

TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.716  
28 June 1956

ENGLISH

Eighteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 28 June 1956, at 2 p.m.

UN LIBRARY

JUN 29 1956

UN/SA COLLECTION

President:

Mr. ASHA

(Syria)

Later:

Mr. GRILLO (Vice President) (Italy)

1. Attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence [15] (continued)
2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru [4c, 7] (continued)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol T/ER.716. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

56-18201

(63 p.)

ATTAINMENT BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE OBJECTIVE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE: DRAFT PREPARED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF A SEPARATE SECTION OF THE REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (T/L.684)

[Agenda item 15]

The PRESIDENT: I should like to recall to the members of the Council that we last discussed this item at our 702nd meeting. In accordance with the request made of the Secretary-General by the Council, we now have a draft of a separate section of the report of the Council to the General Assembly.

The SECRETARY: I merely wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that if it adopts this draft, certain minor changes will have to be made as a result of the decision to have the Council's report to the General Assembly appear in one volume. When this draft was prepared by the Secretariat, it was assumed that there might be two volumes. Consequently, if the Council approves this draft, the necessary minor editorial changes will be made.

The PRESIDENT: Can the silence of the members of the Council be interpreted as approval of the draft?

Mr. HAMILTON (Australia): I am not at all clear about the significance of the changes which would be made by the Secretariat to this draft in the light of the Council's decision to submit its report in the manner in which it has decided. Perhaps the Secretariat could enlighten us a bit further on this aspect.

Secondly, can the Council be told what will appear under the relevant chapter of part I of the Council's report, in the light of the fact that certain information which is normally given in that part is now found in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this draft?

The SECRETARY: My previous remarks referred to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report, in which it will be noted that, as regards Tanganyika, reference has been made to volume I, part II. The volume number will be deleted and reference will be made to the appropriate section of the single volume which will appear.

(The Secretary)

This is merely an editorial change of no significance. Another change would have to be made in paragraph 4, line 4, which now reads, "are included in the two volumes". That will have to be referred to in another manner.

As regards the content of paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and so on, if they are approved by the Council they would be set out in the manner indicated here, namely as part III of the Council's report. The reference to the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence, which will be submitted later to the Council as part I, dealing, as we have said before, with housekeeping matters, will then be before the Council for its approval.

Mr. HAMILTON (Australia): I am very grateful to the Secretary of the Council for that information, but the purpose of part of my inquiry was to elucidate whether in fact the text which would appear in part I of the Council's report would add or subtract anything substantially from the text of the four paragraphs which we find in this draft. As my delegation sees the arrangement which is proposed, the draft, in point of fact, takes over almost exactly the text which would be expected to appear in the relevant section of part I of the report or, should I say, the relevant section of the relevant chapter of part I of the report which deals with the action of the Council in respect of the resolutions of the General Assembly.

It would seem to my delegation that the text of part I of this draft will in fact constitute a duplication of the text which must normally appear in the relevant section of the relevant chapter of part I of the report.

The SECRETARY: It will be inevitable that there is going to be some overlapping. However, in part I of the Council's report, which still has to be approved by the Council, emphasis will be placed on the procedural aspects with regard to the attainment question and I would rather imagine that while there will be some duplication with regard to the present paragraphs 1 and 1<sup>1</sup> as in this document, they will be considerably shortened and at the same time put a slightly different emphasis on it in so far as they will be merely dealing with the mechanics in which the Council has discussed the aspects, namely the procedural aspects thereof.

Mr. GIDDEY (United Kingdom): Still a further question occurs to my delegation and that is that this draft -- which of course was prepared, as the Secretary has made it clear, on the basis that the Council would adopt the Secretary General's proposal for the publication of the report, which the Council has in fact decided not to adopt -- appears in the form of a third part to the Council's report, which normally consists, I think, of two parts. I would be grateful if the Secretary of the Council could give us some reason, which may indeed be a perfectly obvious one, as to the need for adding a part to the report rather than dealing with this question in its, shall I say, housekeeping and substantive form in part I of the report where, as the Secretary has made it clear, a reference must inevitably be made. In other words, the General Assembly, I think, has always



(Mr. Gidden, United Kingdom)

used the phrase "a separate section". What is the justification, if indeed it is required, for translating this concept which the General Assembly has had of a separate section into a separate part of the Council's report?

The SECRETARY: While of course the General Assembly has referred to a separate section, and this is not part of the normal nomenclature adopted in the Trusteeship Council in the submission of its report, the Secretariat, in submitting the draft, has primarily been guided by the precedent established in this regard in its report to the General Assembly in 1954 when the report was divided into three sections and the section dealing with attainment was then presented as part III.

Mr. GIBBS (Australia): I only have one comment and that is that my delegation is somewhat reluctant to deal finally with the draft at this stage, particularly as we have already agreed that there should be simply one volume of our annual report which will be approved at the end of this session. I have in mind, of course, that four of the Territories which will be dealt with in any index we adopt have yet to be considered by the Trusteeship Council.

As members will see from page 3, where the Territories are listed, four of them have not yet been dealt with. I do not know if this is a very serious matter, but frankly my delegation is reluctant to deal finally with this document until we have dealt with all the Territories and would prefer that any vote or final decision on this particular paper be deferred until we have reached the end of the agenda of the present session.

The PRESIDENT: I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for the position of the representative of Australia, but I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that this document has been in the hands of the Council since 12 June. While I personally would like to accommodate all delegations, it seems to me that if we were to keep on our excellent record of managing our affairs and finishing at the target date, it would be very useful if we were to come to an early decision. However, I am in the hands of the Council. If there are delegations which would like to postpone the discussion of this matter or postpone a final vote on it, that will be quite in order. But I am just wondering whether

(The President)

it is wise at this stage to have to have a further postponement. If the representative of Australia has any particular remarks or amendments or suggestions to make, I am sure that the members of the Council will be very happy to listen to him.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): My only point was the mechanical one, that this is an index of a report which has not yet been completed. There was some purpose in finalizing this as soon as possible when we were thinking in terms of two volumes to our report. Now we have decided that the report will be in one volume which will not be approved until the end of this session. There seems to be very little reason why we should hasten now to decide upon the index of a report which we have not yet approved. It does seem to me to be reversing the order of the cart and the horse a little.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that in this case we have two questions which are linked with each other but yet are fairly far removed from each other. We have on the agenda the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence, a draft prepared by the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General proposes a procedure. He is not raising a point of substance. He is simply telling us how he thinks the report should be drafted.

The Secretariat may be right in feeling that the resolution adopted at the last session of the Trusteeship Council was not sufficiently clear in regard to what was to be done by the Secretary-General. A glance at the records of the last session indicates that a specific task was given to the Secretary-General to comply with paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 946 (X). The Secretary-General was to prepare a report as requested by the General Assembly. I might recall that the Assembly requested the Trusteeship Council to take steps so that the order in which this question would be dealt with would be in line with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. In accordance with this, in its next report the General Assembly should include special sections containing relevant information, conclusions and recommendations.

I have not heard the opinions of all representatives on the Council, but it seems to me that the Secretariat should begin preparation of the report. It should recall the debates which have taken place; it should indicate the course of the debates. Then the decision of the seventeenth session should be recorded, as well as the decision of the eighteenth session, including the conclusions and recommendations of the Council.

Now the question arises whether that which has been approved by the Council should be made a part of the report or whether it should not. That is a serious question. In my preliminary opinion it seems to me that the part which deals with individual Territories could include this information as conclusions of the Council. It might be helpful to the members of the Fourth Committee to have this information rather than the figures which we see here, the references to chapters, sections, parts, volumes, etc. None of this is very clear and, in any event, some of the volumes are not yet available. This does not constitute a report, it is only a mass of figures. It seems to me that the General Assembly would not be able to work on such a basis. It would have to search the report to find all the references which are mentioned here.

Would it not be simpler and more convenient to include in the report what was adopted by the Council? But that is not all. In the previous document the Secretary-General indicated that there was some additional information and he asked whether that should be included. Of course, the Secretary-General

and the Secretariat are not in the same position as our excellent interpreters, who simply have to interpret what we say. The Secretariat must elaborate and develop certain matters which are discussed. It must analyze the various positions taken, and so on. Therefore, the Secretariat was asked to undertake this task. It is not the same as having something copied by typists. I am not criticizing the Secretariat in my remarks, as I think that the Secretariat is an excellent organization and deserving of our respect. I admire the manner in which it is organized. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the meaning of the resolutions is that a special report should be prepared, and it seems to me that the Secretariat, by means of its own machinery, should be able to give us an excellent report. In this, of course, the Secretary-General can do nothing; he can only take the recommendations of the Council and attach them to the report on each Territory. Then, what is intended will be clear.

It seems to me that there would be no practical purpose in submitting a special report. A special report was submitted at the ninth session of the General Assembly. Therefore, we have a precedent, and all of us like precedents. At that time a special report was submitted without conclusions and recommendations. In this instance the Trusteeship Council went further and said that the recommendations and conclusions must be contained in the report.

These are my preliminary views and conclusions after the brief discussion which we have had here. Perhaps I have not dealt adequately with the complexity of the question, but, from what was said by the representative of the Secretary-General, it seems to me that the whole question is not so very complicated.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I had not expected to express our opinion on this question, as I am sure that we have given expression to our views on earlier occasions.

