



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.1201
18 July 1962
ENGLISH

Handwritten notes:
Drafting Committee
Note
Chairman of the Committee
President
Later: (21050)
Secretary-General

Twenty-ninth Session
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 18 July 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. BINGHAM	(United States of America)
Later:	Mr. SALAMANCA	(Bolivia)
	(Vice-President)	

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: report of the Drafting Committee [3c] (continued)
2. Report of the United Nations Visisint Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 [5]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1201 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 3c

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1039 and Add.1, L.1051) (continued)

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

The PRESIDENT: When we adjourned yesterday we were in the middle of discussing certain amendments to the report of the Drafting Committee. I do not believe it is necessary at this time to recall the amendments that have been proposed. There was an amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union and an amendment to that amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia, and also a separate amendment proposed by the representative of New Zealand.

I give the floor to the representative of Bolivia on a point of order.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Briefly, and in view of the debate we have had on this point, I believe I can submit a proposed amendment which would be completely separate, which would not be submitted as an amendment to the amendment of the Soviet delegation, since our view is different from that of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bolivia for that clarification and give the floor now to the representative of the United States, the first speaker on my list.

Mr. NOYES (United States of America): I am not quite clear as to the situation with respect to the amendment that the representative of Bolivia proposed at our last meeting, but perhaps at this point I could speak to the Soviet amendment in particular and come back to the other later.

(Mr. Noyes, United States)

The amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union gives me considerable difficulty. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by the representative of New Zealand and, particularly, with those made by Sir Hugh Foot. My delegation feels very strongly that it is in no way fair to the interests of the Nauruan people to mislead them as to the realities of the situation in which they find themselves. As I indicated during the general debate, my delegation is not prepared to comment on the proposals submitted by the Local Government Council to the Government of Australia on 19 June. The Australian Government has not yet had time to submit to us their reactions to these proposals. It seems to us that it would be entirely inappropriate under these circumstances for the Trusteeship Council to consider commenting in any way on these proposals, let alone endorsing them. May I point out that we are not dealing here with the question of whether the Nauruans should be given their independence on the island of Nauru; we are dealing here with proposals relating to a new home for the Nauruans. Whether this new home is on an island or on the mainland, it necessarily involves arrangements for the Nauruans to settle on territory now belonging to a State which has sovereign rights over its own territory. Whether this State is Australia or some other, it seems clear to my delegation that it is beyond the competence of the Trusteeship Council to make or endorse proposals to that State involving the cession or other disposition of any part of its territory. Any State is of course free to negotiate with the Nauruans for the cession or permanent use of its territory. It is of course open to the Australian Government and people to negotiate an agreement with the Nauruans for the cession or use of their territory by the Nauruans under arrangements acceptable to all concerned, and we would welcome any agreement which the two parties worked out between themselves. But it is certainly no part of the obligation of Australia, as the Administering Authority under the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement, to make available any part of its own territory for this purpose. May I point out also that we do not have

(Mr. Noyes, United States)

before us the views of the Government to which the Nauruan proposals have been presented and whose territory is being sought. I cannot believe that this Council intends to deal with an extraordinary problem of this nature, involving the sovereignty of a member of this Council over an as yet unidentified portion of its territory, without at least waiting for an expression of views by that member. Certainly my delegation is not prepared to do so.

(Mr. Noyes, United States)

I might suggest that if this proposal had been directed not to the Australian Government but to one of the other Governments represented at this table, seeking a similar arrangement on territory belonging to it, the representative of that Government here would be vigorously opposing any action by this Council on the matter before his Government had considered it fully and provided full instructions.

This proposal goes beyond the jurisdiction of the United Nations in another respect, as has been pointed out during the debate by the representative of India. The proposal outlines certain treaty arrangements which might be made between sovereign Nauru nation and the Australian Government. While I have no doubt that the future status of the Nauruan people is proper subject matter for consideration by the Trusteeship Council, I doubt that it is competent or that it would be the part of wisdom for it to become involved in the details of any treaty arrangements which would carry on beyond the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

I believe that Sir Hugh Foot has put his finger on the crucial point here. We very seriously doubt the wisdom of arousing the Nauruan people's hopes to unrealistic heights. The United Nations, if it considered it appropriate and wise, might promote the independence of the 2,400 Nauruans as a separate nation on its own island. As we see it, however, such an outcome would not solve the problem of the Nauruans, and they have told us clearly that they have turned their backs on this idea in favour of the development of a new home elsewhere. They must in their own interests face their problem realistically. The essence of their problem is that they must reach agreement with a sovereign nation upon the arrangements for the use of some part of its territory. While the cession or other arrangements for the permanent use of such territory may be possible, it is clearly a most unusual process and must be voluntarily agreed to.

The Nauruans should recognize that there is little of anything that the United Nations can appropriately do to press any nation to give up part of its territory to them. In the final analysis they must rely upon the good will of the other party to the arrangement.

For these reasons I am opposed to the Soviet amendment and will vote against it.

Mr. DOISE (France)(interpretation from French): I should briefly like to explain the vote of my delegation on paragraph 3 of the Drafting Committee's report and also on the amendments which have been submitted.

My delegation feels that the Council should adhere to the formula presented by the Drafting Committee, a formula which is satisfactory both as regards logic and because it is in the very interests of the Nauruan people. In fact, we feel that if the Soviet amendment were adopted there would be a contradiction between paragraph 1 and paragraph 3 of the report since in paragraph 1 we request Australia to undertake two series of inquiries in two parallel directions, namely, the resettlement of the Nauruans on another island or their settlement on Australian soil. Thus, everything will depend on the future home of the Nauruans and today, here in the Trusteeship Council, we cannot make any decisions concerning the Nauruan proposals made on 9 June 1962. These proposals are quite recent; they have not been studied fully by the Trusteeship Council; we are also awaiting the reaction -- and it is indispensable that we should know this reaction -- of the Australian Government. Consequently, any decision taken today would be premature.

I should like to recall that in our statement in the general debate we said that the Trusteeship Council should not maintain an illusion or prolong uncertainty. We also said that any decision at this stage of our work on the future home of the Nauruans -- a home whose name we do not know yet -- and also any discussions on the stipulations of an eventual friendship treaty with Australia seem to us to be totally premature.

Therefore, under these conditions, my delegation can vote only for the text presented by the Drafting Committee.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): Yesterday I suggested an amendment or an addition to the first sentence of paragraph 3 in order, I hoped, to make the summary of the Nauruan proposal which appears in that paragraph a more accurate one. When I read the paragraph, assuming that my amendment were accepted, I realize that it still is not a full summary of the proposal, and the more I try to make this paragraph a full and accurate summary, the more I realize that this could only be done by a complete rewording and enlargement of the whole

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

paragraph, which would make it, I think, inappropriate for the present document. I therefore feel that paragraph 3 in the form already proposed by the Drafting Committee is sufficient for its purpose, as the representative of China pointed out at a much earlier stage. I therefore wish to withdraw my suggestion for an addition to the first sentence of paragraph 3.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): After hearing the statements made in the Trusteeship Council, I think that there is a clear-cut majority in favour of the original text presented by the Drafting Committee. I should like to ask for some clarification on a point and I should also like to make a brief explanation.

In the first place, the Council of Nauru has indicated conditionally and has stated that those were their main conditions for the transfer of their homes. Let us suppose that the Council did not take into account the point of view presented by the Council of Nauru in discussing the problem of the transfer. In that case, the powers under the Trusteeship Agreement would still be valid, so the Council could only take note of the position maintained by the population of Nauru. But in my amendment I suggest that we should take note with sympathy of that point of view because if the Nauruan population is transferred to another island and if their rights are still valid under the present agreement, I think that the Council should take note that this is conditional and that this is the minimum that we can accept.

