to fears and obsessions in paragraph 48 of the Mission's report rather surprising. A people being as well-educated as are the young Nauruans, a people who have also acquired many technical skills, are surely tolerably well-prepared to adjust to any new situation that may arise. The Nauruans are a sound people, an intelligent people, a well-fed people, a healthy people, a well-educated people, a people with a great deal of money behind them. Comparatively speaking, that is having in mind the condition of the bulk of this planet's three billion human beings, the Nauruans are among the most favoured, among the most fitted to survive in modern conditions. They have surpassed by far those goals in health, nutrition and education that are still, unfortunately, only distant goals for the great majority of our fellow human beings. Most of them are better fed and educated than the explorers who navigated the great unknown oceans in past centuries, better fed and educated than were most of the pioneers who settled the New World. Therefore I cannot see the need for fears and obsessions. If ever a people had cause to be positive and confident it is the Nauruans; and those few I have met, including Mr. Hammer de Roburt who has been with us, reinforce my optimism about their future prospects.

The query which now hangs over the future of Nauru is only indirectly the result of phosphate extraction. Indeed, if the latter were stopped or sharply curtailed the resulting fall in the levels of Nauruan income would only worsen the situation. The simple fact of geography is that this tiny Pacific island has always been largely barren. Before the phosphate resources were developed it supplied only a subsistence living for a small number of people, and that mainly by fishing. There is a little strip of fertile land around the coast. The phosphate lands never could and never did grow anything useful. No topsoil has been removed by the mining operations. The phosphate lands were no less barren before extraction than after.

The islanders, therefore, like many others in the Pacific, must have lived on their tiny strip of cultivable land under constant threat of over-population. This threat of over-population was lifted by the discovery of phosphate deposits. Just as improved medical services made possible a rapid growth of population so, as the Mission's report makes clear, the phosphate revenues have provided a steadily rising standard of living to keep pace with the growth. But phosphate deposits are a temporary good fortune. When they are exhausted, this high standard of living must encounter the more normal economic facts of life on a Pacific Island.

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

These facts are, quite baldly, that a large population cannot be maintained on a small island without some form of emigration. Such a situation frequently occurs in Pacific islands, where population growth is always liable to outstrip resources. Indeed, the experts speculate that this process of over-population and emigration led to the original settlement of much of the Pacific. It probably lay behind many of the great voyages of the Polynesians which so stir the imagination.

It has, of course, been suggested that, instead of migration, the fertility of Nauru could be increased by covering the barren areas with a blanket of topsoil. Soil specialists and all who have visited the island declare that this is impossible; that the cost would be prohibitive, and the soil unstable. But whether or not they are right seems hardly relevant. Even if backfilling were feasible, the resulting arable land, however productive of coconuts and bananas, could not begin to provide the Nauruan people with the sort of life to which they have grown accustomed as a result of the phosphate operations. The representative of the Soviet Union, whose private proposal this has been, has suggested rather vaguely that the Nauruans could also develop their fishing. But surely neither he nor anyone else can expect the Nauruans to maintain their present elaborate economy, including free cinema shows, 'bus services and electricity, by selling fish to each other; and at such a remote distance from other centres they certainly cannot sell it to anyone else.

Without some form of resettlement, the end of phosphate extraction would also have side effects which -- quite apart from the economic difficulties involved -- would dislocate the entire structure and habits of present-day Nauruan society. The phosphate workings have raised standards of education and technical training to the levels demanded by an advanced industrial society. Without the employment they offer and the revenue they provide, there would be no opportunities and no outlet for the growing body of skilled Nauruans. The consequent waste of talent would not merely be a personal frustration: it could hardly assist the smooth transition to a fish and coconuts economy.

Even the diet and level of consumer goods now enjoyed by the Nauruans would be upset. The phosphate ships provide a fast and frequent link with the outside world. This cheap service enables the islanders to import large quantities of

food and other goods. Without the phosphates, however, neither the ships nor the goods they carry will again find their way to this tiny island under the Equator. Nauru will relapse into its former isolation, wrapped in the enormous distances of the Pacific.

Faced with these facts, the Nauruan people have concluded that some form of emigration or resettlement is essential. They have reiterated this view several times through their elected representatives, and it has once again been confirmed at this Council table by the Head Chief. We here are ignorant of the realities of island life; the Nauruans encounter them daily. In such circumstances, we no longer have any justification for pursuing our private theories in the face of Nauruan opinion. The latter must be taken as the starting-point for the efforts both of the Administering Authority and of the United Nations.

The problem, as the Visiting Mission has made clear, then becomes one of assisting the Nauruans to express their wishes in detailed and practicable form. The original proposals advanced by the Administering Authority did not apparently meet the essential need of the Nauruans to preserve the identity of their community. The Visiting Mission has made certain suggestions. Now, although unfortunately too late for the Visiting Mission to take them into account, the Nauruan representatives have set out their ideal desiderata, both for an island home and for their future State. The next step is to discover how far these desiderata can be realized in practice, taking into account the facts of geography of international life and of economics. In principle the Visiting Mission would seem to have sense on its side in feeling that these facts may rule out the discovery of a suitable new island. But the important point is that the Nauruans themselves must be enabled to explore every possibility. Only they can decide whether any particular site approaches their ideal, and only they can determine in what directions they may have to compromise.

The process at this stage, therefore, is one of search and negotiation. The search will have to be extensive and the Nauruan representatives must be closely associated with it. The negotiations will be flexible and continuing, a dialogue which can clarify the ideas both of the Nauruans and of the Administering Authority. Both have begun. Nauruan representatives have inspected two possible island sites: discussions with the Australian Minister of Territories which took place last month are to be resumed in August.

The Joint Administering Authority fully acknowledges its obligations to assist the Nauruan people after the phosphates are exhausted. The earlier proposals, the generosity of which has never been disputed, indicate that financing at least should not be one of the worries of the Nauruans in deciding on their future home. What remains is for the Administering Authority to make every effort to ascertain and accommodate the wishes of the Nauruans themselves. The "freely-expressed wishes of the people" can become a rather glib and unthinking phrase. But the Administering Authority takes it seriously. It would be ironical if Australia were to be criticized in the Trusteeship Council precisely because it is careful not to seek to impose any solution from outside. Nevertheless, the Administering Authority is also aware that the patient process of consultation and negotiation should not needlessly be prolonged. A clear obligation rests on all of us, and particularly on the joint administering Powers, to do everything possible to ensure the best possible future for the tiny but unique community of the island of Nauru.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the view of the Soviet delegation the Trusteeship Council, in its examination of the question of the future of the Trusteeship Territory of Nauru this year, must concentrate its attention on the basic issue, which is the demand of the Nauruan people that it should be granted independence and given the possibility of creating its own sovereign State. The will of the Nauruan people is completely and clearly stated in the memorandum presented to the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council by the Nauruan Local Government Council and in the Nauruan proposals (T/1600) presented to the representatives of Australia on 19 June 1962, and it is clear also from the statements here of the Head Chief, who has made an important contribution to our discussions.