As far as I can see, the Trusteeship Council had requested the Secretary-General to prepare a separate section in terms of resolution 1369 (XVII). We have now before us a separate section prepared by the Secretary-General. Originally we had contemplated a rather lengthy separate section which would have included much more material than the present abbreviated section. But, since much of the information

originally intended for the section will appear elsewhere in the report of the Council, we think that it is somewhat unnecessary to repeat that information in this separate section. It seems to us that a decision on this particular point has to be taken first. It would essentially be a decision on the form of the separate section rather than on the substance, which is what the representative of Australia was referring to a moment ago.

So far as the form is concerned, we are inclined to accept this form without prejudice to the form of reports on this question at future sessions of the Council.

With regard to the substance of this separate section, we realize that it is at the moment incomplete, and the sections relating to Western Samoa, New Guinea, etc. have yet to be filled in. Perhaps a decision on that could be left over until a later date. I think that it would be quite reasonable to expect the Council to take a decision now, at any rate, on the form of the separate section.

Mr. ARNEFALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation's position on this question is well known, but we have never before expressed clearly and in detail the arguments on which that position is based. Our position was made known in the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi at the seventeenth session. Later, when the Council was examining the report of the Drafting Committee on Ruanda-Urundi and the reports on Tanganyika and other Trust Territories, my delegation supported them, stating that, in view of the divergence of opinions and the balanced distribution of votes in the Council, we deemed it essential to vote for those reports so that implementation could be begun of the General Assembly resolutions. Undoubtedly, however, they were far from meeting what my delegation believed to be the desire of the General Assembly.

We have before us document T/L.684, which relates to attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories. In our discussion of the form of the Council's report, my delegation expressed the thought that this problem contained ramifications. Now the Council has before it a note by the Secretary-General (T/1252) relating to the same subject. I may not be correct, but my impression was that the Council has not given sufficient attention to the last



part of paragraph 2 of this document, which states that "the Secretary-General finds it necessary to invite the Council to give him more precise instructions as to the form and content of the proposed separate section of its report".

The second point on which, I think, the Council reached no final decision, although the matter was discussed, is that relating to the recommendations as alternatives, which the Secretary-General submitted in paragraphs 8 and 9 of this document.



(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

There were views expressed at that time, and my delegation again refrained from making any comment at that time, but the fact is that apparently the majority of the Council was inclined to accept the recommendation of the Secretary-General appearing in paragraph 9 of the document which gave the impression that a section should be prepared containing a sort of index. Before going further and explaining my delegation's views on the question before us and in order to do this in a more definite way, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of the Council. I should like to know, in the Secretariat's opinion, what relation this document T/L.684, which we have before us and are discussing, has with the proposal of the Secretary-General contained in document T/1252?

The SECRETARY: The Secretariat was under the impression that the Council at a previous session had adopted the alternative proposed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 9, and it will be noted from the Note on the first page of document T/L.684 that the Secretariat states that:

"In accordance with the instructions given by the Council at its 702nd meeting after consideration of the note submitted by him (T/1252) in connexion with... the Secretary-General has prepared the following draft..."

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Secretary for his reply. I think there is some misunderstanding between the majority view of the Council and the President and the opinion of my delegation. My delegation had the impression that the two alternatives had been considered, that is, the two proposals presented by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 8 and 9, that no decision had been taken on them. Nevertheless, during his statement the representative of India expressed the wish to have before him a document which would show in practical and concrete form what would be the content of the proposal in paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General. When the Indian representative made this suggestion and no objection was made to it by any member of the Council, my delegation did not understand that this implied that we had taken a decision approving one of the alternatives. It is not that in substance my delegation is disputing the validity of this decision, if this is the Secretary's interpretation and that of the Council; if this is so, my delegation will not dispute it.

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

My delegation, however, would have liked to have had a clearer statement of the position on this point. As that was not possible before, we think that now is the time for us to explain our position. I think I should ask the indulgence of the Council if I take time to make a statement, but I should point out that at no time did my delegation ever make an explanation of the reasons for its position on this question.

First, I think that there is no conflict between document T/L.684 and the decision taken by the Council, at least with regard to this year, to continue to submit its report to the General Assembly in a single volume. There is no serious conflict although there are some drafting points which will have to be taken care of. One of these is contained in the first column in paragraph 5. There are a few other changes of that type. My delegation, in the Committee on Ruanda-Urundi and at the seventeenth session, said that in its view this Council had not properly interpreted the resolution on the question, and that in applying them it disregarded many of the elements of the resolutions, in particular those relating to the degree of separation in regard to how this question should be dealt with in the report to the General Assembly. There are other aspects as to form, and this is not an observation to the Council, but it is rather a description of fact observed by the Council on which to base its recommendations.

My delegation, together with the Haitian delegation on the Ruanda-Urundi Committee, submitted a document which has already gone into the annals of the Council. Two sections of the document were approved. First, section A, which related to the description of facts, was rejected. Parts B and C, as the Council will remember, were adopted with some amendments and were supported by a majority of the Council. My delegation voted for them, reserving its position on the substance of the Council's attitude, reserving its position in the General Assembly. Before this was approved, certain delegations in this Council, including the Australian delegation -- and if I am wrong I hope I will be corrected -- on one occasion, when we approved resolution 1369, said that they understood that the Secretary-General was to prepare a separate section in which they would include the facts on which the Council had based its opinion. I think that is what is meant in resolution 1369 (XVII).

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

When the reports of the Drafting Committees on Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika were discussed in this Council, one of the arguments made to reject the session relating to the description of facts was that it was the Secretary-General's task in accordance with resolution 1369.

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

My delegation did not share this view, but at the eighteenth session of the Council it was surprised to find before it document T/1252 in which the Secretary-General interpreted the resolution of the Council -- giving an interpretation which was at variance in some respects with opinions expressed on this resolution by members of the Council, including some Administering Powers. The Secretariat tells us that the alternative in paragraph 9 of document T/1252 was adopted, and is therefore submitted to us in that document.

In this connexion my delegation would merely like to point out the following. First, it does not consider that in this form the Trusteeship Council is interpreting and applying faithfully the resolutions of the General Assembly and its own resolution 1369 (XVII) because it differs widely from what we think was the General Assembly's desire. Secondly, with regard to a separate section relating to what the Indian delegation has called the "formal aspects" of the question, my delegation agrees that this is one of the forms -- and perhaps the best form -- and although we did not fully endorse the Council's action at the seventeenth session this is, perhaps, one of the ways of complying with the provisions of the resolution.

With regard to the substance of this chapter, in the same form -- although somewhat vaguely, as the representative of India has pointed out -- this Council had accepted a much more extensive chapter, and the delegation of Guatemala had also accepted a much more extensive statement. We thought that the Council, and not the Secretary-General, should, at the seventeenth and now at the eighteenth session, include a separate chapter or separate chapters as a statement of facts relating to this problem on which to base its conclusions which, unfortunately, are now dispersed and lost in various chapters relating to the various Territories dealt with in the report.

Nevertheless, my delegation thinks that the form, as distinct from the substance, is appropriate and acceptable, but it would only support it in order that we might begin taking tentative steps towards fulfilling the Assembly's resolutions. Our vote in this respect, however, could in no way be interpreted as an expression of full satisfaction with the way in which the General Assembly's resolutions are being applied.

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

Again I say that my delegation is not passing judgement on the wisdom of those resolutions. It would also reserve its position so that in the Fourth Committee and in the Assembly itself it could review this whole question, but so long as these resolutions are in force this Council can take one of two positions. Either it can explain why it feels that these resolutions are inadequate or it can decide that it cannot express this view or feels that it should not do so if that is not the right attitude to take, and can apply the resolutions literally and in their full meaning.

It do not know whether I have explained my delegation's views sufficiently clearly. I repeat that, as the representative of the Soviet Union said a few minutes ago, this is an extremely complex problem. We are having to deal with a very abstract concept because, although we have a draft before us which is supposed to be the first part of the report, and a draft of what might be called part two of that report, it is also true that the precise scope of the second part, which was partially approved at the seventeenth session, can be appreciated by members only with the exercise of some imagination, because the contents of the chapter on the attainment of self-government are not very clear. We hope that the form in which we understand this part two will be written coincides with the Secretariat's interpretation of this part as understood at the seventeenth session.

I apologize for the length of my statement. With regard to the form of this document, my delegation will vote for it with reservations. With regard to its substance we have many objections, but we shall vote for it also, again with reservations. With regard to the Australian suggestion to postpone consideration of it, we have no objection either to approving it or postponing it at this session. We would accept either course.

Mr. MULCAHY (United States of America): Since we have already spent nearly forty minutes on what my delegation considers to be a rather minor procedural point, we should like the opportunity to intervene at this time because the discussion arises out of the implementation of a resolution which my delegation introduced at the last session. We think that we said all that had to be said on this as far as we were concerned during the last discussion at the 702nd meeting. We might reiterate that, in the view of the United States delegation, the



(Mr. Mulcahy, United States)

Secretariat's effort now before us in document T/L.684 represents the best possible fulfilment of a very difficult mandate. The United States delegation feels that, in view of the rather badly and hastily drafted resolution that all this hinges upon, the Secretariat has attempted to comply with the wishes of the Council in the best manner it could. The Council, in turn, has attempted to comply in the best manner it could with the wishes of the General Assembly.

I do not see why we cannot come to a simple vote on this procedural point and put it up to the General Assembly that we have all -- the Secretariat and the Council -- done the best we could with the Assembly's wishes, at least for this session. If the General Assembly has any strong views and is dissatisfied with our method of procedure, we can be certain that it will let us know.