I must say here that I have serious doubts concerning the possibilities offered to such a small population. In any case, this is a point of view which is taken from the Agreement. The Nauruan population has certain rights, and it has the right to accept self-government or to renounce it. This is a possibility which exists and which is quite obvious from the international point of view. That is why I should like to withdraw my amendment to the Soviet amendment.

In the first place, the difference of opinion which we have with the Soviet Union is quite clear. We are willing to accept the fact that the proposal of the Nauruan population is conditional. We could perhaps change the word "endorses" or add the words "with sympathy" because this population is looking for another home and if a certain country would accept their transfer to its own territory, I think that this is the minimum of the rights they have that we should recognize.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

I do not believe that anyone in the Council would maintain that we have no sympathy for that point of view. I therefore think that my position is perfectly solid. We should at least indicate that we view these proposals with sympathy. It is not enough merely to take note of them.

We must recognize that the position of the population is a difficult and complex one.

Hence, I should like to make a change in my own amendment -- namely, that the paragraph should begin with the words "The Council views with sympathy the proposals ...". That is the least that we can do for the population of Nauru.

The representatives of the people of Nauru have not submitted anything final. But these people certainly have rights even in the case of a transfer of their home. Hence, I think that it would be perfectly logical for the Council to express its sympathy. We must not forget that the entire economy of the Territory was based on the export of phosphates. Now we are talking about transferring the people to another place. Certainly the right of self-determination exists. I am not proposing that we should say that the Council accepts these proposals in a final and definite way. But the least that we can do is to take note with sympathy of the desires of the people of Nauru.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I have listened with sympathy to what has just been said by the representative of Bolivia.

I would seriously ask him not to press his amendment. As I have already said, the text of the Drafting Committee appears to us to be completely appropriate to the actual position within the Trusteeship Council. In the text submitted by the Drafting Committee the Council would note with interest the proposals submitted to the Government of Australia. With all respect I would say that I do not think any case has been made out for noting with sympathy, as distinct from noting with interest. What, really, is the difference? It is not necessarily the function of the Council to be sympathetic: the function of the Council is to be judicious, and also, of course, to be well informed.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

As regards a sympathetic approach, I think that if paragraph 3 is taken, not by itself, but in relation to other parts of the draft report there is sufficient evidence of the basic sympathy of the Council with the aspirations of the Mauruan people. In paragraph 2 the Council "trusts that ... the Administering Authority will fully respect the desire of the Mauruan people to retain its national identity". In paragraph 5, the Council bears in mind the "importance of assisting the Mauruan people to be self-governing in all their domestic affairs". And I dare say there are other phrases to the same intent. I think that the whole report is sympathetic, in that sense, with the Mauruan people.

I fear that it will cause some of us further difficulty if the representative of Bolivia insists on his amendment to paragraph 3. I therefore appeal to him not to press that amendment. Indeed, it would be far better if we did not have to vote on any amendment -- but that is another question, which we have not yet reached.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have no objection to accepting what the representative of Australia has just said. But in discussing a problem such as Mauru we are dealing with important general principles. I should therefore like to repeat my arguments, briefly.

I do not think that it is enough to say that the Council notes with interest. The population of Mauru has indicated general conditions, which they may withdraw during the course of the negotiations. However, during these negotiations the Administering Authority should at least know that the Council is sympathetic with these suggestions by the people of Mauru. We should be logical.

I do not have any strong objections to withdrawing my amendment. But I think that if we agree that we must uphold here the principle of self-determination there should be no problem.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): We have made it clear that we are in favour of the maintenance of the text prepared for the Council by the Drafting Committee. In view, however, of what has been said by the representative of Bolivia, I should like to make it very clear -- if indeed that

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

is necessary -- that I am sure that every member of this Council has the greatest sympathy with the Mauruan people in the dilemma facing them. I believe that we could ask the Head Chief to take that message back to his people. I think it was reflected in every speech made on this subject in the Trusteeship Council. I am sure that that is one factor on which we are unanimous, particularly those of us who have had the privilege of meeting the Mauruan people on their own island and sharing with them to some extent the anxiety which they feel. There is no doubt whatever that all of us in the Visiting Mission and in this Council have the greatest sympathy with these people.

I would not wish that such a matter should be dealt with by amendment of the draft before us because I think that this would be an unsatisfactory exercise. As I have said, there is no doubt whatever that we have the greatest sympathy with these people who face such a dreadfully difficult decision in the future.

I therefore hope that the Trusteeship Council will not dispute or disagree or divide on that issue. I am perfectly certain that every member of the Council feels towards the people of Mauru the utmost sympathy in their problem, and I hope that the Head Chief will so report to his people.

The representative of Bolivia has, I am sure, expressed the views of many members of the Council -- certainly of myself -- but he would probably agree that this is a matter on which there must be no doubt and no division.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation has given very careful consideration to the amendment proposed to paragraph 3 by the Soviet delegation -- that is, replacing the words "notes with interest" by the word "endorses". I have also given very careful consideration to the further amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia and to what he has said regarding his suggestion that the paragraph begin with "The Council views with sympathy".

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

As far as the word "endorses" is concerned, we are not shy of endorsing anything provided we know what we are endorsing. The amendment reads:

"The Committee endorses the proposals submitted by the Resettlement Sub-Committee of the Nauru Local Government Council, etc. "

These proposals are set forth in document T/1600, from which I shall read a few paragraphs in order to explain the difficulty of my delegation. On page two of this document we read the following:

"In brief the Nauruan people propose the creation of a sovereign Nauruan nation governed by Nauruans in their own interest but related to Australia by a Treaty of Friendship, details of which are not yet developed developed ..." (T/1600 page 2)

The report continues:

"The Nauruan people have not yet determined, in full, the final form of the Government they wish for the Nauruan nation." (Ibid)

With regard to sovereignty, the report states: "... we desire the Nauruan nation to be sovereign and free to govern itself." (Ibid) But the details have not yet been determined.

As to the Constitution, the Nauruans say that they would "wish that a written constitution be developed". (Ibid)

Concerning a Parliament, they say that "At present we visualize a unicameral legislature". (Ibid)

Under the heading "Executive" we read the following:

"We are interested in the executive system of government in Tonga and Western Samoa, but our mind is open on this question." (Ibid, page 3)

Concerning international association, the Nauruans say:

"We should wish the Nauruan nation to be a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations." (Ibid)

I could continue reading this document and finding everywhere the same thing. My delegation would have wished to endorse anything if we knew exactly what we were endorsing. If it is the question of finding a new home for the Nauruan nation, it should be spelled out. It should be stated that this is what we wish to endorse. We know that the question of finding an island for a sovereign Nauruan nation has

(Mr. Kidwai, India)

been accepted by the Government of Australia and by all the people. If we endorse this principle of finding an island, we should also indicate that it must be a suitable island. Therefore, if we are to endorse something upon which we shall have to stand in the Council, in the Fourth Committee and everywhere else, we must know exactly what we are endorsing. That is the reason why we cannot support the proposal to "endorse".

I should like to have some clarification from the representative of the Soviet Union as to his position, after which my delegation may wish to make further remarks on this matter.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of India has put the following question to us: what is the position of the Soviet delegation? We consider that we have already explained our position quite clearly and on several occasions.