In the memorandum of the Local Nauruan Government Council which was handed to the Visiting Mission there is a definite demand that the Nauruan people should be given independence in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) -- in other words, the well known Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.



(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

In the proposals of 19 June 1962 -- as a matter of fact, so far in the general debate one does not frequently hear mention of those proposals -- the representative of the Nauruan people called for the creation of a sovereign Nauruan state, to be managed by the Nauruans themselves. These proposals contain details with regard to the structure of the future government, its functions and the relations of Nauru with Australia and other States. In these proposals, the Nauruans stress that they wish to create their own independent and sovereign state. In speaking of their intention to conclude an agreement of friendship with the Government of Australia, the Nauruans indicate that the friendship and co-operation of Australia must be effected on a basis which would not violate the sovereignty of either Australia or of the Nauruan nation. This is the clearly-stated will of the Nauruan people. The Nauruans are demanding freedom and independence for themselves in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is characteristic that this historic document of the General Assembly and its Declaration never reached the far-removed island and was lost in the Pacific ocean. The members of the Council will recall that only a year ago, at our twenty-seventh session, the representatives of Nauru told us that they and their people had not even heard of the Declaration of the General Assembly and that the Administering Authority had not brought this document to the knowledge of the Nauru Local Government Council.

We now see that this Declaration has become the property of an ever-increasing mass of people in the colonies. We see how this Declaration is being converted into a powerful instrument for the moral support of the people who are fighting that liberation and into a weapon which is being applied by the United Nations.

How do the Governments of Australia, Britain and New Zealand react to this demand? What measures are they adopting for the implementation of the general Declaration of 14 December 1960? Bluntly, none. The Administering Authority is directly sabotaging the implementation of this Declaration with regard to Nauru and refers to special and exceptional circumstances in this regard. It ignores even the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council, although it is well known that the Trusteeship Council, where the colonial Powers are a majority, has never adopted any recommendations toward the speedy liberation of the peoples of trust Territories.



(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Indeed, at its twenty-seventh session last year, the Trusteeship Council called upon the Administering Authority:

"...to establish realistic targets reflecting a proper sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life; and invites the Administering Authority to establish such targets in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)".  
(A/4818, paragraph 22, page 12)

The reply of the Administering Authority to this request is virtual mockery. In its annual report, the Administering Authority flatly states:

"Having regard to all the peculiar circumstances of Nauru, and having particular regard to the uncertainty of the future home, and believing that attempts to fix political target dates in the best of circumstances can be no more than conjectures, the Administering Authority does not consider that realistic target dates for political advancement can be established". (T/1589, page 45)

Thus, the Administering Authority ignores the United Nations and particularly the will of the Nauruans, who demand that a date for their independence be fixed.

In the memo presented by the Nauru Local Government Council, entitled "Target Dates for Nauru", it is stated directly that the Nauruan people are demanding that such planned target dates be fixed for the progressive movement of the Territory toward independence. On page 3 of annex 2 to the report of the Visiting Mission, we read:

"Looking enviously around and beyond us, we see other islands and peoples, some just emerging from their old life while others are being prepared, with realistic target dates fixed for progressive advancement towards independence. We are not even favoured with tentative target dates. On the other hand, we are being loaded with intangible promises which seem to accumulate stratum after stratum as the years roll by".

(T/1595/Add.1)

Upon careful examination of the circumstances, it will be seen that the Nauruans go on to write:

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

"... one's enthusiasm and initiative are inevitably muffled and blunted by too much and most of the time unnecessary restrictions or in other words, we are being too much and unnecessarily hedged in".

(Ibid.)

In conclusion, the Local Government Council of Nauru states:

"We now propose once again, that realistic target dates ...set for our independence,". (Ibid., page 4)

And what sort of decision is being proposed by the Administering Authority to the people of Nauru with regard to the freedom of that trust Territory? At the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council, there was a detailed discussion of the question of the future of Nauru and its people. Special criticism was levied at the plan of the Administering Authority regarding the resettlement of Nauruans in Australia. This plan was criticized because it implied the liquidation of the national essence of the Nauruan community and would have been tantamount to its assimilation in Australia. Since then a whole year has passed and unfortunately, as can be seen from the report of the Visiting Mission of the United Nations for 1962, the Administering Authority has done nothing whatever toward the constructive solution of the problem regarding the future of the trust Territory in accordance with the wishes of the Nauruan people.

As can be seen from the document presented to the Council, the only plan which the Australian administrators have with regard to Nauru is the old plan for the resettlement of Nauruans in Australia; this is the same plan which was rejected by the Nauruans themselves. The insistence upon this plan by the Administering Authority is typical. At last year's session, the Trusteeship Council heard assurances by the Administering Authority that it will base itself upon the wishes of the population of Nauru in the first instance in all matters affecting the future of Nauru. As is known, the population of the island has rejected the plan. Yet again and again attempts are being made by the Administering Authority to enact something which is unacceptable to the people.

In order to achieve this end, the Administering Authority has attempted to utilize the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council which was sent to the island of Nauru this year. This attempt was greatly assisted by the fact that half of the Visiting Mission was composed of representatives of colonial Powers.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Moreover, the post of Chairman of the Visiting Mission was given to the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Hugh Foot, the representative of one of the three Powers which compose the Administering Authority of the trust Territory of Nauru. Sir Hugh, of course, has tried to safeguard the interests of the Administering Authority in the course of carrying out the so-called inspection of the island of Nauru. It is no accident that in the Visiting Mission's report, and particularly here at the meetings of the Trusteeship Council, Sir Hugh has tried in every way possible to stress the fact that the proposals on the question of the future of the Nauruan people must be formulated by the Australian Government, rather than by the Nauruan people themselves.

In this connexion, we were rather interested to note the statement just made by the representative of New Zealand which stressed another aspect of the matter -- one on which we agree with him fully -- that any proposals must come primarily from the Nauruan people, that they must decide what place is suitable for them and what place is not suitable. We agree with such an approach.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Moreover, in his statements the Chairman of the Visiting Mission tried to lay emphasis on the claim that the aspirations of the Nauruan people in trying to obtain a new island as a new home should not be encouraged too much. He tried to cast doubt upon the realistic nature and feasibility of the proposals advanced by the representatives of the Nauruan people. Let us turn to the report of the Visiting Mission to see what is stated there. In paragraph 78 of that report we find the following:

"While it is necessary, in our opinion, to carry out this survey of possible island homes with urgency and thoroughness (the Nauruans being kept fully informed as the survey proceeds) the Mission doubts whether the search for an island home in fact offers the best hope of a solution for these people."

