



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Eighteenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 28 June 1956,
at 2 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence: report of the Secretary-General (T/1252, T/L.684) (<i>continued</i>).....	127
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru (<i>continued</i>):	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1247, T/1249);	
(ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1256)	
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the special representative (<i>continued</i>).....	128

President: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

Present:

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

Attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence: report of the Secretary-General (T/1252, T/L.684) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 15]

1. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said that when document T/L.684 was prepared, the Secretariat had borne in mind that the Council's report to the General Assembly might appear in two volumes. Now that the Council had decided (711th meeting) to issue its report as a single volume, all references to two volumes would have to be deleted.

2. In reply to a question by Mr. HAMILTON (Australia), Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said that there would inevitably be some overlapping between paragraphs 1 to 4 of document T/L.684 and the section of part I of the report to the Assembly dealing with the Council's actions in respect of various General Assembly resolutions. The emphasis in the two parts would be rather different; however, the pertinent paragraphs of part I concentrating primarily on the procedural aspects of the Council's discussion. Furthermore, those paragraphs would probably be considerably briefer than usual.

3. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) noted that the General Assembly resolutions on the subject called for a separate section of the Council's report on the attainment of the objectives of self-government or independence. He wondered whether there was any particular reason why the Secretariat had proposed that document T/L.684 should appear as a separate part III, rather than as a section of part I.

4. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) replied that the Secretariat had been guided by the precedent established in 1954 when the Council's report to the General Assembly (A/2680) had been divided into three parts, the material on attainment appearing as part III.

5. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) pointed out that four of the Trust Territories listed in paragraph 5 of the document had not yet been examined by the Council. His delegation was reluctant to take final action on the draft until all the Trust Territories had been dealt with; it would therefore prefer the vote on document T/L.684 to be deferred to the end of the current session. Moreover, he could no longer see any need for haste since the Council had decided that for the current year at least its report to the Assembly should be contained in one and not two volumes.

6. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Secretary-General had to some extent been justified in submitting document T/L.684 to the Council, inasmuch as he had been acting on the basis of Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII), which was not very clear. On the other hand, it was quite clear from the records that the Secretariat's task was to implement General Assembly resolution 946 (X), operative paragraph 2, which specifically called for a separate section containing information concerning measures taken or contemplated towards self-government or independence and estimates of the periods of time required for such measures, together with the Council's conclusions and recommendations thereon. In his opinion the cabalistic figures appearing in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft entirely failed to meet the requirements of the General Assembly resolution, and would only make the General Assembly's work more difficult. It would be much simpler and more convenient to reproduce the relevant information, conclusions and recommendations in a separate section, as the General Assembly had repeatedly requested.

7. In the report in document T/1252 the Secretary-General referred to the possibility of amplifying that material, where appropriate, by bringing it up to date by reference to official data available to him. It would add to the value of the special section if such information were included, together with a summary of the views of the various delegations. As the Secretary of the Council had said, there was a precedent for submitting such a special section and the problem, as stated by the Secretariat, did not seem particularly complex.

8. In reply to a question by Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala), Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat was under the impression that at the 702nd meeting the Council had adopted the alternative proposed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 9 of his report (T/1252), that was to say that it had decided that the second section should be prepared essentially in the form of an index. He read the relevant passage from the records of the 702nd meeting.

Mr. Grillo (Italy), Vice-President, took the Chair.

9. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said that it had been his delegation's impression that the Council had taken no decision on the alternatives proposed by the Secretary-General in document T/1252, paragraphs 8 and 9. When that document had been discussed at the 702nd meeting, the Indian delegation had suggested that it might be useful to have a document illustrating what the proposed index would be like. As the Guatemalan delegation saw it, the Council had endorsed the Indian representative's suggestion, but it had not actually decided on the index form of report.