I think that the representative of Guatemala stated in his earlier remarks that, despite some reservations, his delegation would still be able to send it forward. My own delegation feels much the same way -- that we have reservations about this whole subject, but that it is a procedural point which apparently is not going to satisfy everyone. I think, however, that we might tie the matter up as soon as possible by putting it to a vote this afternoon.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I should just like to make three comments on the United States representative's observations. First -- and this is merely for purposes of record -- my delegation does not feel that this is merely a procedural point. On the contrary, it regards it as one of the most serious substantive points before the Council. Second, this is the second occasion during our debate on this question that the United States representative has indicated that resolution 1369 (XVII), which his delegation sponsored, may have been drafted too hastily. I respect this view, but again for purposes of record I should like to state that my delegation does not share it at all. Third, I should like to make one point clear with relation to our position on the substance of the question as it was commented upon by the United States representative. I do not know how my words were interpreted, but it may be that I did not express my thought very clearly. I merely said that if the majority of the Council wished to approve this document my delegation would vote for it, but



(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

that it would do so with reservations on its form and even more serious reservations with regard to its substance. I added that we did not for one moment feel that this document reflected a process which represented the full application of the General Assembly's resolutions.

Mr. MULCAHY (United States of America): I wish to thank the representative of Guatemala for clarifying the misconception I had on one or two points in his previous remarks, but it does occur to me that in any case, at the time when the entire report is before the Council for approval, any delegation will have the right to call for certain sections to be re-examined if necessary. I know it is not usually done but I know of no rule of procedure that could prevent it. If any delegation were not satisfied with the final form of this section of the report, it could take the matter up at the time when the report as a whole is being dealt with.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that we are discussing one thing only at present, namely the form of the report. We are not discussing the contents of the report, and I should like to have this confirmed. If we adopt any decision it will relate only to the form of the report; as for the report itself, that will have to be submitted by the Secretary-General first. That is how I understand it.

The PRESIDENT: I fail to see what the wish of the Council is. The Council decided at a previous meeting that the question of the attainment of self-government or independence would be discussed later in the light of the index which the Council itself asked the Secretariat to prepare. I should therefore like to have from the representative of the Soviet Union some concrete proposal on this draft. What are his suggestions? As the Secretary of the Council has pointed out, this draft has been designed for insertion, if adopted, in the second volume of the Council's report. The Council must therefore decide today what to do with this document which the Council itself requested the Secretariat to prepare.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I believe that during my earlier intervention I pointed out that the question now before the Council is that of taking a decision on the form of its report to the General Assembly on the action taken by the Council on this question of the attainment of self-government or independence. As we see it, there are two obvious courses open to the Council. The first one, clearly, is to follow the 1954 pattern of report, which would contain the substance of the proceedings on this question in the Council. No such proposal is before the

Council; in other words no member here has put forward formally any proposal to the effect that the report on this question to the next session of the General Assembly should follow the pattern of the 1954 report. On the other hand, we have here before us a draft section which does not contain in full the substance of the discussions of this question but which lists references to sections dealing with the substance which will appear elsewhere in the report. I suggest that we take the decision now only on the form of reporting to the General Assembly. As the representative of Australia has pointed out, this abbreviated section is somewhat incomplete in regard to New Guinea, Nauru and Western Samoa. It may be that the Council will adopt no recommendations in relation to this question in respect of, let us say, one of these Territories, in which case obviously any references to that Territory will have to be removed from this draft. So, without prejudice to the contents of this draft section, I suggest that we should take a decision on its form and, as I said earlier, this will not in any way commit my delegation in regard to any action which may be taken at future sessions of this Council either in regard to the form or in regard to the substance of reporting on this rather important question to the General Assembly. In other words, we should now simply take an ad hoc decision to suit the special requirements of this particular session of the Council.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My opinion of the character of our present discussion is that we are discussing the form of the report, since it will be difficult to discuss the substance in view of the fact that we still have a lot of work to do concerning a number of Territories and we do not know what proposals or recommendations there will be. Therefore we can discuss only the question of form and in that case I associate myself with the views expressed by the representative of India. I also take note of the statement made by the representative of Australia when he pointed out that it was impossible to adopt any decision on questions which are still pending in the Council.

Now I wish to draw attention to another question. Not only for my delegation, but also no doubt for other delegations, it seems that it is very difficult to depart from decisions already adopted. In the General Assembly we voted for a special section which would contain information, conclusions and recommendations.

This was in October or November of last year, and eight months have elapsed since then. I think it is even more regrettable that at the seventeenth session of the Trusteeship Council, only two or three months ago, we asked the Secretary-General to draw up a special section of the report which would contain information pertaining to the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence. This section was also supposed to include recommendations and so forth. This was only two or three months ago and it seems to me that a question of the authority of the Trusteeship Council is involved. It would be easy to say that the decision we adopted earlier was taken hastily and that now, two or three months later, we think that an error was committed, but I do not think that is a good procedure. I do not think that the Secretary-General should follow such a line of thinking in proposing to us not a separate section of the report but what is called an index. We asked the Secretariat to draft a report with conclusions, and the Secretariat proposes to us something which is just the work of a librarian. It consists of a few pages only and I am convinced that we hardly needed a resolution to get that. I am sure that this index by itself will be ignored by all delegations; it does not give us anything. Nobody will go down the columns of this index to find out where to look in other documents for the information he desires. The representative of India has said that no one has proposed that we should have a report in the form of the 1954 report but it seems to me that the Secretariat should prepare the report as was requested by the Council during its seventeenth session and as was requested by the General Assembly, and that this report should be a separate report and not an index.

I do not know how suitable that would be. Perhaps there may be some reference, as proposed in this index by paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and so forth, in the report. But the conclusions and recommendations should be set out separately. There should be a substantial introduction prepared by the Secretariat, followed by the conclusions and recommendations. The completion of all that would constitute the work that was requested by the General Assembly. Perhaps this would satisfy the General Assembly to some extent. Perhaps we could choose this form.

It seems to me unnecessary to vote on the index as it is here proposed. It would be difficult for the Soviet delegation to vote in favour of this, to vote in favour of something which members will not be able to use. Representatives will want to read about the various Territories, but they certainly will not want to proceed in this way.

The SECRETARY: With reference to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to recall the history of this question as regards the Secretariat.

It will be recalled that the Secretariat submitted a document (T/1252) to the Council in which it placed before the Council two alternatives in the discharging of its responsibility under the resolution adopted by the Trusteeship Council at its seventeenth session. These alternatives were set forth in paragraphs 8 and 9. In paragraph 9, the Secretary-General suggested that an indexing might be one way out of this particular situation.

When this question was discussed by the Trusteeship Council at its 702nd meeting, the discussion which took place was summed up by the President of the Council in the following way:

"I think that the representative of India has made a very wise suggestion. As I indicated earlier, it is not my intention to rush the matter to a vote on whether we should adopt the alternative suggestion made by the Secretary-General. Therefore, I think it would be the sense of the Council to request the Secretariat to prepare such an index and to circulate it to members for study. We could then take a final decision at a future meeting. I think we can dispose of this matter in a very short time if the Secretariat helps us, as it always does, by bringing us an early report and showing us the proper form.

"It was so decided." (T/PV.702, p. 31)



The PRESIDENT: I understand that it is the prevailing desire of the members of the Council that a decision should be taken on the draft contained in document T/L.684, subject to such changes as may appear necessary after all the reports have been examined.

Mr. ARENALES CATAIAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I have no wish to introduce any further difficulty for the President or for the other members of the Council. I should merely like to draw the Council's attention to the following fact. The Secretary has just read out an excerpt from the verbatim record of the 702nd meeting of the Council, which confirms to some extent, unless I do not clearly understand this point, my belief that the Council had not finally adopted the alternative contained in paragraph 9 of document T/1252. The representative of India had merely said that it would be desirable to have something concrete before us. The President of the Council then said that he did not wish to push matters to a vote that afternoon and that the representative of India had made a wise suggestion.

We now find ourselves in a slightly different position. We have before us document T/L.684. In the note on the first page of this document we read:

"The draft has been designed for insertion, if adopted, in the second volume of the Council's report..."

My delegation feels that this reference should be to a single volume of the Council's report.

Now this is the type of suggestion from the Secretariat which might be well-founded if the Council had previously taken any decision on this point. Therefore, if the Council accepts the view of the representative of India and the representative of the Soviet Union, a view which my delegation supports, to the effect that we are now considering the form of this paper, then we do not have to vote on document T/L.684. We need merely vote on the alternatives set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 of document T/1252.

The desire expressed by the representative of India, in other words, has been satisfied. We have before us in concrete form the result of one of the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 9 of document T/1252. In the light of this document, we can vote on the alternatives.



(Mr. Arenales Catalan,  
Guatemala)

It is at this meeting, however, that we are going to take a decision. I support the views expressed by the representative of India and the representative of the Soviet Union. I should like, however, to supplement their views by stating that we should not vote on document T/L.684 but that we should vote on the alternatives submitted by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 8 and 9 of document T/1252.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should like to make a very brief statement before we proceed to the vote. Having expressed myself earlier on the question of the form of the report, I had hoped to postpone any expression of views on the substance. However, as the representative of the Soviet Union has offered his own views, we feel obliged to offer our tentative views in regard to the substance of the question.