And what does the Visiting Mission propose? In paragraph 79 of the report we find the following:

"The Mission consequently feels that as an alternative to the proposal for an island home, a proposal should be worked out and set out in detail for the establishment of a single community centre for the Nauruans in Australia within easy reach of some main centre of population. This would be a development from and an improvement on the generous offer already made by the Australian Government."

It is quite clear therefore, from what the Visiting Mission states in these paragraphs of this report, that this proposal of the Visiting Mission unfortunately differs in no substantial way whatsoever from the plan of the Administering Authority which already has been examined here and which has been categorically rejected by the Nauruan people as running counter to their desires to resettle themselves on a new island so as to have their own independent State on that new island of their own choice. What is being proposed by the Visiting Mission does not go beyond the proposal of the Administering Authority to settle the Nauruans in the territory of Australia, if necessary even in a separate community, a sort of reservation, as it were, for a non-white people. And naturally, any thought whatsoever of creating on Australian territory a separate and independent Nauruan state is completely excluded.

The Nauruan people quite justly reject any plans for their resettlement which imply the liquidation of the Nauruan community and its national essence, and it is for that reason that they flatly rejected the plan of the Administering Authority. In the memorandum submitted by the Nauru Local Government Council in respect of a future home for the Nauruan people it is stated that the proposals of the Australian Government are unsatisfactory in all regards. The Local Government Council expresses the fear that the three Governments composing the Administering Authority had been trying to disperse the Nauruan people by resettling them and assimilating them in the three countries. They point out that "...such a scheme is not in keeping with the spirit of the U.N. Charter" (T/1595/Add.1, Annex I, page 11). They go on to say:

"This is the proposal to assimilate our people into the metropolitan communities of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. This would write finis to Nauruans as a race and we simply cannot see our way clear to agree to it. No amount of explanation could possibly change the fundamental nature of the proposals in this regard. At best one could only minimize the shock effect of a sudden implementation of such a scheme, by implementing it not so suddenly. Even then it could only assume another form but its execution, however gradual will essentially remain a systematic or methodical obliteration of the Nauruan race from the face of this earth. The assurance or rather the view that at least there will always be Australians in future who could probably trace their ancestry, if they wish to, to the Nauruan race which once lived on Nauru, is indeed poor consolation." (Ibid., pages 11 and 12)

The memorandum goes on to say:

"The suggestion in respect of the Australian proposals for our resettlement, as advocated by one or two members of the Trusteeship Council" -- and I think those members of the Trusteeship Council will know who is referred to here -- "which was to the effect that decision as to acceptance or otherwise of the proposals should be left to the individual. Is this an attempt at some form of coercion? We hope the view will not be put into practice." (Ibid., page 8)



(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

The Soviet delegation wishes to assure the Nauruan people and its representative here in the Trusteeship Council, the Head Chief of Nauru, that it will never agree to plans of this kind on the part of the Administering Authority and will strenuously object to their approval in any form whatsoever in the Trusteeship Council or in any other organ of the United Nations. The Soviet delegation resolutely rejects any proposals, no matter from whom they may come, which run counter to the interests and the expressed desires of the Nauruan people. The Soviet delegation declares itself in opposition to these plans of the Administering Authority since these plans are purely predatory in nature and based only on the interests of the Administering Authority, which interests are to be found in the existence of phosphates on the island. We have already stated and we now repeat that the proposals advanced by the Administering Authority arise from the policy of ruthless exploitation of the natural resources of the island of Nauru as carried out by one of the three administering countries through the British Phosphate Commissioners. The Soviet delegation has tried in the past to get the Trusteeship Council to require the Administering Authority to change its policy with respect to Nauru, that it base this policy not upon the 1919 Agreement for the exploitation of the phosphate deposits of Nauru -- an agreement which is nothing other than a colonialist plan for exploiting the natural resources of the island -- but that it base itself on the Trusteeship Agreement, the Charter of the United Nations and the General Assembly's Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

We still continue to believe that there are ways and means for ensuring natural and proper living conditions for the indigenous inhabitants of the island within the framework of freedom and independence. Unfortunately, this aspect of the problem is something to which the Visiting Mission has not devoted any time in its work and in its report. To this end it is necessary, first of all, to turn over all rights and control over the natural resources of the island to the people of Nauru. The ownership of all the land containing phosphates must be returned to them in full, without the necessity for their paying anything therefor. All of the equipment and facilities utilized for the mining and processing of the phosphates must be turned over to them, and the Nauruan people themselves must exercise full control over the exploitation of the phosphate deposits and receive the full profits from these natural resources. As we stated

previously, this would be tantamount to the liquidation of the British Phosphate Commissioners, with all of their properties and assets being handed over to the Nauruan people. Under these circumstances, there would no longer be any excessive and rapacious plundering of the island's resources, with the result that the deposits would last not only for thirty years, as will be the case under the present arrangement, but for at least a hundred or a hundred and fifty years. Under these circumstances, too, the profits, so far as the Nauruan people would be concerned, would not diminish but, on the contrary, would increase.

An end must be put to this situation where the real masters of the island are not the Nauruan people but the British Phosphate Commissioners, a situation in which the island of Nauru is considered by the Administering Authority primarily as a source of the cheapest and best phosphate in the world to be used for the agriculture of Australia and New Zealand -- a natural resource which has already provided them with 28 million tons of phosphate and which may yet yield additional scores of millions of tons.

Representatives of the Nauruan people have written, quite rightly, in their memorandum:

"To us, the indigenous people of this land, it appears that the object of paramount importance in the whole set-up in this island is the B.P.C. and all that it stands for.

"Sometimes, it makes us feel that we, the indigenous people, are being looked upon as a bit of a nuisance and a huabug and should have been somewhere else away from this phosphate island.

"Therefore, we submit that the island is being exploited primarily for the benefits of countries and people other than the island itself and its indigenous people.

"We request, then, that our interests be placed before all other interests and that whenever clashes of interests occur, ours be given first consideration." (T/1595/Add.1, Annex IV, p. 2)

This statement eloquently characterizes the very essence of the policy of the Administering Authority on the Island of Nauru towards the people and indicates the degree of interest and involvement of the Administering Authority in the Island. This statement also entirely refutes the statement of the Visiting Mission to the effect that the Administering Authority takes good care of the interests of the population.

The principal factor which determines our attitude towards the proposals of Australia as well as other proposals regarding the future of the Trust Territory is the lack of agreement with such plans on the part of the population of the Island itself. This is the basic and governing factor and it is what the Trusteeship Council should be guided by in reaching its decision. Any plans and proposals regarding the future of the Trust Territory of Nauru and its population must emanate, in the first place, from the Nauruan people and must be supported by them. Without their agreement, no decision should be adopted on the implementation of any such plans.