We have before us as a major issue the question of the future of Nauru. Several proposals have been made. Apart from the proposals of the people of Nauru themselves, no other proposal makes provision for the creation of an independent, sovereign Nauruan State or of an independent Nauruan community according to the principles contained in the Declaration of the General Assembly. That is well known to all. The proposal -- whether made by the Administering Authority or by the Visiting Mission -- that the Nauruans should be resettled in Australia and thus the Nauruan community liquidated has been rejected by the Nauruan people. Thus we have a clear choice before us.

The Soviet delegation supports the proposals of the Nauruan people, which proposals are fully in accord with the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration. These are a statement of the will of the people of the Trust Territory, and we support them. That is the whole point and purpose of our amendment.

I must point out that in the report of the Drafting Committee, in all its conclusions and recommendations, there is no reference whatever to the Declaration of the General Assembly. On the other hand, we note, when the representative of

Bolivia, particularly in the last version of his amendment, is trying, rather meekly, to bring in a reference to the principle of self-determination and the provisions of the Declaration, that a united front is being created by all the colonialists here, even in this meek reference to the Declaration. The representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and of the other colonial Powers are trying to exert pressure upon the representative of Bolivia, insisting that he should not have his amendment put to a vote. They are not making a similar attempt with regard to the Soviet Union amendment because they know that such an attempt would be pointless.

We shall not withdraw our amendment; we shall oblige all the colonialists to vote against it, if they wish, but we wish to bring them out into the open. They can say that they sympathize with and defend the interests of the population, but when it comes to an actual decision and to the formulation of our conclusions and recommendations, they forget all about their declarations and say: let us adopt the text without any amendments.

Of course, in such a body as the Trusteeship Council the colonial Powers have a majority and can adopt any decision however absurd it may be and however unacceptable to the indigenous population.

We can see here the emergence of a new dance, so to speak, which may be described as typical of the debates in the Trusteeship Council. It is a kind of colonialist verbal twist. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom allege that the Soviet amendment does not serve the interests of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory. That is a monstrous allegation. How can anyone in his right mind say that support of the proposals of the Nauruans does not accord with the interests of the Nauruans? Where is the logic? Perhaps this is a colonialist kind of logic which implies the absence of common sense or human logic. If one follows that kind of colonialist logic, then one might go on to say that we can behead a person and that to do so will be in his own interests.

The representative of the United States said that the Soviet amendment went beyond the competence of the Trusteeship Council. On what basis did he make such an assertion? In paragraph one of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report

it is stated that an alternative proposal would be the establishment of a Mauruan community centre in Australia, whereas the Nauruans are asking that they be given an acceptable island for resettlement. The Nauruans call for a separate state, and in that they have our support.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Then the representatives of the colonial Powers come and state that this does not fall within the competence of the Trusteeship Council. But the resettlement of the Nauruans on the territory of Australia is also a resettlement on the territory of a sovereign State. Why do they not follow their own logic in this? I am speaking to the representative of the United States, and I ask why they do not follow their own logic and say that paragraph 1 likewise goes beyond the competence of the Trusteeship Council. How can one make such things coincide in that kind of logic? Your position is illogical and inconsistent.

The Soviet delegation bases itself on the fact that at the present time the Trusteeship Council should be guided by the Charter and by the decisions of the General Assembly. The Trusteeship Council operates under the guidance of the General Assembly, and we should not overlook this, gentlemen colonialists. The Trusteeship Council must be guided by the provisions of the Declaration of the General Assembly, and this Declaration is not even mentioned in your draft recommendations and conclusions. These recommendations and conclusions make no provision for the implementation of that Declaration, and when reference is made to various plans for resettlement, an attempt is made to push aside the question principally at issue, namely, that even now, at this very moment, as yesterday and as in previous years, there is an open colonial plundering of the Trust Territory. The phosphates are being removed from this island by day and by night, and there is virtually a physical dismemberment of the Trust Territory. The indigenous inhabitants are now saying that their phosphates are being taken from them and they will not have anything to live on, so they must be given another island. But even that you refuse them. That is why, in full responsibility, we wish to state that at the present time in the Trusteeship Council the colonial Powers are preparing a plan designed to go against the interests of the indigenous population of Nauru. That plan has been rejected by the Nauruan people, but that plan, in one form or another, is being dragged through the Trusteeship Council, at least in its preliminary

(Mr. Gberemko, USSR)

form, so that subsequently it may be strengthened and consolidated, and the Soviet Union does not want any part of that.

We resolutely and categorically oppose such a plan, and that is why we introduced our amendment. We introduced it in order to show the Nauruans that there are forces in the Trusteeship Council which support them and endorse their position and so that they might recognize those forces which act against them.

We wish to point out that the New Zealand representative became afraid even of his own amendment and hastily withdrew it, since in that amendment it was indicated that after all some new island should be found. The proposal of the Nauruans is based on the idea that a new island should be found for them in place of their island which is now being dismembered, piece by piece. It appears that when we speak about a small population, 2,500 people, we are told that this is a microscopic problem and they cannot understand how the Declaration could be applied to such a small community. The representatives say they do not even know whether it should be resettled and whether it should be taken from Nauru and resettled on another island. But that is where the hypocrisy of the colonialists appears. Why, in the case of such a small community of 2,500 people has it been necessary to have an administration composed of three States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand? Such powerful and united forces were required in order to engage in trusteeship. It is quite clear that these Powers never contemplated and will never seriously contemplate bringing the Nauruan community to independence. They are principally interested in the natural wealth of the country, the phosphates.

We stress this fact again because this is being beluded in various ways by the representatives of the colonialist Powers, and the attention of the Trusteeship Council is being oriented towards the various alternatives of the resettlement of the Nauruans. We cannot conceal our surprise with regard to the statements of the representatives of the colonialist Powers when they express sympathy with the people of Nauru. But when the Bolivian representative proposed his very moderate amendment that this should be stated in the text,

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

they balked at that and immediately decided to squeeze it out. They are afraid even to include that in their decisions.

The Soviet delegation will insist upon its amendment. We request you, Mr. President, to put it to a roll-call vote so that the manner in which the representatives voted may be made clear for all. If this amendment is not accepted, then we shall consider that the whole orientation of the report of the Drafting Committee, all its recommendations, run counter to the interests of the Nauruan people and that they are radically at variance with the interests of the Nauruan people. We shall vote against them and we will not participate in what is being prepared here for the Nauruan people. We shall continue further to uncover the plans of the colonialists and transfer our position to the General Assembly, where perhaps we may find a just solution, if this cannot be achieved in the Trusteeship Council, the organ of the colonialists. It is precisely because we are dealing with a very small community that we think it needs protection and support from the United Nations.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Very briefly, I should like to recall the words used by the Soviet representative when he spoke of the pressure exercised by a number of representatives here to lead us to modify our position. My position is extremely simple. The Soviet Union presents an absolute problem to the Council and takes an absolutely rigid attitude. My position is both logical and practical.

The population of Nauru is the only one which is able to say how the principle of self-determination should be applied, and we wish to defend that position. In this, I agree with the representative of India who said quite clearly that this decision is not final or definite. We should say that we fully sympathise with the position taken by the population of Nauru and that we are not making any final decision of any kind.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

As has been said by the United Kingdom representative, we all have sympathy for the position of the Nauruan people, and I think that this sympathetic feeling can be shared by everyone. I apologize if I am a little energetic in replying to the Soviet representative. I do not know what the Council will accept. I submitted my amendment because I did not wish to take any definite position, and I know full well that there is nothing of that kind implied in this debate.

The Soviet representative knows very well that when I carry out tasks on behalf of the Council I do so without fear and under no pressure. In the Visiting Mission I have at heart only the interests of the people -- this was true in Nauru and New Guinea as it was in the Pacific Islands. I am very astonished that the Soviet representative should go so far as to state publicly that I am changing my amendment as the result of colonialist pressure in the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

It is possible that Bolivia will be the only country to vote for my amendment; but I wish to say finally that the population of Nauru can count upon my delegation's sympathy.