10. His delegation had made it quite clear at the seventeenth session that it did not feel that the Council had fully complied with General Assembly resolutions 558 (VI), 752 (VIII), 858 (IX) and 946 (X). It had nevertheless voted in favour of the rather limited texts which had been adopted at the 697th and 699th meetings, during consideration of the Drafting Committees, reports, and had reserved its position in the General Assembly. He recalled that his delegation and the delegation of Haiti had submitted a proposal concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/L.653, para. 7, proposal B), which was divided into sections A, B and C. Section A might be described as the information section; it had not been adopted (697th meeting), and he had understood that one of the reasons for the Council's failure to adopt it had been that, in accordance with resolution 1369 (XVII), the Secretary-General would be preparing just such an information section.

11. His delegation had been rather surprised at the interpretation of resolution 1369 (XVII) given in the Secretary-General's report (T/1252) and still more to hear that the Council had definitely decided in favour of the alternative set out in paragraph 9 of that document. The index form proposed in document T/L.684 did not faithfully reflect the intentions of the various General Assembly resolutions or of Council resolution 1369 (XVII). It would be far better to have a separate section bringing together all the information on the attainment of the objective of self-government or independence that was now buried in the various chapters of the report. Nevertheless, his delegation was prepared, with serious reservations, to accept the form suggested in document T/L.684, if such was the wish of the majority of the Council.

12. Mr. MULCAHY (United States of America) said that his delegation was responsible for introducing the text (T/L.640/Rev.1) which later became resolution 1369 (XVII). He agreed that it had been rather badly and hastily drafted. The Secretariat had done its best to meet the Council's wishes and the Council, in turn, had done all it could, at least for the present session, to comply with the General Assembly's instructions. If the General Assembly was dissatisfied with the Council's method of proceeding, it would certainly make its dissatisfaction known. The issue was one on which it was obviously impossible to satisfy everyone and he would be prepared to vote in favour of document T/L.684, although with reservations. When the Council's whole report was submitted for final approval, it would be open to any member of the Council to ask that certain sections should be re-examined. That was not usually done, but he knew of no rule of procedure to prevent it.

13. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that there were two courses open to the Council. One was to follow the 1954 precedent and to include in the report a full section on attainment of self-government containing the substance of the proceedings in the Council; no one had submitted a formal proposal to that effect. The second

alternative was to adopt an abbreviated section along the lines proposed in document T/L.684. While his delegation would prefer a longer and more informative section, it would be prepared to vote in favour of the form proposed in document T/L.684 on the understanding that acceptance of that form was an *ad hoc* decision to suit the special requirements of that particular session of the Council and that his delegation was in no way committed with regard to the form of future reports.

14. As far as substance was concerned, a bare index was clearly inadequate and the separate section should briefly recall the essence at least of the recommendations adopted by the Council, although it need not necessarily reiterate all the background information on which those recommendations had been based. Those who were fundamentally opposed to any separate section were bound to vote against the index as they were bound to vote against any elaboration of it.

15. He agreed with the Australian representative that it might be advisable to defer any decision on the substance of the separate section until discussion of all the Territories had been completed.

16. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed that the Council should abide by the decisions of the General Assembly and by the decision which it had itself taken as recently as two months previously (resolution 1369 (XVII)). Those decisions called for a separate section containing information, conclusions and recommendations. It would be very difficult for his delegation to vote in favour of the proposed index form, which would not meet the General Assembly's wishes and would be very inconvenient to use.

17. After a further exchange of views, Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) reiterated his opinion that the Council had not yet decided between the alternatives set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Secretary-General's report (T/1252), and proposed that the Council should not consider document T/L.684 at that meeting.

The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

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

(i) **Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1247, T/1249);**

(ii) **Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1256)**

[Agenda items 4 (c) and 7]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jones, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, took a place at the Council table.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE (continued)

Political advancement (concluded)

18. Mr. THORP (New Zealand), referring to the future of the Nauruans, asked whether any significant body of public opinion in favour of any other solution than settlement in Australia had emerged among them.

19. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that many of the older people favoured staying on Nauru, as the phosphate deposits would not be exhausted in

their lifetime, and others, of all age-groups, felt that no move should be made until it was absolutely necessary. However, the majority were becoming reconciled to the idea that the future of their community lay in a new country where they would have greater opportunities of expansion and employment than on Nauru. He had discussed the question with the Nauru Local Government Council, which felt that arrangements for the location of a suitable home should be made as soon as possible.