The Soviet delegation gives its unqualified support to the demands of the Nauruan people regarding the creation of their own independent and sovereign state. We believe that the Trusteeship Council must require from the Administering Authority the fulfillment of these demands of the Nauruans and

its adoption of immediate measures for the handing over of complete authority to the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory in accordance with the Declaration of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960 (1514 (XV)). The Administering Authority must take steps toward the fulfillment of those just demands contained in the memorandum submitted by the Nauru Local Government Council and in the proposals of the Nauruans of 19 June 1962.

The Soviet delegation considers that to the Nauruan people, represented by the Nauru Local Government Council, must be handed over full ownership, without compensation, of all the assets and property of the British Phosphate Company in order that the people themselves may dispose of the natural resources of the island and carry out the mining and processing of phosphates in a fashion and on a scale which would be commensurate with their needs and interests.

Again, the Soviet delegation believes emphatically that the Trusteeship Council must take into full account the expressed will of the people of Nauru and must categorically reject the plans of the Administering Authority regarding resettlement of the Nauruans in Australia and their assimilation into that country; such plans are aimed at the liquidation of the Nauruan community in the interests of the British Phosphate Company which acts as an overlord in the Island.

The Head Chief of Nauru, in one of his brief statements in the Council, touched upon the substance of our discussion here when he said:

"I think that the main problem lies in the reconciliation of the wish of the Nauruan people to set up an independent, sovereign state on an island adjacent to Australia with the wishes of the Australian Government in the matter." (T/PV.1190, p.41)

The Soviet delegation believes that the demands of the Nauruan people are fair and justified and we fully support them. In our opinion, the Trusteeship Council, if it is to be true to the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial peoples and countries, must unequivocally and without any qualifications support these demands of the Nauruan people.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom to exercise his right of reply.





Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I do not propose to discuss any of the points raised by the representative of the Soviet Union at this stage except to deal with two accusations which he made, one against the Mission and one against myself.

He said that the Visiting Mission had been utilized for the purposes of the Administering Authority. Other members of the Mission are perfectly capable of speaking for themselves, and I should like to say, as Chairman of the Mission, that we were not open or available to be used by anyone.

Then the representative of the Soviet Union made a personal accusation against myself. He said that my purpose was to safeguard the interests of the Administering Authority. That is a most serious accusation. When I was honoured by this Council in being elected as Chairman of the Visiting Mission -- and I think that the election was unanimous -- I regarded it as my duty to devote my whole effort to the service of this Council and to the people of Nauru, and not of my own Government. I have not consulted my Government between now and the time when I was appointed. It may be a distinction difficult for the representative of the Soviet Union to understand. I would suggest that the accusation which he has made is unworthy of him.

I always welcome vigorous debate. I look forward to future opportunities of vigorous debate with the representative of the Soviet Union, but I think that he is not serving this Council well when he makes imputations against the personal good faith of other members of this Council.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): My remarks were a statement of the position of the Soviet delegation on this subject; our purpose was not to advance any accusations against the Visiting Mission or, personally, against the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. But I consider that any member of the Trusteeship Council has a right to express his view regarding the report of the Visiting Mission and to express his critical evaluation of some of the parts of that report. If any member of the Council happens to disagree with any of the proposals or conclusions in the report, he would not be honest and frank if he did not express his disagreement. Therefore,

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

I fully respect the opinion that is held by the representative of the United Kingdom, Chairman of the Visiting Mission. He has his own point of view and we must take it into account; we must recognize its existence. But we too have our own opinion, which is quite distinct from his. When I said that the representative of the United Kingdom had defended the interests of the Administering Authority, that was an expression of our point of view. No personal attack is implied. This is our assessment of the situation. We have now heard a statement by the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Hugh Foot, to the effect that he was only defending the interests of the Nauruan people.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Now, the Council has before it a special document setting forth the point of view of the Nauruan people. In view of the statement that has just been made, I venture to express the hope that the delegation of the United Kingdom, and Sir Hugh Foot personally, will support the proposals contained in that document, which was presented on 19 June by the Nauru Local Government Council. That would be the best way for the representative of the United Kingdom to demonstrate that he does indeed defend the interests of the Nauruan people.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Bolivia in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The Soviet Union representative obviously has the right to make a critical evaluation of the report presented by the Visiting Mission to Nauru and New Guinea. I in no way dispute that right.

However, in one part of his statement the Soviet Union representative said that the Chairman of the Mission, Sir Hugh Foot, had exercised "self-inspection". Now that critical evaluation is offensive not only to the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, but to all the members of the Mission. I hope that the Soviet representative, Mr. Oberemko, will understand that I must reply and that I cannot accept such a generalization, particularly as it concerns me. There are several reasons for this.

The Soviet representative is well aware that, in this Visiting Mission to membership of which I had the honour to be elected by the Council, I could not accept points of view which I did not share or sign a document containing opinions which were not mine.

I would ask the Soviet Union representative to allow me in turn to make a critical evaluation of his point of view. He considers that it is the exclusive right of the people of Nauru to seek solutions for the problem of Nauru's future, including the possibility of settlement on a hypothetical island.

I do not think that this right can be exercised exclusively by the inhabitants of this island, without the assistance of the Administering Authority. These people are somewhat isolated on an island in the ocean; they are separated from the rest of the world by great distances; and this prevents them from personally studying the possibilities of another location. I am sure that the Soviet representative, with his sense of realism and logic, must agree with me that any solution to this problem must be a joint effort; the question must be solved by agreement between the Administering Authority and the people of Nauru.

At a previous meeting, I stressed the point that the Administering Authority had been very slow in submitting specific plans. That is why the Visiting Mission was compelled to submit tentative solutions for study here as possibilities. That being the case, I do not believe that the equanimity or good faith of the Visiting Mission can be questioned. In this connexion, what Sir Hugh Foot has just said is quite correct. The Chairman of our Mission acted with the greatest possible objectivity -- and, especially in New Guinea, this was sometimes very difficult for the representative of the United Kingdom.

To revert to the subject, it is only logical that this debate should evoke some differences of opinion on the evaluation of the work done by the Visiting Mission. But the Soviet representative must admit that the proposals which have now been submitted by Head Chief de Roburt, the President of the Nauru Local Government Council, did not exist when the Mission was in Nauru. These proposals were submitted to the Administering Authority only a few weeks ago. How, then, could we have pronounced judgement on a situation which did not exist when we were there?

Finally -- and I say this because we must act with the greatest degree of objectivity -- the representative of the Nauru Local Government Council, replying to a specific question put by Sir Hugh Foot, stated that he did not exclude the concrete proposals which had been put to the Administering Authority.