In our opinion, the General Assembly had asked for a separate section. The Trusteeship Council had agreed, and indeed had resolved, to prepare a separate section for the General Assembly. The question then would be: what should be the contents of this separate section? We have here this abbreviated separate section. In our opinion, a bare index is clearly inadequate and is not likely to satisfy the General Assembly. We feel that the separate section can briefly recall the substance at least of the recommendations which had been adopted by this Council. Those who are fundamentally opposed to this whole question are bound to vote against the index, as they will be bound to vote against any elaboration of the index.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Guatemala wish to make a formal proposal as to the action that should be taken so that we may decide whether or not to have a vote?

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): Yes, Mr. President, I wish to make a formal motion, but I should like to explain the motion in detail.

My delegation could hardly make any proposal that would be contrary to our views on the substance of the question. In this sense, my motion will be limited solely to the fact that the Council should decide at this meeting on the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence and how that question should be dealt with in our report, namely that it should be included in a separate section corresponding to sections I and II which, by custom, make up section I of our report.

(Mr. Arenales Catalan, Guatemala)

In this sense I believe that I can withdraw my proposal because it was only made to facilitate for the Secretariat an interpretation of the views of the Council. If the Secretariat is clear as to the views of the Council, I will withdraw my proposal. My delegation merely wishes that we should not vote on the substance and hence that the vote should not relate to document T/L.684. This document is an example which was requested by the Indian delegation of the Secretariat. But the decision to be taken on it is an entirely different matter. Therefore, my delegation would not like to have the Council vote either for or against the document but merely on the question of the form in which the report should be made to the General Assembly on this question. If the Secretariat is clear as to the Council's views on this point, I will withdraw my proposal.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Now that the representative of Guatemala has withdrawn his proposal, it seems to me that we have before us only one surviving suggestion from the representative of Australia who when he commented on this document simply said that for the present he would like the Council not to take a decision on the substance. We have no objection to that and we may leave the matter rest there.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the opinions in the Council are quite different. In order to make things clear, I shall put to the vote document T/L.684.

Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I had expressed a wish, but since the President desires to put document T/L.684 to the vote, I formally propose that the Council should not consider this document at this meeting.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the proposal of the representative of Guatemala not to consider document T/L.684 at the present meeting.

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

## EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/L.686):

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1247, T/1259) [Agenda item 4c]
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN THE PACIFIC, 1956 (T/1256) [Agenda item 7] (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J.H. Jones, special representative for the Trust Territory of Nauru under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Political advancement (continued)

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): Questions were asked yesterday about the ultimate future of the Nauruan community. I have formulated the question which I am about to ask solely with the aim of covering aspects of the problem which, although they have been touched upon, could perhaps usefully be expanded. I should like to ask Mr. Jones to what extent is there a measurable, coherent and significant public opinion concerning the ultimate future of the Nauruan community in favour of any single solution, other than the one mentioned to the Mission of settlement in Australia, to which the representative of Italy referred earlier.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): There has been no firm decision by the Nauruan people as a whole on the question of their re-settlement. Many of the older people favour remaining on the island. They give as their reason that they are living under very favourable conditions and that the exploitation of the phosphate deposits will last much longer than their own expectation of life. There are others -- and these include the Nauruans in all age groups -- who feel that they should remain on the island as long as possible and that they should not be required to move from it until it becomes absolutely necessary. The majority, I should say, of the Nauruans are now coming round to the idea, and they are realizing that the future of the Nauruan people as a whole lies in a move to a new home, a place that will provide for an expanding population, that will enable them to maintain at least the standard of living which they have attained and will provide opportunities for the increasing number of skilled workers to find suitable employment.

(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

I have had the opportunity of discussing this matter with members of the Nauruan Local Government Council and they are quite frank in the matter of the diversity of opinion which is held by the Nauruan people with regard to their future. They also appreciate that it is quite a serious problem. The general feeling of the members of the Local Government Council is that a move will have to be made and that the sooner arrangements for a suitable home have been made the better. They are more or less reconciled now to the idea that wherever they may go, they will not be able to establish a new Nauru under their own government. They realize that possibly the most they can hope for is to have a Local Government Council somewhat on the lines of that which they now have.

Mr. CHACKO (India): My first question relates to the by-laws so far passed by the Nauruan Local Government Council. My understanding is that, so far, apart from adopting its rules of procedure, the Local Government Council has adopted only one substantive law; that is the one relating to the impounding of stray cattle and pigs. I should like to ask the special representative if my understanding of the situation is correct.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Local Government Council has actually adopted four rules. Rule number **one** was the first and it was made for the establishment of pounds; rule number two is for the control of straying stock. They are more or less related although they are two separate rules. Rule number three relates to the conduct of Council business, and rule number four is to regulate the election of the head chief.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I believe that confirms my understanding that the only substantive action taken by the Council so far was the one relating to the impounding of cattle, etc.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): The special representative pointed out that, among the rules adopted by the Local Government Council, was one relating to the election of the head chief. That is an additional rule to those which the representative of India apparently understood to have been adopted.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I do not believe that I misunderstood the answer. I said: "apart from the rules concerning the functioning of the Council", if I remember right. "... concerning the functioning of the Council" means its methods of conducting the business, including the election of its president.



(Mr. Chacko, India)

Normally, in my understanding the rules of procedure of an organ, whether it is a Council or even any organs of the General Assembly, includes the method of election of a President, who is called the head chief in this case. So I think I am still right in my conclusion that apart from the two rules relating to the one question, that is, the impounding of strayed cattle, the other action was the question of the rules of procedure.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): As I understood the question, the representative of India was suggesting that only one rule has been made by the Council. In my reply, I said that that was not correct, that the Council has made four rules and I named the four rules. They are the numbers under which the rules are registered. So actually the Council, since 1 July 1955, in accordance with its statutory authority made four rules.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I thank the special representative for his explanation, but I want to restate that I was quite aware of the position that there were four rules adopted, two falling into the category of the rules of procedure of the functioning of the Local Government Councils, and two relating to the operation of the pounds.

I should like to ask the special representative if he could give us some idea of who took the initiative in passing the rules concerning the impounding of the cattle.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The desire to have a rule to control the strayed stock was made by the Nauruan people themselves, but the first draft to give effect to it was prepared by the Administrator and submitted to the Council for its consideration.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I am glad to know that the initiative for this was taken by the Nauruan Government Council although the Administration helped in the drafting of the rules. I asked this question in connexion with the statement made here the other day by the special representative in which he felt rather concerned about the Visiting Mission's remark that it might have been better not to pass this rule as the first item of business of the Council. The special representative said:



(Mr. Chacko, India)

"The Mission did not question the substance of the rule, but its remark in this connexion might be regarded as belittling the wisdom of the Council in adopting it at this stage. This could hardly tend to increase the popularity of the Council with the people or to encourage the Council in its work -- both of which objectives have been, I think, supported in the past by both the Administering Authority and this Council." (T/PV.714; p. 63-70)

I just wanted to say that the Visiting Mission, in making this suggestion, was merely expressing the view that a local government organization which was set up in the Territory by popular election would have done well if it had started with some measure which would have been more popular among the people, and it might have been desirable for the Administering Authority to give them proper advice in that connexion.

There was no intention on the part of the Visiting Mission to belittle the work that has already been done by the Council. In fact, the members of the Mission have themselves discussed this matter with the councillors in Nauru, and I do not believe that they were inclined to give an interpretation of this type, as is implied in the special representative's remarks.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): It was not my intention in my opening address to criticize the Visiting Mission, but merely to point out that it may have an adverse effect in so far as the people are concerned because these documents are made available to the Nauruan people in what is more or less a library, where they can and do read them. It went through my mind that considering that for four years we have been endeavouring by every means possible to encourage the Nauruan people, or particularly the Council, to make rules for their own local government and the people may read this and say it is perhaps unfortunate that this might be misunderstood by them as a criticism coming from the United Nations, a criticism of their own council. Perhaps in their eyes it might be saying to them, "you people don't know what you are doing because you are being criticized by an international body." It was from that angle that I made that remark. Perhaps it might be considered as an unnecessary remark, but I felt that I should draw attention to the effect it could possibly have on the Nauruan people,

(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

and to the fact that it could perhaps retard to some extent, even though in a very small way, the efforts of the Administering Authority to get these people to take advantage of the opportunity given them to make rules.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I am still not quite sure whether the line of thinking of the special representative is quite acceptable to my delegation. I am not quite sure whether the Nauruans, from discussion I had with members of the Local Government Council in Nauru, are likely to interpret this in that manner rather than as an expression of views by the Mission. The special representative himself mentioned just now that the Administration had taken a lot of pain to educate the Nauruan people and to bring them to the stage of establishing this Local Government Council. What we feel is that, having taken so many pains to educate them and to tell them how to make it function, it might have been wise on the part of the Administering Authority to go a little further and to advise them that when they started passing substantial laws they might start with some popular measure and then go on to measures which would probably have been received with some hesitation by the local people. It was purely an expression of views by the Mission that if the Council, as its first measure of enforcing its authority, could have started on some popular measure, it would have been better.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): My only reply to that is this: that the Local Government Council is set up to do a job of work and make rules for the benefit of the Nauruan people. It is not there to bring forth something that is popular but something that is necessary at a particular time. Straying stock has interfered with the hygienic arrangements which are made on the island, and this particular rule was made to assist the Public Health Authorities in the maintaining of hygienic measures throughout the island. It was an absolutely necessary measure. Personally, I think it was just as well the Nauru Council was prepared to face up to it and face up to its responsibilities, irrespective of whether it was popular or not.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I do not want to prolong the discussion of this question, but I should like to say that I still maintain, while appreciating that the step that has been taken is a necessary step, that they could as well have started with several other measures on which action is urgently needed.

