



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-seventh Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 23 June 1961,  
at 2.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960;</i>	
(ii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded) . . . . .</i>	109
<i>Appointment of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands . . . .</i>	110
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960 (continued)</i>	
<i>Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority . . . . .</i>	110

**President:** U TIN MAUNG (Burma).

**Present:**

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):**

- (i) *Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960 (T/1574, T/L.1014);*
- (ii) *Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961 (T/1560)*

[Agenda items 4 (f) and 6]

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Goding, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took a place at the Council table.*

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. GODING (Special Representative) thanked the members of the Council for their constructive suggestions and said he wished to deal with a number of points raised during the general debate. It was true that Micronesia was entering the mainstream of the political and economic life that was quickening the

entire Pacific area. The time had come, as the representative of Paraguay had said (1152nd meeting), to develop the political maturity of the population as rapidly as possible so that they could establish their own institutions and decide their own destiny. In that connexion, the Administering Authority hoped that it would be possible to create a Territorial legislative council before 1965, the date fixed, since the transformation of the Inter-District Advisory Committee into a legislative organ would be accelerated by the work of the future Sub-Committee on Political Development. In addition, the representatives of the district of Saipan would take part in the work of the Committee as delegates, not as observers, as they had done in the past. With regard to the site of the future Government Headquarters, the Administering Authority considered that the matter should be decided by the people; furthermore, it intended to help them in that task by organizing meetings of the Inter-District Advisory Committee in the various districts, so that each member could become familiar with each district. Finally, the Administration was working out the necessary measures for unifying the administration of the entire Territory.

2. The political development of the Territory depended on the creation of democratic institutions at the local level, and the Administering Authority's political training programme was being actively pursued. In that connexion, although there was a general desire to increase the rate at which municipalities were being created, their creation should not be merely nominal, since such representative institutions were useful only if the people understood the principles underlying them. In the same way, the increased authority of the district congresses and of other administrative organs depended on the systematic training policy followed by the Administering Authority. It had no objection to giving qualified Micronesians senior administrative positions, but it was careful to entrust such senior functions only to experienced staff who had already given proof of their competence.

3. In the field of education, several problems had still to be solved at the elementary and primary levels, owing mainly to the increase in the school population. The Administering Authority would study the possibility of giving additional aid for teachers' salaries and would also consider lowering the compulsory school age from the eight-year level.

4. With regard to public health, he was particularly gratified to receive the congratulations of the Council, as the results achieved had been due entirely to the energetic action of the Micronesians themselves. The Administering Authority would make every effort to provide all the necessary technical assistance to any Micronesian officers who requested it.

5. As far as economic development was concerned, the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust

Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961, stated categorically in paragraph 73 of its report (T/1560) that the Territory's main natural resources had not as yet been exploited. However, agricultural resources had been exploited to a considerable extent and commercial fishing was promising. It should not be assumed that the Territory enjoyed great natural resources. Nevertheless, the Administering Authority was resolved to renew its efforts in that field and to examine with the closest attention the recommendations of the Visiting Mission, in particular those relating to agriculture, fisheries, handicrafts, transport and communications, as it was convinced of the fundamental importance of economic development for the advancement of the Territory towards the objectives of the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

6. With regard to the situation of the people of Rongelap, it was certain that the radio-active fall-out of 1954 had left no traces and that the health of the islanders was satisfactory. However, the Administering Authority would continue its regular medical examinations, while trying to minimize their psychological impact on the Rongelap people. The rehabilitation programme was practically completed but it had been complicated by the fact that the population of the island had more than doubled since 1954.

7. The summary records of the Council's meetings would, as in previous years, be distributed to Micronesian leaders, staff members and students, and the Administering Authority would prepare and distribute to the people a document explaining the objectives of the Trusteeship System.

8. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) added that the United States had been unable to consider as constructive and disinterested most of the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union at the previous meeting and had therefore not dealt with the inaccuracies in them. However, far from wishing to convert the Territory into the fifty-first State of the Union, as the USSR representative had claimed, the United States had followed and was continuing to follow only the policy of leaving the people of the Territory to determine their own political future at the appropriate time. With regard to the plebiscite conducted at Saipan, the United States was proud that the local people thought so highly of the American political system that they wished to share its benefits and responsibilities.

9. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had above all recommended the application in the Territory of the provisions of the Charter and the General Assembly Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples; and the representative of the United States was labelling that course of action as not being constructive. It had to be admitted, on the other hand, that the latest statements by the special representative and by the United States representative contained nothing constructive in that connexion. With regard to the alleged inaccuracies mentioned by the United States representative, he would like to hear what specific facts the representative of the United States was referring to. For when he had mentioned facts, he had based himself on the report of the Visiting Mission and had quoted specific paragraphs. For example, when he mentioned the percentage of land under the control of the Adminis-

tration, he had taken the figures given by the special representative of the Administering Authority: 55 per cent of all the land was controlled by the Administration. Finally, the reference to the possibility of converting the Territory into the fifty-first State of the Union was mentioned in annex III of the report of the Visiting Mission, which contained an address delivered on 29 September 1960 by the Naval Administrator to the Saipan Legislature in which reference was made to the fact that the Trust Territory might be united with Guam, and that at some time in the future the Trust Territory might become the fifty-first State of the United States. Therefore that idea, whose paternity he, as a matter of fact, denied completely, could not be attributed to the Soviet representative.

10. He noted with regret that, in his concluding statement, the representative of the United States had not declared to the Trusteeship Council what concrete measures the Administering Authority intended to take for the speedy implementation of the General Assembly's Declaration of 14 December 1960.

11. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) replied that the address in question contained a list of the different solutions concerning the political future of the Territory and that, as far as he knew, no mention was made of the possibility that the Territory would become the fifty-first State of the Union. Furthermore, neither the members of the Trusteeship Council nor the Visiting Mission shared the views of the representative of the Soviet Union.

#### APPOINTMENT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

12. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands should be composed of the representatives of Australia, Burma, New Zealand and the United Arab Republic.

*It was so decided.*

*Mr. Goding, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, withdrew.*

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960 (T/1562, T/1571, T/L.1012) (continued)**

[Agenda item 4 (e)]

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, 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 REPRESENTATIVE AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINIS- TERING AUTHORITY

##### *Political advancement*

*Mr. Bingham (United States of America), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

13. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he would like a more precise reply to the question about Australian immigration laws which he had asked at the twenty-sixth session (1054th meeting). Was there any

difference between the concepts of residence and citizenship? Who were the Nauruans who wished to settle in Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom, and who were the ones who wished to stay in the Territory?

14. Mr. HOOD (Australia) observed that the question of the Australian immigration laws did not arise in the Trusteeship Council.

15. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) added that the offer made to the Nauruans by the Minister of State for Territories made no distinction between residence and citizenship.

16. In reply to another question by Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that, if the Nauruan community accepted the offer, any Nauruan arriving in Australia would immediately become a resident and a full citizen of Australia.

17. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) recalled that the representative of the Soviet Union had suggested that a plebiscite might be held in Nauru. The case of that Territory was rather paradoxical, because its people helped to work the phosphate mines but could not till the soil, nor could they settle in another island. Hence the little community was as it were paralyzed.

18. Which of the inhabitants would wish to be free to settle in Australia, and which would probably want to stay on the island?

19. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) replied that part of the population—particularly the older people—would probably stay in Nauru, where they would remain the trusts of the Australian Government and of the other Administering Authorities of the Trust Territory.

20. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) asked who would be responsible for the minority of Nauruans who decided to stay in the Territory—the Trusteeship Council, the Australian Government, the New Zealand Government or the United Kingdom Government?

21. Mr. HOOD (Australia) replied that the Administering Authorities were now consulting with the Nauruan people on that question.

22. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that, even if some of the Territory's inhabitants migrated to Australia, the Trusteeship Council would still take an interest in the indigenous people who had stayed behind. When the Australian Government had consulted the Nauruan population and the Trusteeship Council, it should make its policy clearer.

23. He wished to ask Mr. Gadabu, the representative of the Nauru Local Government Council, a question.

24. Mr. HOOD (Australia) explained that members of the Council were perfectly free to question Mr. Gadabu, who was ready to answer them. However, questions about the Australian Government's policy should be addressed to him, Mr. Hood, or to Mr. McCarthy.

25. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) assured the Australian representative that his questions did not concern the Administering Authority's policy. He only wanted to know whether the Nauruans preferred to stay on their island or to settle elsewhere.

26. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too was very anxious to hear Mr. Gadabu's opinion on that point.

27. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that his delegation did not propose at the moment to ask that Mr. Gadabu should take a place at the Council table. Could the Bolivian representative continue to address his questions to the special representative?

28. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) asked what the Territory's status in relation to the Trusteeship Council would be if the Nauruan people accepted the Australian Government's proposals.

29. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) thought that it would be for the Trusteeship Council itself to consider the matter further. The Administering Authority had made proposals to the Nauruans so that it might have a better understanding of the question, obtain the Nauruan reactions and inform the Council at an appropriate stage. Those proposals were not yet final.

30. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) recalled that there were three aspects of the problem: the people of Nauru, the Trusteeship Council and the Australian Government. He would like to know specifically whether the people had been consulted about their possible resettlement outside Nauru and, if not, when they would be consulted.

31. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) explained that the Nauruan people were not yet ready to accept the proposals as they still hoped that a place might be found in which they could continue to live as a Nauruan community. The three Governments concerned were considering the question from that aspect.

32. In reply to another question by Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that the resettlement of a Nauruan community or communities would be easier if the younger generations, who would adapt themselves more quickly than their elders, were to emigrate first.

33. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) thought that trusteeship should soon be ended in Nauru. But, if the Nauruans were resettled in Australia, it was the Council's responsibility to see that they had the same rights, status and opportunities as other Australians.

34. He regretted that he had not been able to question Mr. Gadabu and he hoped that the Australian Government would soon explain clearly how it proposed to end the trusteeship.

35. Mr. KIANG (China), recalling that in May 1959 a group of fifty-eight men, women and children of the Nauruan community had gone to visit relatives and friends in the Marshall and Caroline Islands, asked whether there had been a further visit in 1960.

36. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) replied in the negative.

37. Mr. KIANG (China) asked, with regard to the future of the Nauruans, whether the young people of the Territory who were at present studying or apprenticed in Australia had adjusted themselves to their environment.

38. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) admitted that there had been some problems of adjustment but said that they were being overcome, as was

borne out by the increasing numbers of Nauruans now attending various Australian secondary and higher educational establishments. At the request of the Nauru Local Government Council arrangements had been made to deal with those difficulties: the position could be improved still further and the Administering Authority was endeavouring to do so.

39. In reply to another question from Mr. KIANG (China), Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said that he had put the Administering Authority's proposals to the whole of the Nauruan population. He had not of course been able to have a personal word with every inhabitant, but he thought that, with the friendly co-operation of the Local Government Council, he had been heard and seen by virtually every Nauruan.

40. Mr. KIANG (China) asked what had been the general reaction of the people whom the special representative had consulted.

41. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) recognized that there were people on the island who were not in favour of the Australian proposals, but he thought that a substantial number of them had viewed those proposals sympathetically. His impression was that the Nauruans were keenly aware of the gravity of the situation. They had had much discussion with him about the consequences of various decisions, and they were sincerely trying to make up their minds. He had not expected a quick decision: so many factors were involved that the people had to be given time to reflect on the matter at leisure.

42. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether he was correct in thinking that the Nauruans, regardless of their reactions to the Australian proposals, realized that there was no future for them on the island and were in favour of resettlement elsewhere.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said he thought that was so. As was to be expected, the greatest opposition to the Administering Authority's offers came from the older people. But he had had the impression that even those who had no wish to leave their island did not dispute the necessity of resettlement.

44. Mr. KIANG (China) asked how the Local Government Council had come to the conclusion that the Nauruan people were not yet ready to accept the Australian proposals.

45. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) said it was difficult to answer that question. He could only say that the members of the Council had seemed to him to have a great sense of responsibility.

46. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether it would be possible to bring to Australia two or three Nauruan families to see how they would adapt themselves to their new life.

47. Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative) explained that the question had already been put to him in Nauru but that he was not empowered to make offers to individuals. He had therefore confined himself to informing the Local Government Council of the matter. In the Administering Authority's opinion, the matter was one of general proposals addressed to the Nauruan people as a community. No individual offers could be made.

48. Mr. KIANG (China) pointed out that many families were reluctant to emigrate because they did not know what would happen to them in the host country. That psychological factor was important, and those persons who had expressed the desire to go either to Australia or to New Zealand or elsewhere should be encouraged to go so that, upon their return to Nauru, they could tell their fellow countrymen of their impressions. He wondered whether, as there were people of Polynesian stock in New Zealand, that country would not be the most suitable for the resettlement of the Nauruans.

49. Mr. HOOD (Australia) recalled that the offer of resettlement had been made jointly by the three countries constituting the Administering Authority and that the offer was explicit.

50. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether it would not be possible to invite the Nauruans who so desired to go to any of the three countries in question as tourists.

51. Mr. HOOD (Australia) commented that a person from Nauru could obtain information on Australia in any Australian travel office.

52. Mr. VELLODI (India), reverting to the procedural question raised by the representative of Bolivia, agreed that it was for the Australian delegation to decide whether Mr. Gadabu should or could answer a question. However, he recalled that the Local Government Council of Nauru had proposed to the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959, that an indigenous representative should attend the meetings of the Trusteeship Council so as to give any necessary explanations; on the other hand, the Australian argument was that every member of a delegation must express the official views of the Administering Authority.

53. His delegation was certain that the special representative would be able to inform the Council sincerely of the reasons that prevented the Nauruans from accepting the generous offer of the Administering Authority; nevertheless, it reserved the right to request to have Mr. Gadabu's views if it was not entirely satisfied with the explanations given by the special representative.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.