Quite frankly and sincerely, I must say that I hope that on some occasion the Soviet representative will give us details on how he thinks resolution 1514 (XV) can be applied to the island of Nauru.

I hope I may be forgiven for making the following clarification. The only point on which I am completely in disagreement with the Soviet representative is that he believes that the question of resettlement is within the exclusive province of the population of Nauru and I believe that there must be an agreement between the population of Nauru and the Administering Authority; in my opinion, no solution will be possible without such an agreement.

Mr. KIANG (China): I should like to make one general observation on an established practice of the Trusteeship Council. I hope that what I am about to say will not be misunderstood. I am not referring to the interventions we have just heard; I am referring to the role of the Visiting Mission in the Council's deliberations on the Territory visited by that Mission.

It is the established practice of the Trusteeship Council that after the Chairman and other members of the Visiting Mission have returned from the Territory and have signed the report, and after that report has been presented to the Council by the Chairman of the Mission, the members of the Visiting Mission are under no obligation to answer any questions, except for the purpose of clarifying the wording of the report itself.

Members will recall that, for example, Mr. Dorsinville, who was Chairman of some Visiting Missions to various African Trust Territories, declined to answer any questions put to him by representatives on the Council, and his position was fully supported by the Council.

I would give another example. In 1959, the then President of the Council, Mr. Asha, tried in various ways to put questions to me, as Chairman of the 1958 Visiting Mission, on our report. I made it quite clear that since I was the ex-Chairman of the Visiting Mission I found it inappropriate to answer any questions or enter into any discussion in that capacity, or to express any opinion. I also said to the Council that members of the Visiting Mission were present in the Council only in their capacity as members of the Council and could state facts, if the Council wished, but nothing more.

I should very much like to see that this good practice and tradition of the Council is preserved.

I turn now to my general statement on the Trust Territory of Nauru.



(Mr. Kiang, China)

Once again in its consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru in the year under review the Trusteeship Council has the benefit of the Visiting Mission's findings. We wish to express warm appreciation of the good work of the distinguished members of the 1962 Visiting Mission. It was good to hear from the Chairman that on the Visiting Mission the experience of the two administrators and the two diplomats was well balanced, not only by virtue of the equally divided membership as envisaged in Article Article 66 of the Charter. Nothing could have been more fitting than that the man leading this Visiting Mission to Nauru, whose people are demanding more powers, should be an Englishman with the instinct for self-government and with practical experience gained in the course of his career.

In introducing the report of the Visiting Mission, Sir Hugh Foot made an interesting and also timely reference to the Mayflower. It happens to be coincidence of historical interest which our friends from Nauru might be interested to hear that, according to American history, had it not been for the stumbling block of the numerous islands in the South Pacific and the prevailing easterly winds, the Polynesians might have reached America in their skillfully navigated canoes even earlier than the passengers on the fleet led by the Mayflower.

This time, as it has before, the Council has enjoyed the able assistance of the Special Representative, Mr. McCarthy. It was also a great privilege to have the leader of the Nauruan people, the able Head Chief Mr. de Roburt, come to join in our discussions in the Council. As one of those who cannot forget his most friendly and generous reception on the island in 1959, it is my personal pleasure to welcome the Head Chief here. His presence and his assistance to the Council have enabled us to know more of the thinking of the Nauruan people on matters relating to their vital interests, and the Head Chief has certainly demonstrated the great capacity and stature of Nauruan leadership.

I wish now to say a few words about the political developments in Nauru in general. It has been the view of my delegation that the uncertainty as we see it in the whole question of the resettlement of the Nauruan community should not prevent the Administering Authority from giving effect to measures which will advance self-government in Nauru. The documents in the annexes

(Mr. Kiang. China)

to the Visiting Mission's report have caused us concern that no progress seems to have been made since this Council endorsed the recommendation of the 1959 Visiting Mission to grant more powers to the Nauruan Local Government Council. Like others, we feel strongly that the Administering Authority should not be reluctant to take a certain amount of risk in carrying out both its declared policy and the objective of the Trusteeship Agreement. We had hoped that the Administering Authority would inform the Council at this session that measures had already been taken to broaden the powers of the Local Government Council. We are disappointed that nothing has been heard from the Special Representative to that effect. As I have said, we do not share the view that, because of the uncertain future of the island, time should be lost in determining the future shape of Nauruan self-government. It is necessary that the people of Nauru be assisted in every possible way to be self-governing in all their domestic affairs. Many of the powers and functions of the Administration in the Territory should be devolved, with deliberate speed, upon the representative government institutions of the people.

With our own knowledge, gained during our previous visit to the island, we would like at the same time to urge that the Local Government Council itself should utilize its existing powers to the fullest extent. We in this Council have been concerned about the fact that the Local Government Council has not yet exercised its power of taxation. Since the Nauruan people are now looking far ahead towards their future, the Nauruan people themselves have to be fully prepared to be able to bear the responsibility for all the services which the Administering Authority is now rendering to the people of Nauru.

In the matter of self-government, the Visiting Mission has put forward a sensible recommendation that an advisory committee should be set up at once to consider the whole matter of full Nauruan participation in the legislature and in the executive administration of the island, to report with recommendations within a period not greater than six months. We hope that the Administering Authority will give that recommendation its prompt and favourable consideration.

Since the island's phosphate industry is an integral part of the economic life of the Nauruan people, the Visiting Mission has rightly recommended that from now on the Nauruan people should be given full participation in all decisions of the British Phosphate Commissioners which affect Nauruan interests.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

For such participation it would be a good beginning that the system of an annual conference should be instituted on a permanent basis so that the representatives of the Phosphate Company and the Nauruan elected government could meet regularly and review the activities of the Phosphate Company which directly affects the interests of the Nauruan people. Such closer consultation and co-operation between the Phosphate Company and the Nauruan people would have far-reaching and desirable effects upon the future partnership and relations between the Nauruan people and the Australian Administration. While the Nauruans themselves do not desire immediate participation in the deliberations of the Board of the Phosphate Company in all matters concerning the Nauruans, we hope that the Administering Authority will make efforts to train and appoint suitably qualified Nauruans to responsible administrative positions in the phosphate industry.

This brings me to the recommendations of the Visiting Mission for the creation of a public service commission with a board of five members of whom three might be Nauruans. My delegation hopes that this Council will endorse this recommendation and urge the Administering Authority to give effect to it. We agree that this recommendation, if approved and carried into effect, would go a long way to dispel the feeling of dissatisfaction prevailing in Nauru.