Mr. HCOD (Australia): The representative of the Soviet Union has taken the occasion of the discussion on his proposed amendment to launch one of his familiar invectives against the Administering Authority of this Trust Territory. I find it necessary to stigmatize his statement as a callous distortion.

He spoke of the interests of the Nauruan people. Can it honestly be imagined for one moment that the version of the circumstances which he attempted to put before the Council is one that, in any conceivable way, could advance the interests of the Nauruan people? I would surmise that the Nauruan people are a good deal happier to be dealing, as they are dealing, with the Australian Government on these matters affecting their future than they would be if they were dealing with the Government of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KIANG (China): I very much dislike to involve myself in this unnecessarily protracted debate. However, in the light of what has transpired in the Council, I feel obliged to say a few words about the situation which now confronts us.

First of all, I must declare how very much impressed I am with the pertinent remarks made by the representative of the United States. He has, in fact, raised the level of discussion on the point before the Council. I must congratulate my distinguished friend, Mr. Moyes.

It seems to me that we are very much confused with regard to one thing. Actually, I was morally responsible for having the Nauruan proposals set out in a document and circulated to the Council; that was done at my request and those proposals were never submitted to the Council by the Head Chief. The proposals were submitted to the Australian Government, which told us that they would be further discussed with the Nauruan leaders this coming August. Therefore, it is important to remember that those proposals have never been before the Council.

I think it is superfluous for any of us to go into the details of any part of the proposals. As a matter of fact, very few of us here have discussed the proposals in the general debate and, as was said, it would be inappropriate for the Council to take any decision on this matter before the Australian Government informs the Council of its final decision with regard to them.

A great deal has been heard here with respect to whether or not we have been kind to the Nauruan people. I am quite sure that the Head Chief, who is present here, does not want mere lip service. He does not seek sympathy alone. What he really wants from this Trusteeship Council is sound advice. That is what he is expecting us to give. And I must say that such sound advice is contained in many of the recommendations and conclusions which this Council is about to approve. I am certain that the Head Chief has read all the speeches which have taken place in this Council in previous years and he knows perfectly well where each delegation stands in this matter.

At this time, it seems to me, it is our duty to demonstrate to the Nauruan people that they may retain their trust and confidence in this Council. It is therefore insufficient merely to mouth words in order to win the sympathy of the Nauruan people. What we must do is to give them sound advice.

Therefore, as I said yesterday, my delegation will not be able to vote for any proposal to amend paragraph 3 of the draft report. Consistent with our position yesterday, my delegation will not take part in a vote on any amendment to the paragraph which is now before the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I must apologize to the Council; I do have to leave in order to catch a plane. I will therefore turn the Chair over to our Vice-President. I am sure the Council will agree with me that, sitting in the Chair, the representative of Bolivia may speak and vote as such. I now turn over the Chair to him.

Mr. Salamanca (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. KIDJAI (India): The statements which have been made here, both today and previously, have convinced me that the consensus of opinion in this Council is that the wishes of the Nauruan people in regard to their resettlement is a matter of paramount importance. No one here has disagreed with that concept.

The proposals submitted by the Mauruans are not yet fully developed; they need further discussion and further steps must be taken to make them complete and thorough. For this reason, the Council has not been able to consider them fully. With regard to paragraph 3, I should like informally to propose an amendment which, if it obtains support, I will then propose formally.

In place of "notes with interest", I would substitute the words "decides to give sympathetic consideration". Therefore, the paragraph would read:

"The Council decides to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals ...".

I should like to hear the reactions of other delegations to my suggestion. If we find any agreement with it, we shall propose it formally.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): With the permission of the members of the Council, I should like to say a few words on this suggestion, speaking in behalf of my delegation.

I am inclined to support the suggestion made by the representative of India which, realistically speaking, has the same value as the Bolivian proposal. I would therefore vote in favour of it.

I am certain that other members of the Council will now wish to express their opinions of this amendment.

Sir Hugh FOCT (United Kingdom): I think we all feel that we are approaching a stage when we can conclude this discussion. But I would like, if I may, to say one or two words in reply to the speech made just now by the representative of the Soviet Union. He sets himself up as a spokesman for the Nauruan people. But my experience is that the Nauruan people are perfectly capable of speaking for themselves. He distorts the position by saying that the Nauruan people have rejected as unacceptable the proposals which have been set out in our report. That is not true. Indeed, the Nauruan people have indicated that they would welcome what we have proposed, which is that they should be given all the facts and the full information before they come to their conclusion.

The Soviet representative further distorts the position by saying in so many words that we have refused to consider a proposal for an alternative island for the Nauruan people. That is not true. It has been said before, and since it has been said again I would deny it again. Our recommendation is perfectly clear that a search should be made for an alternative island immediately and thoroughly in consultation with the people of Nauru, and that should be one of the alternatives which should be set before them in comparison with the other which is also set before them so that they can have the full position on which to make a decision. The Nauruan people have said that they warmly welcome the other proposals which we have put forward in regard to a greater part in the management of their own affairs. These things cannot be overlooked, they cannot be denied. It is necessary, in view of what the representative of the Soviet Union has said, to say them again.

When anyone speaks of hypocrisy and questions the good faith of the members of this Council, he must come here with clean hands. We will pay greater respect to the views of the representative of the Soviet Union when we have some information about progress towards independence of the Soviet colonies in the Pacific -- the Soviet colonies under Soviet administration and under Soviet --

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A point of order.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yes, Mr. President, it will be a point of order. After that you may perhaps permit me to exercise our right of reply in connexion with some of the statements and you might perhaps give us the opportunity of saying what our position is with respect to the amendment which has been introduced.

First of all, on this point of order. We note that when the representative of the United Kingdom runs out of gun powder and out of arguments, he then begins to resort to anti-Soviet calumny. He natters about everything that may run into the mind of his feverish intellect. We believe that some of his most recent figments have no relationship whatsoever to reality nor to the question at present under discussion. I consider that if the representative of a colonial Power prefers to be feverish while being conscious, I suggest that he do so not in the Trusteeship Council nor in any other organ of our Organization. Here we shall not permit the representative of the United Kingdom to engage in anti-Soviet exercises in slander. Let him speak of his own position. Let him present his position and let him deal with the matter at hand.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I would recall to the representative of the Soviet Union that he, of course, can exercise his right of reply. But his intervention at this time is not a point of order. Of course, he is perfectly entitled to make use of his right of reply. We shall now continue to listen to the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Point of order.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Which is the point of order, Mr. Representative of the Soviet Union?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I do not know whether you heard in interpretation what the representative of the United Kingdom was good enough to utter here. Perhaps the interpretation into Spanish was different and you did not hear those words,

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

or perhaps the interpretation was not quick enough to have those words transmitted to you. But the representative of the United Kingdom spoke here of things which have no relationship at all to the agenda and which in fact do not exist.