20. Mr. CHACKO (India) asked whether it was true that, apart from rules on procedural matters, the Nauru Local Government Council had adopted only one substantive rule, concerning the impounding of stray cattle and pigs.

21. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Council had adopted four rules: rule one, on the establishment of pounds, and rule two, on the control of straying livestock, dealt with the same question. Rule three laid down the procedure for the conduct of the Council's business, and rule four regulated the election of the head chief.

22. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that it was clear from the special representative's reply that only one substantive matter, the impounding of cattle, had in fact been dealt with.

23. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that the election of the head chief was also a substantive matter.

24. Mr. CHACKO (India) felt that the election of the head chief, who exercised the functions of chairman of the Council, was more a procedural than a substantive matter. He asked on whose initiative the rules covering the impounding of cattle had been adopted.

25. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Nauruans had evinced a desire for a rule concerning the control of straying livestock, and that the draft rule had been prepared by the Administrator and submitted to the Council for consideration.

26. Mr. CHACKO (India) recalled that, in the opinion of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956, it had perhaps been unfortunate that the first practical legislative act of the Council had dealt with the controversial and widely unpopular matter of impounding livestock (T/1256, para. 35). The special representative had said, at the 714th meeting, that the Visiting Mission's comment might be interpreted by the Nauruans as questioning the wisdom of the Council, which would not tend to increase its popularity or help it with its work. He himself was convinced that the Nauruans themselves did not interpret the Mission's comment in that way. However, the Administering Authority might have acted more wisely if it had advised the Council to adopt a more popular rule as its first measure, so as to run no risk of discouraging the Nauruans' support of their own local government institutions.

27. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he had not intended to criticize the Visiting Mission, but he had thought that, as the Mission's report was available to the Nauruans, it was unfortunate that it should contain a comment which they might interpret as a criticism of their Local Government Council. They might think that the criticism emanated from the United Nations, and that might shake their confidence in the Council. The Indian representative thought the Council should have adopted a popular measure as

its first legislative act; but its function was to do what was necessary, and the problem of straying livestock had become serious on the island. The rule was intended to assist the public health authorities, as straying animals interfered with the application of the health regulations. In his opinion, it was encouraging that the Local Government Council had been willing to face its responsibilities, regardless of whether its action would be popular or not.

28. Mr. CHACKO (India) said he appreciated the necessity for the measures concerning livestock, but there were other equally urgent matters on which the Council could have acted without any risk of making itself unpopular.

29. He asked the special representative whether he could give any further information beyond that in his opening statement (714th meeting) with regard to the Local Government Council's proposal concerning the future of the Nauruans and their desire to be resettled in Australia.

30. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said he had no additional information on the subject. As he had said, the Administering Authority had had no knowledge of that desire of the Nauruan people until they had approached the Visiting Mission. No doubt in the next annual report it would be able to give full particulars of any further developments.

31. Mr. CHACKO (India) said it had been stated by the special representative that the main obstacle to resettlement in Australia was that the Nauruans would be unable to remain as a separate community but would have to be assimilated into the population. He wondered whether the Australian Government would be prepared to consider resettling them in Australia if they did not insist upon remaining a separate community.

32. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that the possibility would naturally be considered by the Administering Authority. There was no constitutional or legal obstacle to a settlement of the kind. There was the practical difficulty, to which the special representative had referred in his opening statement, that it would be contrary to the whole conception of the Australian nation to accept the settlement in Australia of a community which would retain its separate identity.

33. Mr. CHACKO (India) explained that he had asked the question because, if the Nauruans did have to be assimilated, it might in some ways be easier if they were to go to Australia. He realized that the matter would need careful consideration but hoped the Administering Authority would provide detailed information on the subject in its next annual report.

34. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) assured the representative of India that the points he had raised would receive serious consideration by the Australian Government.

35. Mr. CHACKO (India), referring to the assurance that had been given that the Australian Government would be prepared to provide the necessary financial resources for the eventual settlement of the Nauruans, and with particular reference to paragraph 50 (b) of the Visiting Mission's report (T/1256) asked whether the Australian Government had given any thought to the amount that might be required in that connexion.

36. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) pointed out that it was impossible to make even a rough estimate until definite plans had been worked out. That was why he had been authorized by his Government to

assure the Council that whatever the costs might be, the sum would be forthcoming.

37. Mr. CHACKO (India) wondered whether, as suggested by the Visiting Mission, it might be possible to create some intermediate posts in certain departments of the Administration in which Nauruans could be placed so that they could obtain practical training which would fit them to occupy top positions.

38. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) pointed out that in a number of departments the second position was held by a Nauruan. All had been given opportunities to increase their knowledge and experience with a view to their eventually qualifying for the top positions. For some executive posts, however, technical qualifications were required. Some of the younger Nauruans now studying in Australia might eventually qualify for such posts. Consideration would certainly be given to the possibility of creating intermediate posts.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 4.10 p.m.

39. In reply to a question by Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the woman candidate in the elections had not been elected.

40. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) referring to part V, chapter 4, of the annual report,¹ asked what were the functions of the Department of Nauruan Affairs.

41. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that duties of the Nauruans Affairs Officer consisted mainly of direct dealings with the Nauruan people. They went to him with complaints or any problems affecting their everyday life and, when he considered it necessary, he placed the matter before the Administrator. At the present time the Nauruan Affairs Officer was also a magistrate in the lower Court.

42. In reply to a further question by Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that there was no direct liaison between the Nauruan Affairs Officer and the Local Government Council, although it happened that the present Nauruan Affairs Officer was a councillor.

43. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked what were the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance, in view of the fact that the budget of the Territory was almost exclusively the responsibility of the Administering Authority.

44. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Committee in question, a body set up by the Local Government Council, was concerned with the finances of the Council. Sums were made available to the Council, *inter alia*, through the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund.

45. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked why the Administering Authority had concluded that the sites in Papua and New Guinea investigated with a view to the future resettlement of the Nauruans should be rejected, and whether the Nauruans themselves had been consulted.

46. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that no Nauruans had accompanied the survey party sent out to inspect the places in question, but they had been kept informed and the Administration had explained the reasons why the areas had been considered unsuitable. The Administration was looking for a fairly

¹ Commonwealth of Australia, *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of Nauru from 1st July, 1954, to 30th June, 1955*, Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer. (Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1247).

extensive area with favourable possibilities of agriculture, within reasonable distance of secondary and other industries so as to enable the Nauruans to obtain employment, with an adequate water supply and preferably in a coastal area or on a navigable river. So far no area that fulfilled all or most of those requirements and that was the same time unpopulated or thinly populated had been found. The Administration had in mind three areas in New Guinea which might prove suitable. If they did not, it would extend its search further afield in the Pacific.

47. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked whether the Australian Government had taken any steps with respect to the Visiting Mission's suggestion, in paragraph 56 of its report, that a joint committee composed of Nauruans and members of the Administration in Nauru should be set up to study the problem.

48. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that no action had yet been taken in the matter, but the suggestion would certainly be considered.

49. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) recalled the special representative's statement (714th meeting) that the Nauru Local Government Council had so far made little use of the powers with which it was vested under the Nauru Local Government Council Ordinance to initiate legislation and launch enterprises for the benefit of the Nauruans. In paragraph 38 of its report, the Visiting Mission stated that the Council's plans for the improvement of fishing, agriculture and roads under section 43 of the Ordinance were hampered by lack of funds. He asked whether the Council's revenue was sufficient to finance such plans.

50. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the revenue from the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund was more than adequate to finance all the projects suggested by the Council. The plans for the improvement of fisheries, agriculture and roads had not been submitted by the Council and all work on them had so far been financed by the Administration. All efforts to interest the Nauruans in fishing had failed. Progress with the agricultural project had been disappointing, owing to lack of water, but work would continue, and would be financed by the Administration. Road maintenance was also financed by the Administration at present. If road maintenance or any other projects were taken over by the Nauru Local Government Council and the funds from the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund were insufficient to cover them, the Administration would provide further financial assistance. Assistance would also be provided for agricultural development and any other project which the Nauruans wished to put forward, but it was not needed at the present time, as there had been a surplus of about £6,000 in the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund at the end of the preceding year. With the income available for the current year, nearly £22,000 were now available to the Council.

51. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) pointed out that the plans mentioned in paragraph 38 of the Visiting Mission's report had apparently been proposed by the Council and not by the Administration.

52. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administration had no record of any specific proposals from the Council. Under section 43 of the Ordinance all plans were considered on a budgetary basis, but no plans submitted so far had required financing in excess of the Council's revenue. It was possible that the Council had intended to put the plans mentioned by the Guatemalan representative into effect

at a later date and had unwittingly given the Mission the impression that the planning was further advanced than it actually was.

53. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the future of the Nauruan community was a matter of grave concern. The Australian Minister of State for Territories had told the Visiting Mission that a sufficient fund would be built up to meet the cost of resettlement (T/1256, para. 55) and the special representative had confirmed, at the 714th meeting, that funds would be available for resettlement, technical assistance, training, etc. He asked whether the funds would be sufficient to cover the construction of housing and other facilities when the population was resettled.

54. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that, although the general statement made by the Administering Authority with regard to the funds available for resettlement made no specific mention of housing, it could be assumed that the construction of housing, schools and other buildings would in fact be included in the resettlement plan.

55. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) assumed the fund would cover everything that was required to enable the Nauruans to maintain their present level of living in, and to adjust themselves to, their new environment. He asked whether the fund was to be composed of special contributions or whether it would include the royalties from the Nauruan Community Long Term Investment Fund.

56. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority accepted without reservation all the responsibilities which would arise from the resettlement of the Nauruans. It was expected that the Nauruans would be resettled as a single community. Land would be purchased and buildings and other services provided; the people would be given technical assistance in the development of agriculture and training in various trades and professions. The Administering Authority would be responsible for ensuring that the community had become self-sufficient before assistance was withdrawn, but it could not, of course, undertake to keep them in idleness forever.

57. There was a possibility that some Nauruans, particularly those who acquired various skills, might leave Nauru of their own accord and settle elsewhere without much assistance from the Administration. Such cases would have to be examined on their own merits.

58. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked whether any steps had been taken to associate Nauruans more closely with the establishment of the resettlement plans, as had been suggested by the Visiting Mission.

59. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority was consulting the Nauruans on every step relating to resettlement and discussing with them the problems that lay ahead. Further, it had already informed them of the steps it was willing to take on their behalf. If the Guatemalan representative's question referred to the Visiting Mission's recommendation that a joint committee should be established for the consideration of resettlement problems, the Administering Authority had taken note of the suggestion and would give consideration to establishing such a committee.

60. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the Nauruans appeared to be increasingly in favour

of settlement in Australia rather than in other localities. He asked how the change of opinion had come about.

61. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he did not know. It might possibly be that the Nauruans had been impressed by the Administering Authority's efforts to help them, but he could make no positive statement on that point.

62. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted the statement in paragraph 23 of the Visiting Mission's report that the Administration exercised no direct control over the activities of the British Phosphate Commissioners. The question of the relationship between the Commissioners and the Administration had been raised before and the Administering Authority had contradicted the Visiting Mission's statement, but he would like further clarification: was it a fact, for instance, that the Administration could not only supervise the activities of the Commissioners but also issue instructions to them regarding their operations?

63. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) felt he could only repeat what he had said on that subject in his opening statement to the Council, namely, that the British Phosphate Commissioners operated like any private company in any other country: they were responsible for the management of their own affairs within the industry, and for the control of their staff, but their operations were in a general way under the control of the Administration and they were entirely subject to all legislation in the Territory. The Administrator alone had the power to decide what lands were to be classified as phosphate-bearing lands and the budgetary independence of the Administration *vis-à-vis* the British Phosphate Commissioners, was complete and assured.

64. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Administering Authority had constantly failed to respond to the Council's requests for more information about the activities of the British Phosphate Commissioners, and he reserved his delegation's right to raise that matter again when the Council came to discuss the economic situation in the Territory.

65. Noting that the Local Government Council consisted of a head chief and eight other members, he asked how the head chief was elected, whether with or separately from the other members of the Council.

66. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that all nine members were elected together and that the Council itself then elected a head chief and chairman from among its members. Since the inception of the Council, the head chief had retained that function for the duration of the life of the Council. Thus, with the recent elections there had been a change of head chief. Before that time, the head chief had retained his position until his death.

67. In reply to a further question from Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that members of the Local Government Council had the right to initiate legislation without the prior consent of the Administrator.

68. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Local Government Council had jurisdiction over the entire Territory or whether there were areas which did not fall within its competence.

69. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the authority of the Local Government Council extended to all Nauruans and the land owned and occupied by them. Land leased and occupied by non-Nauruans was under the direct authority of the Administration. All such land, including that used by the British Phosphate Commissioners, was held under lease and would eventually revert to the Nauruan people; it had not been permanently alienated.

70. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for an explanation of the Administration's view, as expressed in paragraph 39 of the Visiting Mission's report, that the Local Government Council was not in a position to make useful comments on the Administration's budget.

71. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the members of the Council had not yet gained sufficient experience and competence to be able to offer useful advice on budgetary matters. Nevertheless, in response to the Visiting Mission's suggestion, consideration would be given to the Council's having an opportunity of studying the budget in some form.

72. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to paragraph 40 of the Visiting Mission's report and asked whether immigrants were consulted in the enactment of legislation for the Territory. Further, that paragraph seemed to suggest that although the interests of non-Nauruans were being looked after adequately by the present Administration, that might not be the case when the Nauruans themselves were in entire control of the Territory's affairs; it would be unfortunate if the Administering Authority took that view.

73. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the non-Nauruan workers in the Territory were not immigrants in the strict sense, for they had not come to the island to settle there permanently; they had come there to work for a specified period in accordance with agreements drawn up before they left their home countries. It was understood that they would return to their homes on completion of their contracts; there would therefore be no point in discussing the Territory's legislation with them. Their employment was, of course, subject to the labour legislation in force in the Territory and to the terms of the agreements under which they entered employment. As to the future Nauruan legislative body, he could not predict its attitude or behaviour.

74. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 45 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked why nothing had been done about the suggestions made by Mr. E. P. Eltham, Director of Industrial Training in the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, in the two years since he had visited the Territory.

75. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that although Mr. Eltham had visited Nauru in late 1954, his report had not been received until some time later.

In fact, however, many of his suggestions had already been put into practice, including, for instance, the provision of extra courses of a more technical kind at the Nauru secondary school. The Administration intended to implement many of Mr. Eltham's suggestions for the benefit of the Nauru people.

76. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was aware that the Administering Authority had consulted the Nauruan people on the future of their Territory in the physical sense, namely, what was to happen to the people after the island ceased to be habitable, but he wondered if it had also been carrying on consultations regarding a possible change in the Territory's political status considerably before that date. The phosphate resources would be exhausted in some forty to fifty years; the Administering Authority surely did not intend to suggest that the Nauruans could not evolve and become sufficiently educated to manage their own domestic affairs long before then.

77. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the political future of the Nauruan people after their island ceased to be habitable was a matter of pure conjecture since it would depend on what country they chose as their new home. He would not care to hazard a guess as to how long it would take them to become sufficiently qualified to manage their own affairs unaided. For forty years they had been offered facilities and opportunities of every kind but they had shown little response. He would, however, like to point out that the Nauru Local Government Council had a dual function. As a corporate body it dealt with many matters of local interest—a housing scheme and a co-operative store, for instance, were under its management—and it had the authority to make rules for the local community. In its other capacity, as an advisory body—an unusual function for a local government council—it was empowered to advise the Administrator, by statutory provision, on laws relating to the Territory. That experience would assuredly serve to awaken political consciousness and to assist the people in their political development. There were also encouraging signs that younger Nauruans were taking somewhat more interest in fitting themselves to take their place in the world. It was still too early, however, to attempt any estimate of how long it would take for the Nauruan people to reach any specific stage of development.

78. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) still found it very difficult to believe that the Nauruan people had so little enthusiasm for culture and education, especially after forty years' association with the Administering Authority.

79. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that difficult though it might be to understand such a state of affairs it was none the less true that the Nauruan people as a whole were simply not interested in the opportunities offered them, however seductive.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.