With regard to the question of phosphate royalties, we have noted with satisfaction the emphatic view of the Visiting Mission that

"the strongest obligation rests with the Governments of the countries which have benefitted from low-price, high-quality phosphate over the many years of the operation of the Commissioners to provide the most generous assistance towards the costs of whatever settlement scheme is approved for the future home of the people of Nauru." (T/1595, para. 115)

We fully share this view because we ourselves have maintained in this Council, as I did last year, that whatever resettlement may be ultimately decided upon it is exceedingly necessary that prompt measures be taken to increase the amount of the Nauru Long-term Investment Fund.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

As to the practicability of back-filling the worked out phosphate land with top-soil, my delegation would like to hear more from the authoritative expert opinion which the Administering Authority is now trying to obtain in consultation with FAO. All that we have in mind at present is that after the phosphate deposits are exhausted the people of Nauru who choose to remain on the island will, in all probability, have to turn to what our friend Mr. McCarthy once described as their minute speck of land, and to the vast ocean, as their means of living.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

In the social and educational fields, my delegation has taken note of the progress that has been made through the efforts of the Administering Authority. We are glad that the Administering Authority has conducted an experiment for the control of phosphate dust which we hope will prove successful and that the phosphate dust problem in Nauru can thereby be effectively dealt with with results reassuring to the Nauruan community. I think those who have visited the Island would appreciate and understand the concern and feeling of the Nauruan people about the nuisance created by phosphate dust. In this connexion, I wonder if the impressive but dust-forming motorcycle escort for the Administrator in his daily travels on the Island have been discontinued. I remember that in 1959 I myself had incurred the displeasure of the Administrator -- which I did not know until we left Nauru -- because I had insisted that there was absolutely no need of the dust-making motorcycle escort generously provided for our Visiting Mission's travel on the island.

Let me now turn to the question of the future of Nauru which has exercised our minds in this Council for some years. I was very much impressed by the remarks made by the representative of France on Tuesday. He said:

"It is equally indispensable to retain a sense of proportion in our examination of this problem and to avoid all dogmatism". (T/PV.1190, page 59-60)

When we say the future of the Nauruan community, we have in mind the question of resettlement of the Nauruan people and the related question of the future of the Trust Territory. When the Visiting Mission of 1959 centred its attention on the future of the Nauruan community and gave it a prominent place in its report, there was criticism and dissent, though from a very small minority, in the Council. Those who had attached importance to the question were charged with having overlooked the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, and for having asked the people of Nauru to give up its own island home.

Today, the leader of the Nauruan people has himself confirmed before this Council that a new home must be found for the Nauruan people and that there must be no going back on that basic decision.



(Mr. Kiang, China)

Unfortunately, this baffling problem of resettlement has become more difficult after the recent search for suitable islands had not met with success and after the Nauruans were not able as yet to accept the Australian proposals for integration of the Nauruans in Australia. The matter certainly took a new turn when the Nauruan leaders submitted to the Australian Government their new and far-reaching proposals which are to be found in document T/1600. Since the Nauruan leaders will further discuss the matter with the Australian Government in August this year and the Administering Authority is not in a position to inform the Council of its own views on the Nauruan proposals, we see no point to pursuing the matter and giving our final opinion on it at the present juncture.

However, we wish to say that the Nauruan proposals do seem to point out the possibility of Nauru's becoming a self-governing entity within itself but associated with a larger independent community. We also believe that once Nauru has attained the form of self-government as we visualize it, the question of resettlement of the Nauruan people will assume a more normal character and take a natural course. That is why I was very much impressed by one of the replies which the Head Chief gave to my question -- a question I am referring to now -- regarding the link that he had met between the Nauruan proposals and the question of resettlement. This view of ours may merit some deep thought of the Council, the Administering Authority and, above all, the Nauruan people themselves. May I also say that a self-governing Nauru will have a salutary effect on the morale of the Nauruan people settled elsewhere. They can always look back to Nauru as their home.

We are confident that in their spirit of good will and understanding the Administering Authority and the Nauruan leaders will in the course of time work out practical proposals that can meet the wishes of the Nauruan people. We also trust that in the search for a solution to the problem of the future of the Nauruan community, the Australian Government will fully respect the natural desire of the Nauruan people to retain its national identity as a people above everything else.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

Since we are honoured by the presence of the Head Chief of the Nauru Local Government Council, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to deal with a point which has been constantly in our minds. This point is related to the future of the Nauruan community in the context of the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System as set forth in Article 76 of the United Nations Charter. It remains a question, if not a mystery, why the United Nations had not thought of the future of the Nauruan people at the time when the Trusteeship Agreement was negotiated and approved by the General Assembly in 1947. Nevertheless, it is still the responsibility of this Organization to see that the resettlement of Nauruans outside of Nauru -- should this be the freely expressed wish of the Nauruan people -- be reconciled with the implementation of the provisions of Article 76 b of the Charter. As a party to the Trusteeship Agreement for Nauru, the United Nations has an obligation toward the people of Nauru for the final determination of their future in full accord with their own wish and interests. In the event that the Nauruan people finally decide, of their own free will, to be resettled at a place outside Nauru with equal rights and opportunities as enjoyed by the citizens of that place, it is our opinion that we may be justified in thinking that they have achieved the purposes of Trusteeship by forming part of an independent people.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation would first like to pay its tribute to the Visiting Mission which has furnished us with what may be considered as one of the best reports ever to come from a mission of this nature. While I congratulate the Chairman of the Visiting Mission for having fathered it, I must express a sense of gratification at the fact that a member of my own delegation was closely associated with the task.

My delegation would also like to extend its warm welcome to the charming and educated Head Chief of the Nauru Local Government Council, Mr. Hammar de Roburt, whose firm and, at the same time, concise and to the point replies to answers to questions put by the members of the Trusteeship Council, have made our discussions lively and thrown much light on the problems before us.

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

My delegation would also like to welcome the experienced and able Special Representative of the Australian Administering Authority, Mr. McCarthy, but for whose presence and comments in regard to various matters the deliberations of this Committee would not have been so substantive.

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

Coming to the report itself, the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission included ascertaining as fully as possible the wishes of the Nauruan community regarding its future and submitting a report thereon together with any observations and recommendation it might wish to make. It is to this matter of the future home that my delegation would like first to pay its attention.

It is true that there are problems of today which are no less important and which deserve close attention of the Trusteeship Council, but it is the future which has greater overall significance. The rapid and continuous exploitation of phosphate is depriving the island of its only source of income. The life of the phosphate deposits is becoming shorter and shorter. The Commission's report mentions it to be only thirty years whereas the previous Visiting Mission of 1953 had considered it to be seventy years and the Visiting Mission of 1956 estimated it at forty years. Increasing exploitation of phosphate may further reduce the life of the deposit. Time is, therefore, running out and a solution has to be found without delay.