My statement in connexion with the point of order consists of the request that you call to order the representative of the United Kingdom who has really gone a little too far afield, that you remind him of the fact that he is not a Governor of Cyprus or Nigeria or some other former colony, but that he happens to be in the Trusteeship Council and therefore he should speak in observance of certain rules of procedure which apply in the organs of the United Nations. This is the substance of our point of order. We appeal to you to draw the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom to the fact that he is behaving in a manner which is not appropriate and that it is really high time for him to behave in accordance with the decorum of the United Nations.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): To pursue this matter further, I would merely wish to say that the representative of the Soviet Union repeatedly, constantly and in almost every one of his interventions makes accusations against my country as a colonial Power. If he is given that freedom, I should be entitled to have the freedom to make any statement about the colonies of the Soviet Union in the Pacific on which we receive no information and on which we have no reason to believe that they are proceeding towards freedom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): First, I should like to say a few words myself. I believe that the President has within his to conduct the debate within its proper framework. I should like to recall to the members of the Council that we should continue to discuss the problem which is before us, namely, the conclusions and recommendations presented in the case of Nauru. Anything different would prolong our debate unnecessarily. We should like to call the attention of both representatives that we should remain concretely on the point we are discussing. We, of course, cannot disregard the right to answer. We must maintain some flexibility in our debate, but I think we should concentrate on the point which we are now discussing.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I agree entirely with you that we should indeed concentrate on the discussion of the matter which is before us and which is included in the agenda. I consider that as a very correct ruling and a very accurate opinion on your part in this matter that has now been raised. I think the representative of the United Kingdom has listened to you attentively and has understood what you have said and will continue his statement accordingly.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I believe we have now reached a point where I should like to ask whether other members of the Council wish to express themselves on the amendment presented by the representative of India and which was accepted by my own delegation.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I do not yet wish to express an opinion on the amendment proposed by the representative of India, but I wish rather to ask a question of clarification in relation to it. The proposal is that the Council "decides to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals". May I ask the representative of India precisely when he intends that this consideration take place: at this session, at a special meeting, at the next session? The paper already provides that the matter will come up before the Council again. In the following paragraph there is provision for the report of discussions between the Nauruan leaders and the Australian Government on these proposals, to come again before the Council, and presumably that will be the future consideration.

Therefore, as far as I can see at the moment, the only point of this particular amendment can be that we should consider them now. Is that intended?

Mr. KILWAI (India): In reply, I would like to read out the subsequent sentences of the third paragraph, which read:

"It takes note of the fact that the Nauruan proposals were submitted only a few days before the Council's consideration of this matter and that there has not been time for the Visiting Mission or the Administering Authority to consider and comment upon them; it takes note of the statement of the special representative of the Administering Authority that these proposals will be discussed and examined in further negotiations between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan leaders. The Council hopes that the result of these negotiations will be communicated to the Trusteeship Council at an early date, and in time for consideration by the seventeenth session of the General Assembly." (T/L.1051, pages 1 and 2)

The position is made very clear. If further clarification is required by the Council, we can add a line or so saying "at the earliest possible date", or something of the sort, but perhaps in view of what is already given in this paragraph it may not be considered necessary.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I thank the representative of India for that clarification. As I said before, and as has been said also by a number of other speakers, I consider the paragraph as it stands satisfactory enough. I do not think it is necessary in this paragraph to make a special statement of the Council's sympathy since we know that the Council is sympathetic and since there are similar statements in other paragraphs. But would I be wrong in thinking that the point which the representative of India, and also the representative of Bolivia, have in mind could be met by some such opening formulation as this, which I do not formally propose at present but merely submit as a suggestion, particularly for the two representatives. Could we not have paragraph 3 read in some such way: "The Council records the sympathetic concern which it feels for the Nauruan people in their search for a new home, and notes with interest ..." and then the rest of paragraph 3?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to consult the members of the Council as to whether we could perhaps have a five-minute recess in the hope of finding a formula which will satisfy all concerned and thereby provide a practical solution to our problem. Of course, if the Council wishes to vote now, I shall not press my suggestion.

Mr. HCOO (Australia): Mr. President, perhaps on reconsideration you will not think it necessary to have a recess. I think we have really reached the point at which we can record our views, if you desire us to do so, in the light of the proposals that have been submitted. I would, however, like to be clear on whether the proposals submitted by the representative of New Zealand would be acceptable to the representative of India. Is he still maintaining his own proposal or not?

Mr. KIANG (China): Although I stated earlier that we would not be able to vote for any proposal to amend paragraph 3, we have, however, listened very carefully to the additional words proposed by the representative of New Zealand for paragraph 3, and this, in our view, is not an amendment but rather an addition which we think is quite in order. For this reason my delegation will vote for it.

Mr. KILWAI (India): First of all I should like to point out that in paragraph 3 we are considering proposals and not the concern which the representative of New Zealand has referred to. That is not the exact place for the amendment of the representative of New Zealand. I have found another place where, if the representative of New Zealand agrees, we may add his words. In paragraph 1, as the third sentence, we could say that "The Council records the sympathetic concern which it feels for the Mauruan people in their search for a new home and notes the recommendation of the Visiting Mission ... ", etc. We could add there this sentence, and my amendment which I now propose formally for paragraph 3 would read as follows: "The Council decides to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals submitted by the Resettlement Sub-Committee", and "notes with interest" will be deleted.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, the Council will take a short recess.

The meeting was suspended at 12 noon and resumed at 12.05 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the Council that the situation with regard to the amendments is as follows: We have the proposal of the Soviet Union; we have the proposal presented by India and supported by Bolivia; and then we have the informally presented proposal introduced by New Zealand with respect to which the representative of India suggested that it should be in the second part of the first paragraph. That is the situation as it stands.

I should like to know whether the representative of New Zealand insists on presenting his proposal formally.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I still feel that this particular formulation may represent the greatest consensus of agreement in the Council; and, therefore, I would put it forward formally. Paragraph 3 would read as follows:

"The Council" -- Then insert the words: "records the sympathetic concern which it feels for the Nauruan people in their search for a new home, and notes with interest ...".

The rest of the paragraph then continues.

Mr. KILWAI (India): In the event that the representative of New Zealand presses for his amendment, and if this is adopted, even then I would like to press for my amendment. It would then read as follows:

"The Council records the sympathetic concern which it feels for the Nauruan people in their search for a new home, and decides to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals submitted by the Resettlement Subcommittee of the Nauru Local Government Council ..." and so on.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We deem that now the Council is considering an extremely important matter; and we would wish the members of the Council to have the matter quite clearly before them in regard to what it is that is proposed for adoption.

The representative of the United Kingdom, in his last statement, as in some of the previous statements, stubbornly tries to support this aura of mystification to the effect that, allegedly, the Nauruans and the representative of the Nauruan

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

people, the Head Chief, who has been present at our meetings, allegedly, unreservedly approves and endorses all of the recommendations of the Visiting Mission.

But that is not so. The representative of the United Kingdom is purposely trying to confuse this matter, and is giving for comparison things which are incomparable. In particular, he is saying that the Nauruans, allegedly, are agreeable to the proposal of the Visiting Mission. What proposal or what proposals? There are several; there are several alternatives. The Nauruan people agree that an island be found for them. That is stated in the report of the Visiting Mission; that is true. But further on in that report it is stated that the Mission doubts that such an island can be found. Is that not stated in the report? I am asking this of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. Is it not stated that the Mission doubts that it is possible? Yes, it is so stated.

Then as an alternative, as another proposal, the Visiting Mission proposes the formation of a community Nauruan centre in Australia. Is this proposal acceptable to the Nauruan people, this concrete alternative proposal which has been included in the concluding part of the first paragraph of the draft of our Drafting Committee? We put this question: Is that so?

The representative of the United Kingdom has stated here that the Soviet Union and the Soviet delegation takes upon itself the role of spokesman for the Nauruan people. No, we certainly do not aspire to that. We consider that the Nauruans will better explain their own position and their own wishes. That is why I am suggesting that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission and I address ourselves jointly to the Head Chief, who is present here and ask him directly whether the Nauruans agree with this concluding part, or second part, of paragraph 1 -- namely, the alternative proposal to the effect that -- and I shall read this out in English in order that it might be completely clear to the representative of the United Kingdom just what is being spoken of:

(continued in English):

Do the Nauruans agree, as an alternative proposal, to work out a specific plan for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australia within easy reach of some main centre of population?