My next question relates to the Local Government Council's proposal with regard to the future of Nauruans and their desire to be resettled in Australia. I should like to ask the special representative if he is in a position to give any further information beyond what is already contained in his opening statement.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): No, I have no further information to add. As I believe I mentioned in my opening statement, the first notice we had had from the Nauruan people of this feeling with regard to settling in Australia was when they approached the Visiting Mission, and of course we have really had no time yet to go into the matter thoroughly and to study the pros and cons. We shall do so, and in the next annual report no doubt we shall be able to give full particulars of the results achieved and of what has happened with regard to this feeling expressed by the Nauruan people.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I am not sure that the special representative will be in a position to answer my next question at the present time, but I will proceed nevertheless. It has been stated that the main obstacle to resettlement in Australia is the fear that if the Nauruans go there they will not be able to remain as a separate community but will have to be completely assimilated into the population. On the assumption that the Nauruan people do not insist upon remaining a separate community, will the Australian Government be prepared to consider their resettlement in Australia?

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): That is a matter which affects the policies of the Administering Authority rather than those of the Administration of the Trust Territory, and, with permission, I would answer the question. The answer is that naturally this possibility would be considered by the Administering Authority.

There is no constitutional or legal obstacle to a settlement of this kind. There is the real practical difficulty to which the special representative pointed in his opening statement that it would be contrary to the whole conception of the Australian nation to agree to accept the settlement in Australia of a community as such which would retain its identity. It would be very difficult for the Australian Government to accept any kind of immigrant other than one who became assimilated as soon as possible into the mainstream of the Australian community. Of course, if the Nauruan people decide that what they want is settlement in Australia on those terms that is a matter which will be considered by the Australian Government.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I thank the representative of Australia for his reply. I myself know about the difficulties of the Nauruans going into Australia and remaining there as a separate community. I was merely trying to ascertain whether, on the assumption that they were prepared to be assimilated, the Australian Government would give due consideration to this question. I asked the question particularly because from such information as the Visiting Mission has been able to gather so far it would appear that the Australian Government has not yet found a place where it would be possible for the Nauruans to go and settle as a community. If that is the case, and if the ultimate solution is going to be their settlement in any place where they will have to be assimilated and cannot remain as a community, I wonder whether it would be in some ways easier if they tried to go to Australia. I am fully aware of the difficulty of giving an immediate answer to my question, and I realize that this is a matter which has to be considered carefully by the Australian Government. I hope that the Administering Authority will give it due consideration and provide detailed information on the subject in its next annual report.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I can assure the representative of India that the points he has raised will receive serious consideration from the Australian Government which, in view of the fact that this matter is being raised by the Nauruan people, will no doubt be called upon to consider its attitude towards the proposal in the near future.

Mr. CHACKO (India): In his statement the special representative said that the Australian Government would be prepared to provide the necessary financial resources for the future settlement of the Nauruans when that became necessary. This was, in fact, a point which was also mentioned to the Visiting Mission while it was in Canberra. I should like to ask for one clarification in this respect, namely, whether the Australian Government has given any thought to the possible amount that might be required in this connexion, and I should like to refer particularly to paragraph 50 (b) of the Visiting Mission's report (T/1256) where some of the special requirements mentioned by the Nauruan community are quoted.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I think that it will be appreciated by the Council that until we have some concrete plans and some basis on which we can arrive at even a rough approximation of the cost, it is impossible to make an estimate. It is for that reason that I have been authorized by my Government to assure the Council that whatever the costs may be they will be forthcoming.

Mr. CHACKO (India): I have only one more question under this heading. It relates to positions occupied by Nauruans in the Administration. My delegation is fully aware of the difficulties in the way of Nauruans being given higher positions in the Administration because there are not enough trained persons available at the present moment. The Visiting Mission has suggested that, instead of giving the Nauruans top positions, it might be possible to create some intermediate jobs in certain departments in which some of the Nauruans could be placed so that they could obtain practical training. Would the Special representative like to comment on that suggestion?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Actually, in quite a number of departments the position is already that desired by the Visiting Mission. Let me take, for example, the radio officer whose position was mentioned earlier. The number two position is held by a Nauruan.



(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

I feel confident that if later he shows that he has the necessary technical qualifications it will be possible to appoint him to the first position. In the Public Works Department the only senior position held by a Nauruan is that of Director while the next position, that of senior foreman, as well as the other position of foreman in the various sections of the Works Department, is also held by a Nauruan. In the administrative staff, all the second positions are held by Nauruans and the same applies to the Survey Department, where the senior draughtsman, who is next to the surveyor, is a Nauruan. All have been given opportunities to increase their knowledge and experience with a view to their eventual qualification for the top position. In the Department of Police, as I have informed the Council, we have created two ranks of commissioned officer and we hope that the sergeant-major who has already been promoted to one of the positions of sub-inspector may eventually be competent to take the senior position.

Perhaps what the Visiting Mission had in mind went a little further than that and perhaps they were thinking of the posts of Assistant Director of Works and of Assistant Surveyor. When it comes to executive positions of that kind, however, we believe that the persons appointed must have some technical qualifications and it may be that some of the younger Nauruans who are now passing examinations in Australia will eventually qualify. The suggestion of the Visiting Mission will certainly be considered and when the time comes consideration will be given to the possibilities of advancing these people.

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

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): My task has been lightened considerably by the representatives who have preceded me in putting questions to the special representative. I find myself now with only a few questions and perhaps some of them are a bit superfluous since they have already been answered in part. However, I shall try to obtain further information from the special representative on some of these points.

My first question concerns a subject that aroused my curiosity. It relates to the woman in the Territory who was a candidate in the elections. Was she elected?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): No sir, she failed to be elected.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): I was interested in learning whether she had been elected and whether she had obtained a substantial number of votes so as to assess the position of women in politics in the Territory. I am sorry to learn that this person was not elected and I hope that in the future she will be able to realize her ambition.

My second question relates to the public service. Chapter 4, page 14 of the report, speaks of the Territorial Administration, of which the Administrator is the head. This Territorial Administration consists of the Departments of the Secretariat, Accounts and Customs, Health, Nauruan Affairs, Police and Prisons and so on. I should like to know exactly what the Department of Nauruan Affairs is and what it does. When I was in the Territory I heard a great deal about that Department but I still do not clearly understand its functions.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Nauruan Affairs officer has quite a number of duties which are mainly connected with direct dealings with the Nauruan people. They can go directly to him and make complaints, discuss matters of land ownership or anything at all which affects their everyday life. When cases of need arise, those who want help take their cases to the Nauruan Affairs officer who places them before the Administrator. At the present time, the Nauruan Affairs officer is also a magistrate in the lower court.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): In this connexion, is there any type of liaison between the Nauruan Affairs officer and the Council on Nauruan Affairs?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): No sir, there is no direct liaison, although at present the Nauruan Affairs officer is a councillor. Before the recent elections, he was also the head chief. Now that he has been replaced as head chief, although he is still a councillor, that in no way influences his work as a public service officer.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): My next question relates to the Standing Committee on Finance, which was created by the Council on Nauruan Affairs. I have noted from the statement of the special representative, the report of the Administering Authority and, in particular, the report of the Visiting Mission, that the budget of the Territory is almost exclusively the responsibility of the Administering Authority. In view of this fact, what are the functions of the Committee on Finance?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The committees referred to by the representative of Syria are within the Local Government Council itself. They naturally are concerned with the finances of that Council. The finances made available to the Council, as I am sure the members of the Trusteeship Council are aware, pass through the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund. That transfer has now been earmarked for expenditure by the Council.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): My final question relates to the future resettlement of the Nauruans. I have read in the statement of the special representative that the Administering Authority has in the course of the last year made certain investigations in Papua and New Guinea with a view to the future resettlement of the Nauruans. What reasons led the Administering Authority to conclude that these sites were not suitable for resettlement? In this connexion, I should also like to know whether the Nauruans themselves were consulted and participated in that investigation. While on this question, I should like to ask what are the other sites that the Administering Authority intends to investigate in the future.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I think that the Council will be aware that certain requirements are needed in regard to any future home for the Nauruan people. What we are looking for is a fairly extensive area where there are favourable possibilities of agriculture. Naturally, we are also seeking an area that is within reasonable distance of secondary and other industries which will enable the Nauruans who have acquired certain skills, and those whom we hope in the future will acquire even greater skills, to obtain employment. It has to have a suitable water supply that can be developed into a proper water supply. If possible, it should be in a coastal area for preference or on a navigable river.