The question has been before the Trusteeship Council for a long time. Two aspects of the question have been under consideration. Firstly, rehabilitating the island itself by levelling the worked-out land with the aid of explosive and heavy crushing equipment and importing soil to fill it up. Also, if possible, alternative sources of livelihood for the people in the island. has been a matter connected with this. Subsequent reports of the Commission have discouraged the hope that there is any possibility of continuance of sources of livelihood after the exhaustion of the phosphate deposits or of rehabilitating the mined land left after phosphate exploitation. Paragraph 66 of the Visiting Mission's report makes it clear that Nauru will be incapable of maintaining the population when the phosphate is exhausted. The Head Chief and the other leaders of the Nauruan people have confirmed that a new home must be found for the Nauruan people and there must be no going back on that basic decision.

Returning then to the question of finding an alternative home for the Nauruans three suggestions have been considered: Firstly, an island off New Guinea; secondly, an island in the South Pacific or off the Australian coast; and thirdly, settlement within Australia itself.

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

In regard to the first proposal, the Administering Authority in 1955 reported that extensive investigations as to the suitability of certain islands adjacent to Papua and New Guinea as a home for the Nauruans were investigated but their efforts proved unsuccessful.

Regarding the second possibility of finding an island in the South Pacific or off the Australian coast, a proposal was made by Mr. Cadabu at the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council. The impression is gaining ground that no island exists which has not already been inhabited and for practical reasons it will not be possible for 2,500 Nauruans to find a comfortable home in the existing islands in this vicinity.

Then we come to the third proposal, the settlement of Nauruans within Australia which, according to the Mission's report, is gaining increased interest and is in line with the Australian Government's proposed scheme for integration of the Nauruan people in Australia.

In a fresh set of proposals formulated by the Nauru Local Government Council a proposal has been made for the creation of a sovereign Nauruan nation governed by Nauruans in their own interest but related to Australia by a treaty of friendship. The Administering Authority has not yet given consideration to the proposal. We, however, feel that if an island off the Australian coast is found suitable for the habitation of the Nauruan people, the Administering Authority may give active consideration to this proposal and put forward a detailed scheme for the resettlement of the Nauruans in such an island and with the provisions sought by the people. If, however, it is found that no such island exists, active consideration should be given for the resettlement of the Nauruans in the metropolitan country itself with such provisions as would enable them to maintain their cultural and ethnic identity and enjoy full benefits of Australian education and employment as proposed in paragraph 79 of the Mission's report. We fully realize that granting sovereign rights on the mainland of Australia to any community is a difficult question and my delegation well understands the problem. However, all that we say is subject to the wishes of the people of Nauru.

It is, however, extremely urgent that the matter be given very active consideration both by the Australian Government and by the people of Nauru and a decision be arrived at without further delay. We presume that we are not asking



(Mr. Kidwai, India)

the Administering Authority and the people of Nauru too much when we say that in a year's time constructive proposals for the resettlement of the people of Nauru elsewhere from their island would be presented to the Trusteeship Council for consideration. The Visiting Mission has made specific recommendations in this regard and my delegation supports that recommendation, namely, that the Administering Authority may well take the initiative and make detailed and firm proposals which the Nauruan people could consider.

Mr. President, with your permission then I will come to other matters connected with the question of Nauru. Although the question of the future is by far the most important, we would not wish to ignore the present situation of the Nauruan people. The Visiting Mission informs us that in so far as health, housing and nutrition is concerned the Administering Authority has reason to congratulate itself not only in what it has achieved so far but in what it is continuing to develop for the future.

As regards the question of finances, the Visiting Mission has given us a picture which is at best hopeful. We are told that since the establishment of the Trusteeship Agreement the benefits received by the Nauruan people have been increasing at a steady rate and that at present they receive approximately a quarter of the export value of the mineral which is their very life and blood. It is gratifying to see that under the Trusteeship System the rate of benefit derived by the Nauruan people from their own resources has been increasing. I presume that without the Trusteeship Agreement such benefits would not have accrued to the Nauruan people and I presume it follows, therefore, that were the Nauruan people in a position to exercise full control on their destiny the benefit to be received by them may conceivably have been even greater. I shall not labour at that hypothesis but I think members will be well advised to take that possibility into consideration. It is not for the Administering Authority nor for the Council to determine whether people are receiving adequate benefit from the sale of their own resources, be it labour or mineral in the shape of phosphate or, for example, oil. There is a long history of certain developments in this regard in other parts of the world and after a certain period, during which the owners of resources had not been able to receive adequate compensation for the sale of their resources, an era has set in where adjustment more readily acceptable to both sides has been worked out.

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

In the light of these observations my delegation whole-heartedly supports the recommendation of the Commission that the Nauruans should be more closely associated with the deliberations of the British Phosphate Commission in order that they may be able more clearly to determine whether or not they are receiving adequate benefits from the sale of their phosphates. I need refer only to a brief statement made by the Head Chief in this Council as recently as Tuesday, 3 July -- in reply, as I remember, to a question put to him by my delegation. I believe he made a specific statement that the Nauruan people had always said -- as he would still say -- that they were not getting an adequate price for their phosphate, especially if they took into account the fact that it is about the best phosphate in the world, though still the cheapest.

At this stage my delegation can only express the hope that the Commission's recommendation of an annual conference of the Company and the Nauruans will prove fruitful, especially to the Nauruan representatives. Given a spirit of co-operation and willingness to achieve what we feel would be in the best interests of both the company and the Nauruan people, the annual conference may prove to be of great value. However, should the Nauruan people feel that the conference procedure has not made them any the wiser than my delegation would be prepared seriously to consider the further proposal recommended by the Commission, namely, that Nauruan participation on the Board of Directors of the Company may be considered. It is too early at this stage for my delegation to take a definite stand in this matter, but we shall be guided by the conclusions that may be reached in this connexion by the representatives of the Nauruan people.

I should like now, Mr. President, to seek permission for the member of our delegation who represented India on the Visiting Mission to be given an opportunity to speak on behalf of the Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I am very glad to call upon the Indian member of the Visiting Mission, Mr. Bhadkamkar.

Mr. BHADKAMKAR (India) (Member, Visiting Mission): I am sorry that I was, unfortunately, unable to be with the Council during the earlier part of this meeting, but I have just been informed by my delegation that certain observations have been made -- I will not say questioning, but raising possibly a doubt with regard to the sense and degree of objectivity which guided the four members of the

(Mr. Bhadkamkar, India)

Visiting Mission in reaching the conclusions we have reached in our report. I believe that the other members of the Mission have spoken for themselves -- as they should, and as I believe they must -- and I thought that I might merely add, on my own behalf as a member of the Visiting Mission, that I think that the question of objectivity is, in any sphere, to a great extent controlled and influenced by a sense of personal subjectivity. We cannot get away from that. There is no question about it. But, just as Trusteeship is a serious business, I would venture to suggest that a United Nations Mission in relation to Trusteeship also is a very serious business, and at no point have I felt myself influenced by any considerations other than those of objectivity.