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

(continued in Russian):

This clear question is one we wish to put to the Head Chief of Nauru. Let him tell us here whether the Nauruans agree to this concrete alternative proposal or not. I consider that an end finally must be put to this mystification that has been utilized in the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, who is trying to create the impression that the Nauruans apparently are accepting all of the proposals of the Visiting Mission.

Accordingly, if this is possible at the present stage -- and this is a very important stage -- I would like to have the views of the Head Chief of the Nauruan people on this point: Do the Nauruans agree to the formation of a Nauruan community centre in Australia, or do they wish to have another island found? This is the alternative.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I do not think that the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom should engage in a permanent debate.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): No. I merely wish to correct the representative of the Soviet Union by saying that the proposal of the Visiting Mission was that alternatives should be worked out and put before the Nauruan people for decision; that is all. We have understood from what the Head Chief has said to us that he has no objection to that course being followed and that that course is not contrary to the recommendation which he has made. It would be quite wrong, in my view, to put the alternatives to the Head Chief or anyone else. The recommendation we made is simply this: that the facts should be worked out, the alternatives should be clearly explained and that the Nauruan people should then decide. I have it clear in my recollection from the record which is before us that the Head Chief has stated that our recommendation is not in conflict with his. Therefore, I would not wish the representative of the Soviet Union to put forward a suggestion that the Head Chief or anyone else at this stage without the facts is expected to give any reply.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): We are discussing the report of the Drafting Committee which is a matter entirely for the members of the Council. The proposal has been made that the views of the Head Chief be ascertained on matters of substance, which are the precise content of the report of the Drafting Committee and which have formed the content of the debate which has already taken place and which has been concluded in the Trusteeship Council. I submit that it is not proper or even courteous, having regard to the position of the Head Chief, to have him take part in what is a debate all over again of the substance of this matter. He has provided information to the Council at the stage at which information was sought; he has done this. It is wrong from the

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

point of view of correct procedure, in my opinion, for the Council to reopen the debate on these matters.

The Council should proceed with its consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee. We have two or three proposals before us for the amendment of paragraph 3 of that report. We are all aware of what these proposals are, they have been thoroughly debated; every member of the Council has had the opportunity to say what he thinks of the proposals.

Having regard to all the circumstances, I formally move the closure of the debate.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask a question of the representative of Australia. Obviously his opinion is extremely important in this case, but I should like to understand clearly whether the representative of Australia opposes or accepts the idea that the Head Chief should answer on a point on which there is some doubt. This doubt concerns the point whether the representative of the Mauruan people is ready to discuss the alternatives submitted by the Visiting Mission. This point was raised by the representative of the Soviet Union after a statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. If there are any doubts as to the position adopted in the general debate on this question by the representative of the Mauruan people and if the Administering Authority states that this would be in contradiction of the rules, I should like to ask the representative of the Administering Authority to tell us exactly what his position is.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I am not here to assent or dissent from the proposal that the Head Chief be again invited to this table; this is not the point that I had in mind. My point is that we have already passed the point at which the proceedings are in order. We are considering the report of the Drafting Committee. The members of the Council and only the members of the Council take part in the consideration of that report. That is the correct position, I have no doubt of that. I therefore move the closure of the debate, and my motion for closure of the debate is made under rule 56. I would ask the President to put it to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation has great respect for the delegation of Australia, and what I am saying is not by way of creating any opposition. But I would merely like to remind the representative of Australia that it is stated in paragraph 2 of the report that the Head Chief and the Special Representative were present when this report was being drafted. We have sought their assistance on every point, and this fact is also mentioned in paragraph 2 which states:

"The Drafting Committee held two meetings. At these meetings the Committee had the benefit of the assistance of a representative of the Administering Authority and of the Head Chief of Nauru." (T/L.1051)

We have accepted assistance from these two representatives, and both my delegation and I would be very sorry if this assistance is denied to the Council when it requests it. A point of clarification is being sought. If it is not given here, we will certainly get it in the Fourth Committee. My delegation does not see any reason why this clarification cannot be given to this Council. We received this assistance when the report was being drafted, so why can we not get it now?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before putting to the vote the motion for closure of the debate made by the representative of Australia, I should like to read out paragraph 3 of rule 56 of the rules of procedure. First, however, I would give my interpretation of that paragraph. The problem which we are now discussing is very simple. It is whether the Trusteeship Council can ask the representative of the Nauruan people to reply to a question put by a member of the Council at this point. I now read out paragraph 3 of rule 56:

"A motion for closure of debate on a draft resolution or other motion shall not be considered by the Trusteeship Council until each representative shall have had the opportunity to speak on that draft resolution or other motion. Debate on a motion for closure of debate shall be limited to one speaker for each side".

The question of hearing the representative of the people of Nauru is therefore now before the Council. Once members have explained their positions, I shall make my decision.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): The President has correctly quoted paragraph 3 of rule 56. That was, of course, the provision I had in mind. I would have thought that each representative had had an opportunity to speak on the "draft resolution or other motion". Indeed, that was why I moved for closure of debate under that rule. Of course, it is for the President to decide whether or not representatives have had full opportunity to express themselves.

I would make it clear that my motion for closure was not specifically directed to the suggestion -- if that is what it was -- from the Soviet representative that the Head Chief should be asked to come to the table again. My motion was made in the light of the stage that we had reached and in the interest of the most orderly proceedings of the Trusteeship Council. My delegation of course has no veto over whether or not the Head Chief should come to the table at this time. If the Council desires him to do so, I think that it will have to express

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

itself positively in that sense. Perhaps the President will wish to give an opportunity to other members of the Council to speak on this point.

In the meantime, in deference to what the President has said, I shall not at this stage press my motion for closure.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I am very grateful to the representative of Australia for what he has just said.

Speaking as representative of Bolivia, I believe that it would be in his own interest for the Council to hear the Head Chief of Nauru.

As President, I shall invite the Head Chief to take a seat at the Council table, table, if there is no objection from any member of the Council, to give a brief answer to the question that has been put to him.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Roburt, Head Chief of the Trust Territory of Nauru, took a seat at the Council table.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We should like to know the views of the Head Chief of the Trust Territory of Nauru on the concluding words of paragraph 1 of the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee. First, however, I would explain that we are not putting a question as to the procedure which should be adhered to in the formulation of this or that plan. We are not now dealing with the recommendation of the Visiting Mission to the effect that the Nauruans should participate in the formulation of these plans, that the plans should be presented to the Nauruans for final approval, and so forth. We believe that that goes without saying. Of course the Nauruans must take part in the formulation of the plans and must approve them. What we are interested in now is the attitude of the Nauruans to the alternative proposal regarding the working out of a specific plan for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australia.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

What do the Nauruans prefer? Do they want a separate island, or do they prefer the alternative proposal for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australian territory?

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I merely wish to indicate that I welcome the opportunity which has now been given to the Head Chief of Nauru to join us at the table.

I have a question to put to Mr. de Roburt. Would the President wish me to put it now?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to have some order in this debate. If all the questions are put to him at once, the Head Chief will have difficulty in answering them. I think that it would be better for the Head Chief first to answer the question put by the representative of the Soviet Union. After that, other members may put questions to him if they wish.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I have no objection to the procedure just suggested by the President. I merely wish to state the following.