One of the difficulties we have found, of course, is getting an area which is under-populated or is not populated at the present time. Thus far we have not been able to locate an area that fulfils those requirements or even, shall we say, most of those requirements. The Nauruan people have not actually accompanied the survey parties which the Administration of Papua and New Guinea have been sending out to inspect these places, but they have been kept informed of the areas which we have surveyed and looked at and we have more or less explained to them the reasons why they have been considered unsuitable. We have three areas at the present time in New Guinea which we think may be suitable. If it proves that they are not, we will extend our search further abroad into the Pacific generally. But so far there has been no concrete movement in that direction.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): I would like to put an additional question. I do not know whether the special representative or the representative of Australia would wish to answer it. Paragraph 56 of the Visiting Mission's report indicates that this question of the future resettlement of the Nauruans has been discussed with the Minister for Territories. The Visiting Mission's report states that he has been receptive to this idea of creating a joint committee composed of Nauruans and members of the Administration in Nauru. I am wondering whether the representative of Australia or the special representative could give some indication as to whether the Australian Government has taken any steps with respect to the suggestion of the Visiting Mission, in view of the favourable response of the Minister for Territories. It is a rather long paragraph and I do not wish to read it. If my question is not clear, I will be glad to quote paragraph 56.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I am aware that there has been a suggestion that a joint consultative body should be established expressly for the purpose of investigating the resettlement of the Nauruans and it will undoubtedly receive consideration. In my opening statement I think that I did touch upon it. I said the following:

"The Visiting Mission's suggestion that a joint consultative body should be established expressly for this purpose" -- that is, the purpose of the resettlement of the Nauruans -- "will, of course, receive consideration in the continuing review of this matter in the light of developments." (T/PV.714, page 81)

This was discussed very recently between the Visiting Mission and the Secretary for the Department of Territories in Canberra and no action has actually been taken on it as yet. But they did mention to me, to make it clear, that the matter will definitely be considered.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like first to put a question to the special representative concerning the powers and functions of the members of the Local Government Council. According to section 43 of the Ordinance in question, and with the agreement and approval of the Administrator and the laws of Nauru, the Council is empowered to carry out any works for the benefit of Nauruans and co-operate with the Administration of Nauru and any other body providing public or social service. These are the powers of that Council. The special representative was kind enough to tell us that in the past that Council was somewhat slow in exercising its functions or powers and that it was not due to financial limitations that some of these projects were not carried forward. Nevertheless, I should like to refer to the last portion of paragraph 38 of the Visiting Mission's report which states that the Visiting Mission was informed by the members of that Council that the money which the Council received was far from adequate to meet the expenses involved in such important projects as the establishment of fishing facilities, the improvement of roads, and the promotion of agricultural activities which had been under serious consideration by the Council.



I should like to ask the special representative whether he considers that the current revenue of that Council is adequate to carry out these projects which the Council has under consideration.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): All the projects which have actually been suggested to the Administration by the Local Government Council are not equal to the sum which is available to them under the Nauruan Royalty Trust Fund. The representative of Guatemala mentioned roads, agriculture and fishing. I might add that all those projects are Administration projects and were not submitted or suggested by the Nauruan people themselves; the work that has been done up to date on those projects has been paid for from Administration funds.

As far as the fishing industry is concerned, all efforts by the Administering Authority to get the Nauruan people interested in fishing have failed; they have shown practically no interest whatsoever. I gave some details in that regard, I think, about two years ago, when a real effort was made to get the Nauruan people interested in fishing.

The agricultural project, which has been mentioned in this Council and by the Visiting Mission, we regret to say, has not been as progressive as we had anticipated, owing to the lack of a supply of suitable water. The expenses of that project will be met from Administration funds. The roads are also, at the present moment, an Administration liability. If and when the maintenance of roads is handed over to the Local Government Council and it is then found that the funds available in the Nauruan Royalty Trust Fund are insufficient, further financial assistance will undoubtedly be made available. The same would apply to any extension beyond the experimental farm which we plan to aid the Nauruans and to re-educate them in agricultural knowledge, which they have completely lost. In any such development by the Nauruan people themselves, to cover the cost, plus any cost that may be required for maintenance of roads, and any other project which they desire to manage and handle more or less by themselves, funds will be made available. But at the present time the funds available are undoubtedly adequate and, as I have mentioned, this is proved by the fact that last year there was more than £6,000 surplus funds remaining in the Nauruan Royalty Trust Fund. We anticipate this year that the income to that Fund will be £15,000. With that surplus of £6,000, they will then have nearly £22,000 available for any projects which they desire to take over.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): In view of what the special representative has said, I should like to know whether he would wish to make any further comment on the expression of views given by the Local Government Council to the Visiting Mission. In paragraph 38 of the Mission's report we find the following statement: "The Council informed the Mission that this revenue was far from adequate to meet the expenses involved in such important projects as the establishment of fishing facilities, the improvement of roads, and the promotion of agricultural activities...". The Council was not referring to matters in the hands of the Administration, which are normally under its control, but had in mind the carrying out of certain projects under section 43 of the Ordinance governing the functions of the Council. I should like to know whether the special representative wishes to comment a little further on this -- whether the Administration knows anything about these projects which the Council had in mind -- not the Administration's projects, but those of the Council.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The position is that the activities of the Council which are undertaken under section 43 of the Ordinance are handled on a budgetary basis. That is, the Council submits to the Administrator what it desires to carry out, or a forecast of its activities, and gives an estimate considered to be sufficient for those activities. The Nauruan Royalty Trust Fund is a part of its revenue to be fitted in with its budget. If any additional money were required, the first thing which the Administration would want, of course, would be a plan which could be examined, with the Nauruans, to decide on the amount of money from the Trust Fund or other funds which would be required. So far, the plans and requirements submitted by the Council have not been equal to the amount of money which is available to it for its particular purpose. The special projects which have been mentioned by the representative of Guatemala are unknown to me, and I have no record from the Administration of any concrete plan or application made by the Nauruan people to take part in those particular activities.

I would at this moment draw attention to the fact that the Nauruan Local Council complained to the previous Visiting Mission that it had not sufficient powers and wanted them extended. At that time it had not exercised one of the

(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

powers which it has under the Ordinance. Possibly when the members were discussing matters with the recent Visiting Mission they had these ideas in mind and mentioned them in a general way, but they have not as yet put them in concrete form to the Administration.

Mr. ROIZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to the problem of the resettlement of the population, which is probably the most important confronting the Nauruans with regard to their future, I should like the special representative to be good enough to give some further information about the important statements made in this connexion. The first statement was made to the Visiting Mission by the Minister of Territories of Australia when he stated that when the time came, there would be adequate funds to provide for resettlement of the Nauruans. The second statement was made by the special representative at our meeting on Tuesday, 26 June, when he said that authorization had been given to him to tell the Council that there would be adequate funds when the time came to provide for the requirements of the Nauruan people to be resettled abroad, and that they would have all necessary assistance, whether in the form of technical assistance, training or advice, which would be provided on a broad and generous basis.

(Mr. Rolz Bennett, Guatemala)

These very important statements have no doubt been received with great satisfaction. In this connexion I should like to ask the special representative whether he can, at this stage of the debate, tell us in general terms whether the fund will include the necessary money for the construction of housing and for other work involved in the resettlement of the people in one or more localities, whichever may be necessary.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I cannot state specifically that housing will be provided, because the general statement made by the Administering Authority was to the effect that all funds needed for the resettlement would be forthcoming. The statement did make mention of technical assistance and of other matters to which the representative of Guatemala has referred, and I think it can be accepted that one of the main things needed in the resettlement of the people will be housing. I think it can be accepted also that the general statement made by the Administering Authority to the Visiting Mission was meant to convey that housing, schools and other buildings would be part of the resettlement plan.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): In that case, I assume that the fund will cover everything necessary to ensure that the Nauruans will be able to take up their lives again in another locality at the level which they will then have attained on their island of Nauru. I also assume that everything will be done to maintain the people during the period of readjustment between the time of their displacement and the time when they become accustomed to their new home.

I should also like to ask whether in the preliminary thinking on this question any consideration has been given to the idea that the fund should be made up out of special contributions or whether it will include the royalties which are now used in other ways for the benefit of the Nauruan people.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Administering Authority accepts without reservation the responsibilities which will fall upon it in connexion with the resettlement of the Nauruan people. Most of our thinking, of course, is in connexion with a general resettlement of the Nauruan community as a whole, and most of the remarks which I have made and which I shall now make refer to that form of



(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

resettlement. The Administering Authority anticipates that an area will be purchased for the people, that necessary buildings and other services will be provided, that the people will be given technical assistance in the development of agriculture, and that they will be given training in various trades and professions. If they are moved more or less as a complete community within a matter of a few years it will undoubtedly be the responsibility of the Administering Authority to see that they are settled in and given an opportunity to become self-sufficient before assistance is withdrawn. In general terms, the resettlement of the Nauruans can be taken, I think, to cover all the things that are necessary to establish them in a new home.