My impression is that possibly I personally was in a better situation in this respect in having been not closely connected with trusteeship affairs in the past -- as I hope that I shall not be in the future. That, in my own opinion, helps a person to be more objective than he might otherwise be. So I merely wish to say to the Member or Members who might have felt that our sense of objectivity was not as precise or as perfect as it should have been that, if that is so, it is indeed not by design but, possibly, by accident -- certainly as far as I am concerned.

Mr. GERNIKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I purposely did not speak immediately after the statement made by the representative of Bolivia since I expected that other members of the Visiting Mission would speak. Now the representative of India has done so, and in this connexion I should like to clarify the statement I made on behalf of my delegation with regard to the work of the Visiting Mission.

We stated quite clearly that we did not agree with the principle whereby half the membership of any Visiting Mission comprises representatives of colonial Powers, but that we were always pleased to see the other half of the membership of a Visiting Mission, namely the representatives of the anti-colonial Powers. That is why we say that our doubts apply precisely to that half of the membership which consisted of representatives of the administering Powers. We would have been very happy if the Visiting Mission had consisted only of the representative of Bolivia, Mr. Salamanca, and the representative of India, Mr. Bhadkamkar. We consider that that would have been the best possible Visiting Mission.

Unfortunately, however, an equal number of representatives of administering Powers was added. And, as we pointed out also, the representative of the Administering Authority in this case -- in other words, the representative of the very Administering Authority which the Visiting Mission had to control, investigate and inspect -- was even Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

Thus our critical comments did not apply at all to the representatives of Bolivia and India, and we have no doubt whatsoever about their objectivity. But we consider the very principle of the setting up of Visiting Missions and the membership thereof to be wrong -- the principle whereby any Visiting Mission must necessarily have half its membership consisting of countries which, in the ultimately analysis, engaged in this self-inspection. In other organs the representatives of the Western Powers object to the principle of self-inspection, whereas in this connexion they seem to approve it.

The representative of Bolivia's statement included one interesting aspect. He said that the Visiting Mission had not had at its disposal the proposals of the Nauruan Local Government Council dated 19 June 1962. That is quite an interesting statement, and it may also be, perhaps, that the Visiting Mission did not have the physical opportunity of taking those proposals into account. I have stated, and I now repeat, that we have those proposals now. The document containing them has been circulated as a Trusteeship Council document under the symbol T/1600. I hope that, accordingly, even the members of the Visiting Mission will be able to some extent to change their views or to adapt them in the light of these new proposals which have come from the Nauruan people.

Those are the remarks that I wished to make for the purpose of clarifying the Soviet delegation's position.



Mr. BHADKANKAR (India) (Member, Visiting Mission): I merely wanted to draw attention to one observation made by my friend, the representative of the Soviet Union. He referred to my last statement as having been made by the representative of India.

I think we should draw a distinction in these matters. My last statement was made as the Indian member of the United Nations Visiting Mission, but not necessarily as the representative of India. I now take the floor as the representative of India and am at the service of this Council.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): Certain precedents exist in this Council, as I am aware and as the representative of China has reminded us. I think one of the precedents is that it is not the practise for members of the Visiting Mission to take part in the general debate. Therefore, since I understand that the general debate is about to be concluded, I do not propose to raise any new point.

I thought it would be helpful, however, to make four points of emphasis and confirmation. The first point that I wish to emphasize is one which was brought out very clearly in this debate, that the new proposals recently put forward by the representatives of Nauru were and are dependent on finding a suitable island elsewhere. That was made clear by the Special Representative on behalf of the Administering Authority and is, indeed, made clear in the document itself.

The second point which I should like to emphasize at this stage is the very important statements made by the Head Chief in answer to questions which I put to him. He subsequently clearly confirmed the views which he put before us, firstly, that the proposals which the Visiting Mission had made in regard to participation in the affairs of the Administration of the island and in regard to the affairs of the phosphate company were wholly acceptable to him and to his Council.

Secondly, he made clear in his statement that the recent proposals which were put forward by the Nauru Local Government Council, and which have been brought to this Council, do not conflict with the recommendations on future settlement which were made by the Visiting Mission.



(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

The third point I wish to emphasize is the one made by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the free will and the wishes of the people of Nauru. All of us, I am sure, have wished to keep uppermost in our minds that those wishes should be the guiding principle of our work and the recommendations of the Visiting Mission were that all the alternatives, in full detail, should be placed before the people of Nauru so that they can make their decision -- I repeat, their decision. It is well to emphasize again that what we have proposed is merely that they should have all the facts, all the possibilities, before them before they reach their final decision and that it is their final decision which we shall all wish to respect.

The last point I wish to make relates to the question of targets, with special reference to what the representative of the Soviet Union said to us this morning when he suggested that we had not dealt with this important matter. I wish to read the last paragraph of the report of the Visiting Mission.

"As to timing, everything must of course depend on what future settlement is agreed, but the Mission considers that it should be possible to formulate and decide upon detailed plans for the future and to be ready to put them into effect within a year from now." (T/1595, page 40)

That is our clear recommendation; that is the target we set. It is positive; it is definite. It is a proposal which involves immediate action and I do not believe that any earlier date could have been set. Until the people of Nauru have been given the facts and given an opportunity to decide, it is clearly useless to consider any other target date. But we believe that, within a year, it should be possible to have all the necessary facts about an alternative island -- such as the possibility, for instance, of settlement in New Guinea, which is not excluded in our minds and also the possibility of settlement in Australia. If that matter is dealt with with the greatest energy and despatch, then it should be possible, within a year from now, for the people of Nauru to reach their decision. We do not wish any delay and I would respectfully submit that we could not have suggested any earlier target date. The entire report that we wrote leads up to that date and I would, therefore, like to make it perfectly clear that the question of targets was very much in our minds and, in the final recommendation which we put forward, we recommended that a final decision must be reached within a year from now.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the members of this Council are to be congratulated on the expeditious manner in which the general debate, which is now concluded, was conducted this morning. I understand that the Special Representative has undertaken to give us his closing statement on Nauru, which we will appreciate, tomorrow afternoon.

I imagine that the members would like to adjourn the morning session now but at some stage, perhaps this afternoon, we should consider the matter of procedure with regard to the preparation of the Council's report on Nauru and I would ask members to be prepared to discuss that matter at this afternoon's meeting, before we again take up the question of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. CBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): There are a number of petitions in connexion with the situation in Nauru. We should like to know when these will be examined.

The PRESIDENT: There appears to some question as to whether any petitions were received in time in accordance with rule 86 of the rules of the Council. The matter will be discussed at the start of our meeting this afternoon, which will take place at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.