First, I have no objection personally to the Head Chief of Nauru coming to the table now; in the long run I think that our work can only be assisted by his presence. That is why I raised no objection to the invitation to him. Formally, however, I think that this is the wrong time for either the Special Representative or any of his colleagues to come to the table, because we have reached the stage where we are working as representatives of Governments at this table. I therefore regard the present procedure as wrong in principle, although I raise no objection to it.

Secondly, I regard the type of question put by the Soviet representative --

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to raise a point of order. We have put a question to the Head Chief of Nauru, not to the representative of New Zealand. That representative is now trying by some means or other to answer that question. We believe that the correct procedure would be to call now on the Head Chief of Nauru, because the question was addressed to him. The views of the representative of New Zealand on this point are of no interest to us, especially since we are already acquainted with them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): . I should like to ask the representative of New Zealand not to insist on his point of order. After all, this is a period when questions are asked and answers given.

I should like to make a brief statement. The representative of New Zealand said that the procedure was out of order. I think that we should judge this matter in perfect calm. I asked whether there was any objection to inviting the representative of Nauru to the Council table. Everyone had the right to oppose this suggestion at the time, but now the intervention of the representative of New Zealand complicates the situation. I think that it was perfectly clear. We were going to ask the representative of Nauru two or three questions, and when I suggested inviting him to the table, the representative of New Zealand remained silent. Therefore, I think that we are following the proper procedure. I do not think that we should continue to discuss this point.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I do not believe that I have complicated the procedure. I have not objected; I have recorded my position, and I leave it at that.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union kindly to repeat his question.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to explain once more that our question does not affect the procedure of formulating any particular plan. Therefore, we are not speaking now of those proposals of the Visiting Mission which concern that part of the procedure, namely, that any proposal will have to be worked out with the participation of the Nauruans and ultimately presented for their approval. We agree to those proposals, but that is not what we are questioning now.

In paragraph 1 of the Drafting Committee's conclusions and recommendations reference is made to an alternative proposal. The first proposal was to seek a new island for the population of Nauru and, as I understand it, this proposal coincides with the proposals of the Nauruans themselves. But the alternative proposal was that a plan should be worked out for the establishment

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

of a Nauruan community centre in Australia, not on a separate island, but on the territory of Australia.

Our impression was, and still is, that the Nauruans wish for a separate island to be given to them and that they do not wish to be resettled on the territory of Australia. We should like to have this point clarified. We wish to know the view of the Head Chief of Nauru as to whether the Nauruans would agree to the alternative proposal to establish a Nauruan centre in Australia.

Mr. McCarthy (Special Representative): I do not wish to complicate the issue further, nor to hinder the representative of the Soviet Union. I just wish to point out the difficulties of the question in this respect, that the territory of Australia is made up of many islands, and one of those islands may well be suitable for the Nauruan people.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had expected the President to give the floor to the Head Chief of Nauru. I do not think that the latest comment of the Special Representative was designed in any way to assist in the explanation of the situation. When reference is made to the establishment of a Nauruan centre in Australia, it is assumed that this would be on the territory of Australia, not far from a main centre of population. That is why we would wish the Head Chief to be allowed to speak. If, subsequently, the Special Representative has some clarification to offer, we shall be prepared to listen to him. But, Mr. President, do permit the Head Chief to speak.

Mr. de ROBERT (Head Chief): I am sorry that I seem to have been responsible for creating some confusion in the minds of representative of big nations in this Council. In answering briefly the question of the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to say this: that our position has been made clear in the document containing the proposals of my Council which I submitted to the Minister for Territories last month before I came to New York.

No mention is made in the proposal of favouring resettlement in a community centre close to a main centre of population in Australia. I think that that

(Mr. de Roburt, Head Chief)

in itself is a sufficient answer, but if I may go on -- and I think that all the members of the Visiting Mission will bear me out in this -- the proposition was discussed informally on Nauru at an informal meeting between the Visiting Mission, the Administration and the Nauru Local Government Council. The representative of the United Kingdom, in fact, had put forward the proposal. The Local Government Council considered the proposal, despite the fact that it was put informally, in kindness to us and our aspirations as a people, and my Council came forward with the clear proposals which are set forth in the document which I have mentioned. I think that this document is known to the Trusteeship Council as T/1600.

I hope that this answer will satisfy the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very grateful to the Head Chief of Nauru for the explanation which he has given and which confirms our point of view, namely, that in the proposals of the Nauruan people, no reference is made to and nothing is said in favour of the resettlement of the Nauruans on the territory of Australia or in favour of the creation of a Nauruan centre not far from some main centre of population.

We consider this explanation to be perfectly clear. We can now act, knowing exactly the wishes of the Nauruan people. This clarification convinces us even more that we must speak strongly against this alternative proposal in the latter part of paragraph 1. The Soviet delegation will vote against that proposal.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I am sorry to have to go back over ground which we have already covered, but I am forced to do so. I have two questions I wish to put to the Head Chief. First of all, may I ask if he can confirm that the proposals set out most recently by the Local Council of Nauru are dependent on a suitable island being found?

Mr. de ROBERT (Head Chief): Yes, the proposals are dependent on a suitable island being found near Australia. We think that such an island will be found.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): Secondly, does the Head Chief confirm that he and his people would welcome having all the facts and all the alternatives put before them before the Nauruan people are asked to reach a final decision?

Mr. de ROBERT (Head Chief): I thought I had answered that question at one of the earlier meetings of this Council. May I ask the United Kingdom representative if I am right in this and if, in fact, it is the same question which was asked here in respect of paragraph 53 of the Visiting Mission's report?

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): Exactly. The question was asked and answered before, but it seemed to me to be necessary to ask it again in view of the questions which have now been raised by the Soviet representative. I would therefore merely ask the Head Chief to confirm what he has previously told us in this matter.

Mr. de ROBERT (Head Chief): With the permission of the Council, I would like to read out my previous answer. I said:

"In respect of paragraph 53, I am somewhat unable -- despite my sincere efforts in the time allotted to me -- to reply to the proposition stated there in the same manner as I have replied to the proposition stated in paragraph 54. The dilemma which faces me, as I see it, in regard to the proposition in paragraph 53 is this: If I should say on behalf of the Nauru Council and the Nauruan people that I welcomed this, I fear that it might have the effect of negating the value, the sincerity and the authenticity of the

(Mr. de Roburt, Head Chief)

proposals which we have just submitted, on 12 June -- last month -- to the Australian Minister for Territories. I greatly fear creating such an effect for two reasons. First, I have no authority to adopt here a course which might give rise to an effect such as that I have mentioned. Second, I believe that the Nauruan submission of 12 June to the Minister contains very feasible propositions which do not clash with those of the Visiting Mission and which could be put into practice if the Australian Government wished to be really generous. The people of Nauru trust, expect and hope that the Australian Government will be really generous in respect of those wishes and aspirations. However, we understand that it is open to the Australian Government at the request of the Trusteeship Council to submit proposals on the lines of those suggested in the report; and these would be examined by the Nauruan people."

(T/PV.1190, p. 3)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Does any other member wish to ask further questions of the Head Chief, in addition to the questions asked by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom? The answers which have been given were very precise and they have certainly contributed to a clarification of the position.

Mr. OBLERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We wish to once again express our gratitude to the Head Chief of Nauru for his clear answers, which have truly clarified the situation. Those representatives who wish to know exactly what are the intentions and proposals of the Nauruan people will be able to see in these replies the true position.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I would like to thank the Head Chief of Nauru for the replies, which I knew would be straight forward and clear. I would like to express our gratitude to him for making it quite plain that, although, of course, he supports the recommendations which he has brought to this Council, these recommendations do not conflict with the proposals of the Visiting Mission in this regard.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to thank the representative of the population of Nauru once more.