There is, of course, another aspect which may develop, and that is that some of the Nauruans, particularly those who acquire various skills, may leave Nauru themselves and go to other territories or countries where they will be able to settle without very much assistance from the Administration. That would be a separate problem and each case would have to be dealt with on its merits, but so far as community resettlement is concerned everything necessary to establish them in a new home, within reason -- it is not of course anticipated, nor would it be expected, that the Administering Authority would maintain them forever without working -- will be provided. Eventually, of course, they will have to settle in and become self-sufficient and pay their own way. Every assistance will be given to enable them to do that and until such time as they are able to do it, and have had ample and reasonable opportunity to do it, the responsibility for assisting and maintaining them will rest with the Administering Authority.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is aware that the Administering Authority is deeply and actively concerned about the future of the Nauruan people and that it has the problem under continuing consideration. It also knows that the Visiting Mission's suggestion that the Administering Authority should associate the Nauruans more directly with the consideration of the problem is being heeded and that also is gratifying to us. My delegation would like to know whether consideration has been given to taking any further steps in the future to associate the population of Nauru more directly with the study of its own future.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I am not too clear what information the representative of Guatemala seeks. We are at present consulting the population on every step and we are also discussing with them the problems that lie ahead in regard to resettlement. Further, we have informed them of the steps the Administering Authority is willing to take. I am not too sure what further steps the representative of Guatemala is referring to unless he means the establishment of the joint committee suggested by the Visiting Mission. In answer to, I think, the representative of Syria, I stated that that suggestion would be given every consideration and I also referred to it in my opening address, saying that the Administering Authority had taken note of the Visiting Mission's suggestion and, in the continuing work connected with the resettlement of the Nauruans, would give consideration to the formation of such a consultative body.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): In a meeting which the Visiting Mission had with the consultative body, the members told the Mission that they had wished to submit the suggestion that consideration should be given to their resettlement in Australia rather than in other parts of the Pacific as had been originally proposed. They said that this had been under consideration for some time and that the suggestion had been supported by a majority of the Nauruan population. The Mission had an opportunity, in a general way, to test the opinion of the Nauruans and it did not find that all of them were in favour of the idea, although it appeared that the suggestion was finding increasing favour. Many representatives have referred to this point and while I do not wish to go back over the same ground I should like to know whether the special representative could tell us to what he attributes the fact that there has been this change of opinion, which is apparently a very sudden change in the way of thinking of the Nauruans. I call it sudden because the special representative and the Administering Authority told us that they had had no previous knowledge of this opinion on the part of the Nauruans. How can this sudden change in their viewpoint, this coming around to this suggestion, be explained?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I have not had the opportunity of discussing this with the Nauruan people. Although it had been mentioned just before my visit to Nauru, it was not known to me. I had not seen the Visiting Mission's report and was not actually made aware that this had happened. I think that it will be very interesting for the Administration when it makes its inquiries and ascertains why the people have reached this decision. There is one suggestion I could make, of course, and it is a suggestion that I made some time ago in connexion with a similar application from some indigenous people. It is that they have formed a very good impression of the Administering Authority through its officers and its activities in helping them, and think that it might be a good idea if they could resettle in the country of the Administering Authority. I offer that only as a suggestion.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the special representative for his reply. For the moment I have no other questions.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As was the case at our meeting yesterday, there are some questions which may overlap with points which we have put to the special representative at previous sessions, but since the Territory is progressing as time goes on I am obliged to raise some questions which are not entirely new and which may cover the same ground we went over at our last session.

My first question relates to a comment which appears in paragraph 23 of the Visiting Mission's report with regard to relations between the Administering Authority and the British Phosphate Commissioners. It is stated there that the Administering Authority does not exercise direct control over the activity of those Commissioners. To the best of my recollection the Administering Authority commented somewhat differently on this state of affairs at previous sessions of the Council. Is the situation exactly as stated in the Visiting Mission's report, or has the special representative any other comment on the subject?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): In my opening address I took particular care to cover the point raised by the Soviet Union representative because I did have in mind when preparing my observations the comment by the Visiting Mission which no doubt reflected an impression it had gained during its visit from some

(Mr. Jones, Special  
representative)

source or other. It was for this reason that I went into this rather fully. I have no doubt that the representative of the USSR has a copy of my opening statement before him, and I would refer him to what I said on page 8 of the distributed text. I have nothing to add to that which would in any way help him or the Council. As for the question whether the position is the same now as it was twelve months ago, all I can say is that it is the same now as it has been ever since the ordinances which govern the Territory have been in force. There has been no amendment to any ordinance that would in any way affect the authority of the Administration.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I remember the statements made in the special representative's opening address. As far as I understood them their purport was that the Administering Authority was not subordinated to the Phosphate Commissioners. But there is no question of the Administering Authority's being subordinated to the Commissioners. The question is whether the Administering Authority is in a position to issue instructions to those Commissioners. In other words, are the Commissioners under the control of the Administering Authority? Could we have some specific indication in this connexion? How is the company operated? If this point was dealt with in the special representative's opening statement, I should be grateful if he would tell me where. It seems to me that only general observations were included in that opening statement to the effect that the Administering Authority was not under the authority of the Commissioners of the British Phosphate Company.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I think that perhaps if I read out again what I said in my opening statement that will make it quite clear that the British Phosphate Commissioners are operating as any other private company would operate in any other country. They are responsible for the management of their own affairs within their industry and for the control of their staff, but they are subject to the laws of the Territory in which they are working. That is, briefly, the position with regard to Nauru. As I say, I will read again from my opening statement so that the situation shall be clear:



(Mr. Jones, Special  
representative)

"Notwithstanding the implicit doubts of the Visiting Mission in this connexion, the Administration of the Territory is not subordinate to the Phosphate Commissioners. The Mission stated that it 'noted the commanding position of the British Phosphate Commissioners, who control and operate the phosphate industry, the economic mainstay of the Territory, and over whose activities the Administration exercises no direct control, although the British Phosphate Commissioners are, of course, subject to the labour legislation of the Territory' (T/1256, para. 23).

"In another passage, the Mission describes the Commissioners as 'virtually an autonomous body'."

I felt that that statement could be somewhat misleading, and it was for that reason that I went into some detail in describing what the position was. I went on:

"This is a conception, I suggest, which is out of line with the constitutional, the political and the practical situations. The British Phosphate Commissioners operating in Nauru control no one but their own employees, and certainly not the Administration of the Territory. The operations of the Commissioners are under the direct control of the Administration," --

I might just interrupt here to say that that does not mean the technical operations but the operations in a general way being subject to the laws of the Territory --

"and subject to all legislation in the Territory, and not solely the labour legislation. In so far as their purely technical operations are concerned they, like most industries in independent States, are free to go about their work according to their own methods, but even this freedom is subject to major restrictions. As an example of this, I would point out that the Lands Ordinance 1921-1951 governs their activities in respect of the use of phosphate-bearing land, and that, amongst other substantial powers placed upon him by that Ordinance, the Administrator alone is empowered to determine what lands are to be classed as phosphate-bearing lands. Let me add that the budgetary independence of the Administration vis-à-vis the British Phosphate Commissioners is complete and is assured." (T/PV.714, pp. 77-78)

In that statement I tried to make it clear to the Council that the British Phosphate Commissioners were subject to the laws of the Territory and, for general administration purposes on the island, subject to the authority of the Administration.



Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I raised this point in connexion with possible questions on the economic situation of the Territory. I understand that the Trusteeship Council asked the Administering Authority repeatedly to expand the information relating to the activities of the British Phosphate Commissioners in the Territory. Since all requests are addressed to the Administering Authority and not to the Commissioners in this connexion, it might perhaps be desirable at a later stage to clarify the difficulties which arise from the fact that the Administering Authority does not co-operate fully with the Council but denies it information concerning the activities of the Phosphate Commissioners. I reserve my right to ask this question later on when we discuss the economic situation.

My next question is a purely technical one. The Local Government Council consists of nine members. Is the chief elected at the same time as the eight other members, or are nine members first elected and then a chief selected from among their number? I am not quite clear from reading the document how the chief is selected.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The nine members are elected first and then the Local Government Council elects its head chief and chairman from any of the nine members of the Council.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Is this chief a popular individual? Has he been in his position for a long time or has there been much fluctuation?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Council will remember Mr. Detsidamo who was the head chief for very many years in Nauru. I am not sure of the period, but it was thirty or forty years. He died about four or five years ago. He was replaced by Mr. Raymond Gadabu who was a member of the first council elected in 1951. He remained head chief until the recent elections when a new council was elected. If I remember right, there were two or three previous council members who were re-elected and the others are all new members. They then elected Mr. Hammer de Roburt as the head chief in place of Mr. Raymond Gadabu.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Could a member of the Local Government Council, upon his own initiative and without the agreement of the Administering Authority, introduce some draft law or draft degree which could then be promulgated by the Local Government Council? Do the members have this right of initiative of putting forward legislation?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Yes, they have full freedom to do so.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to know whether the entire Territory comes within the authority of the Local Government Council or whether there are any territorial exceptions?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Council is a local government council and its authority extends to all the Nauruan people and to all the areas of land owned by the Nauruan people. They have no jurisdiction or authority to pass any rules which would effect any land which has been, shall I say, alienated.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is well known, in Nauru there are areas where other nationalities live, not Nauruans. Does the jurisdiction of the Local Government Council extend to the areas where immigrants live?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Generally speaking, no. They come under the direct jurisdiction of the Administration.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Is this land where the immigrants live Administration land or does it belong to Nauruans?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): It belongs to the Administration. It is land that has been acquired by the Administration.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In this connexion, are there immigrants who live on land which has not been alienated but which actually belongs to Nauruans?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): No. There are a number of other Pacific Islanders living in the Nauruan area, but they are there at the invitation of the Nauruan people and actually form part of the Nauruan community now.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We must conclude that 207 acres belonging to the Administration is land which has been alienated. What about the land that is rented by the Phosphate Commissioners? Does the jurisdiction of the Local Government Council extend to the land which has been rented but without being alienated? This land has been rented by the Phosphate Commissioners.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): When I used the term "land that had been alienated", I included all land which is held under lease, which of course will eventually revert back to the Nauruan people. But during the period that the leased land remains under lease, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Administration.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Therefore, we may conclude that the jurisdiction of the Local Government Council extends only to the inhabitants of Nauru and that it does not include land under lease or alienated, and that it does not cover other inhabitants of the Territory such as immigrants or employees of the Administering Authority, and so forth. My next question pertains to paragraph 39 of the report of the Visiting Mission.

(Mr. Grubyakov, USSR)

Perhaps we could have some comments." It is stated here that, in the view of the Administrator, the Council "was not in a position to make useful comments on the budget of the Administration". This sentence gives rise to some confusion as to what the Administration had in mind when that view was expressed.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I take it that what the Administrator had in mind was the fact that in so far as the management of its own local affairs is concerned, the Local Government Council had not shown sufficient competence or experience and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by placing it in a position where it would be asked to offer advice in regard to budgetary matters.