Mr. de Roburt withdrew.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that the members of the Council are now ready to vote on the various amendments. I would like to suggest that the Council should first vote on the Soviet amendment. If it is required, I will ask the Secretary to read out this proposal, or perhaps it is sufficiently clear. The amendment concerns paragraph 3, and the Soviet representative has asked for a roll-call vote to be taken.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): If there is no objection by the Soviet representative, may I request that my proposal be voted upon first. If my proposal were voted upon first it would be made clear what we are voting on.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I think we should vote first on the Soviet proposal, then on the New Zealand proposal, and, thirdly, on the Indian proposal. I would call the attention of the representative of India to the fact that his proposal was made after the New Zealand proposal, and that it includes the New Zealand proposal. However, if there is no objection by the Soviet representative, we could first vote on the Indian proposal.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): For procedural reasons, in view of the fact that our proposal was the first to be introduced, as well as for the reason that this amendment is furthest removed from the text, it seems to us that our amendment should be put to the vote first, as the Chairman suggested. Moreover, we attribute a great importance of principle to this amendment and, accordingly, we would request that it be put to the vote first.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on the Soviet amendment. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Against: France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia

Abstaining: Bolivia, India

China did not participate in the voting.

The amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now put the amendment of New Zealand to the vote. I do not believe that there has been a request for a roll-call vote.

Mr. KIANG (China): I should like a clarification. Are you including India's amendment in the amendment of New Zealand?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall make it clear. The amendment of New Zealand includes an addition; there is an addition to the text. If this amendment is adopted, that will in no way preclude the possibility of voting on the Indian amendment.

Having clarified that point, we shall now vote on the amendment presented by New Zealand.

The amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on the amendment submitted by the representative of India. A roll-call vote has been requested.

Mr. CCRNER (New Zealand): I request that the amendment be read by the Secretary before we vote on it, please.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall ask the Secretary to read out India's amendment.

Mr. RAPOPORT (Secretary of the Council): The representative of India has suggested that the words "decides to give sympathetic consideration to" be substituted for the words "notes with interest" at the beginning of paragraph 3 of the draft conclusions and recommendations. With the adoption of the New Zealand amendment the paragraph would read:

"The Council records the sympathetic concern which it feels for the Nauruan people in their search for a new home and decides to give sympathetic consideration to the proposals submitted" -- and so on.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour:

Bolivia, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Against:

Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

France

China did not participate in the voting.

The amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): In explanation of my delegation's vote, I wish to indicate that we voted against the Indian amendment, not because we disagreed with it, but because we considered it to be adequately covered by the New Zealand text, which we had already adopted.

Mr. NOYES (United States of America): I should like to explain my vote. I considered the New Zealand and the Indian amendments as alternatives and preferred the amendment submitted by New Zealand. I do not see the need for repeating our sympathetic point of view in the same sentence and, therefore, I supported the Indian amendment.

Mr. DOISE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to say a few words in explanation of my vote. My delegation considered that the decision which the Council had to take today in connexion with these amendments was, in fact, premature. As a matter of fact, Mr. DeRoburt's replies a few moments ago confirmed that feeling. It is not up to this Council today to decide what the future home of the Nauruan population will be. For that reason, we voted as we did on the Soviet Union's amendment.

With regard to the Indian amendment, we considered that there is not a very great difference between interest and sympathy; when one indicates interest in someone, one demonstrates sympathy as well and conversely, if one is sympathetic to anyone, one demonstrates interest in that person.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now continue to consider the draft resolution and if there is no objection by the members of the Council, in view of the late hour, we could vote on the remainder of the proposal, including the amendments which have been adopted.

I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on the first paragraph; I should like to enquire whether he insists on that procedure.

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation requests that we have a separate vote on the concluding part of paragraph 1, beginning with the words:

"...and, as an alternative proposal, work out a specific plan for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australia within easy reach of some main centre of population."

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

The Soviet delegation will vote against that part. Aside from that, we do not insist upon a separate vote on any of the individual paragraphs. We agree that we could vote on the report of the Drafting Committee, as a whole.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): In conformity with the Soviet Union's proposal, we shall vote in the following way. We will have a separate vote on the latter part of paragraph 1.

However, I will now put to the vote paragraph 2, beginning:

"The Council trusts that in the search for a solution to the problem of resettling the Nauruan people,..."

That is what we are presently putting to a vote.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I request permission to speak on a point of order. That which we wanted to put to the vote is something quite different. We wanted a vote on the concluding part, that is the last sentence of paragraph 1, which begins with the words:

(spoke in English)

"...as an alternative proposal, work out a specific plan for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australia within easy reach of some main centre of population."

(continued in Russian)

Our delegation makes this request because the part of the paragraph which precedes what I have just read is acceptable to us. It is the part which I have just read to which we object and against which we shall vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Soviet representative for his clarification. It is, therefore, on that last part of the first paragraph on which we shall vote. It reads:

(spoke in English)

"...as an alternative proposal, work out a specific plan for the establishment of a Nauruan community centre in Australia within easy reach of some main centre of population."

(The President)

(continued in Spanish)

This is the part of the paragraph on which the representative of the Soviet Union requests a separate vote. Having made that clear, we shall now proceed with the vote.

The last part of paragraph 1 was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall submit to the Council the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Are you putting to a vote the text as a whole?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Yes.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I have one request, which is that we have a separate vote on the last sentence of paragraph 3. I do that in order to make the position of the Administering Authority perfectly clear. We have, of course, no objection to the hope of the Council that "the result of the negotiations will be communicated ..."; but I would not wish by casting an actual affirmative vote for that particular sentence to commit the Administering Authority to observe any particular date on this matter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask the Australian representative for a clarification. He wishes to have a separate vote on the very last sentence of paragraph 3, is that it?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I think I have made the reservation which is necessary for me to make and I should like that reservation simply to be taken note of. I will not ask for a separate vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the Administering Power has made a reservation as regards the very last part of paragraph 3. It will be noted in the records of the Council.

We shall put to the vote the whole of the resolution, including the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask the members of the Committee whether there is any objection to the first part of paragraph 4. There is some doubt as regards this paragraph.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): At what point are we in the voting? Could you inform me? I must have cast my vote wrongly because I thought I had voted for the resolution as a whole. Are we now to reconsider the vote?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make things clear. We voted on the draft starting on page one, which is a draft resolution from the Drafting Committee; and now we are speaking of the report. This is a subsidiary vote. We have voted on the resolution. It is simply on point four, which is a technical point. The Secretary points out that it is necessary to vote separately on paragraph 4 of page 1. Therefore, we shall put to the vote paragraph 4 of page 1 of the report of the resolution which we have been discussing.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. McCarthy withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 5

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF NAURU AND NEW GUINEA, 1962 (T/1595 and Add.1, 1597 and Add.1; T/L.1050)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We now have a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of China, which is contained in document T/L.1050. These are questions before the Visiting Mission, and the delegation of China has submitted these suggestions. If there is no objection to this draft resolution, we shall consider it adopted.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): Have you adopted the resolution itself?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Yes.

Mr. KIDWAI (India): My delegation would suggest that this resolution be taken into consideration at the next meeting. We should like to know when it is going to be held because we have some alternative proposals and suggestions which we would like to have considered at the next meeting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next meeting of the Council will be held on Friday at 10.30 in the morning. If necessary, we shall have a meeting on Friday afternoon to consider the report of the Committee which has submitted conclusions as regards the Territory of New Guinea.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.