In my opening statement in connexion with that part of the report I said:

"... I am in a position to state that in the light of the suggestion made by the Mission in paragraph 39 of its report, steps are being taken to see whether the Local Government Council may be given the opportunity of studying the territorial budget in some form." (T/PV.714, page 72).

That means that, while the Local Government Council may not be asked its views in a general way, it might be approached in regard to propositions that are being made in regard to the Nauruan people or for the benefit of the Nauruan people. I do not know exactly what was in mind, but it was a step in the direction suggested by the Visiting Mission.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I take it from the statement of the special representative that members of the Local Government Council do not have the knowledge and experience which would enable them to participate in consultations on the budget of the Territory. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Not to any useful purpose.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My next question pertains to the rights of immigrants. It is stated in the report of the Visiting Mission that immigrants form almost half the population. The report also states that "when the Nauruan Local Government Council.... gradually develops into a legislative body," it is not readily to be expected that "the non-Nauruans will be content that it should pass legislation affecting their interests



(Mr. Grubyakov, USSR)

without such interests being represented". (T/1256, page 21). I should like to know to what extent consultations with the persons concerned take place with regard to the issuing of legislation.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The people referred to as immigrants by the representative of the USSR are immigrant workers; they are not immigrants in the true sense of the word. They have not immigrated to Nauru for the purpose of settling there. Considering the scarcity of land in Nauru, the Administering Authority would be, I think, acting within its powers if it recommended that no immigrants should be allowed. But the question does not arise for the simple reason that nobody desires to immigrate to Nauru, I take it, because there is no particular reason why they should. Therefore, the problem which we have to deal with and which has been mentioned by the representative of the USSR, is the problem of immigrant workers. They are engaged in their homelands for a specific period of employment, and part of the agreement is, of course, that they will return to their own homes -- which is their own desire -- at the termination of that agreement, unless they receive the authority of the Administration to remain on the island as workers. At the present time quite a high percentage of the Chinese workers have been on the island for more than ten years. Some have been there for as long as twenty years; quite a number have been there for a period of five years or more.

So far as the other Pacific Islands are concerned -- mainly, Gilbert and Ellice Islands -- the people from there, for the most part, return home after the period of their employment. There would, therefore, be no point in discussing with those workers any laws relating to their stay on the island. The labour laws of the Territory govern their employment there, and the agreements which they enter into are drawn up, in the first place, in their own home areas -- for the Chinese, in China, for example. When they come to the Territory they are finally approved, or otherwise, after they have been seen by the Administrator and have expressed their willingness to be employed under the conditions laid down in the agreement.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should not like to remain under the impression, which may be an incorrect one, that, according to paragraph 40 of the Visiting Mission's report, a distinction is made between the possible future administration of Nauru and the

(Mr. Grubyakov, USSR)

present administration. It is said that when a legislative body has been formed, the immigrants will not easily accept not having their interests represented. At the present time there is an Australian Administration in the Territory, which probably will protect the interests of these people, but the impression is that this paragraph expresses some doubt as to the future objectivity or justice of the organ which might be created.

And it will be necessary for the immigrants to have representatives in the legislative body otherwise their interests will not be protected. I would not like to retain the impression that the objectivity of that future organ is in question. Perhaps the special representative could comment on this.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I would say that that is a problem for the future, and at this stage I would not care to offer any comments on what the solution may be.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I understand that this is a problem for the future and that it is a hypothetical one. Yet this paragraph seems to contain some doubts as to the qualifications of the local legislative body, and that is why I asked my question.

I am using this report of the Visiting Mission because it is a new document. We receive the reports of the Administering Authority every year, but we receive this only once every three years. The fact that I am quoting from the Visiting Mission's report does not mean that we did not devote the necessary attention to the report of the Administering Authority. Paragraph 45 of the Visiting Mission's report refers to the training of qualified Nauruans for certain administrative and governmental positions, and there is a reference to the raising of the skills of Nauruans in general so that they may be qualified for economic, financial and other positions. A report has been prepared by Mr. Eltham who visited Nauru during August-September 1954. The Visiting Mission draws attention to this fact. My question is simple. About two years have elapsed since the visit of Mr. Eltham. Perhaps the special representative could tell us whether the report was of special interest or perhaps it was not from the point of view of the political usefulness as regards the Territory because the Administering Authority apparently has not given consideration to that report for two years. Perhaps that report is not worth consideration.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Although the visit was made towards the end of 1954 and one or two suggestions were made shortly after the visit, the report itself was not received until some time later. In effect actually, we have been giving effect to quite a number of the suggestions submitted by Mr. Eltham. One of these, a very important one, I think, I mentioned in my opening address. This related to the Nauru secondary school. The Nauru Secondary school is housed in a very excellent building which is now providing quite a number of courses and also adult education in the evenings. Many of the courses are in line with the suggestions of Mr. Eltham. As I mentioned in my opening statement, the courses of the secondary school were originally adjusted to a syllabus of the University of Melbourne's intermediate examination but, accepting the advice of Mr. Eltham we have incorporated some new subjects. These are technical subjects and will enable students to obtain the Victorian Junior Technical Certificate and the Intermediate Technical Certificate. I mention at the time that this does emphasize the technical side of the school's activities, and I mentioned that it was in line with the recommendations of Mr. Eltham. Although that is the only specific mention made of how we are giving effect to Mr. Eltham's suggestions, I can assure the representative of the USSR that we are in general more or less going to give effect to many of the suggestions which he made which will undoubtedly benefit the Nauruan people.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have one more question which will be my last. We have discussed the complicated question of the achievement of independence and self-government of Trust Territories. In connexion with the discussion of that problem, my present question is as follows: the Administering Authority in my opinion, in this specific case of Nauru, is carrying on consultations in connexion with the future of the Territory in the physical sense of the term. Did the Administering Authority hold consultations in which the political future of the Territory of Nauru was considered with the indigenous population or with representatives of indigenous population? Have there been consultations where the population was consulted not only on what will happen when the Island will no longer be suitable for settlement, but was the future status of the Territory discussed, not after forty or eighty years but at an earlier stage?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I think it is a rather complicated question to talk about the political future of the Nauruan people at this stage when their future is so uncertain. Despite that fact and that probably in forty or fifty years time or even before that when they leave the Island and resettle elsewhere, of course any steps taken in regard to final political developments will be taken in so far as they will come under the Government of whatever country they may go to or to whatever country they may be transferred. The most that we can expect, and they are quite aware of this, is that they may be able to keep their identity as Nauruans and have their own Local Government Council. So far as their political future on the Island of Nauru is concerned, I think I have explained this. I may also tend to clarify further the question raised by the representative of Haiti yesterday when he asked me certain questions with regards to the local native government. I feel that perhaps I did not reply as fully as I could have if I had really understood his question. At the present time the Nauru Local Government Council has a dual function. One function is as a corporate body. It is a local government council and it is concerned with those things which come within the orbit of a local government council. They are matters of local interest to the Nauruan people and are more or less kept within the boundaries of the Nauruan people and their lands.

The representative of Guatemala a little while ago read out certain authorities and powers which they had relating to going into business or undertaking certain projects.



(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

Under that particular authority, the housing scheme is now under their management and they have a co-operative store, and no doubt as time goes on there will be other projects for which they will be entirely responsible. Then, under the rule-making power they have authority, which of course is usually granted to a local government body, to make rules for their own community. Their other role, which is an unusual one for a local government council to have, is the advisory role, in which they can advise the Administrator, by statutory provision, on laws appertaining to the Territory. All this is designed to assist the Nauruan people in their political development. The extent to which the present Council may be expanded, and the extent to which other powers apart from those which are usual for a local government council may be granted to them, are matters for the future and matters about which I cannot, as special representative, even offer any suggestions at the present time. It will be a case of meeting developments as they come along. All these measures, however, are designed to awaken the political consciousness of the inhabitants and help in their political development in a general way.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As is stated in the report, the phosphate resources of the Territory will be exhausted within forty-five to fifty years. I would not presume to attribute to the Administering Authority the opinion that during that period the indigenous population will not be sufficiently developed or educated to administer its local and domestic affairs. Could the special representative tell us, in the light of the general development of the Territory, whether perhaps a period of twenty or twenty-five years will be too little for the inhabitants of this richly endowed island to attain a degree of education and development sufficient for them to become capable of administering the Territory? I mean of course the domestic administration.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I would not hazard a guess as to how long it will take the Nauruan people to become qualified completely to manage their own affairs. We are affording them the opportunities. We are providing the

(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

facilities for their education. Their advancement depends, as I have already mentioned, on their latent capacity, on their desire and willingness to work and to learn as much as it depends on the facilities. The great unknown quantity, therefore, is the response of the Nauruan people and I would not attempt to try to gauge what that will be. We have to do our best and make every endeavour to promote their advancement, and it will be a matter of waiting to see what their response is and what the rate of their development will be. To try to suggest any time-limit would amount to making a wild guess.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the light of the experience acquired during the past ten years by the Administering Authority in the Territory, would the special representative give us his opinion concerning the extent to which the indigenous population co-operate with the Administering Authority in its efforts to develop the Territory, to raise the educational level and so forth? It seems to me that the Administering Authority's experience is long enough to render possible a judgement about the progress of this development. Or do the measures taken by the Administering Authority in the development of education and culture and so on meet with some resistance on the part of the indigenous population?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): In the last remark of the representative of the USSR I would change the word "resistance" to "lack of interest", and that has been displayed by the Nauruan people for the last forty years, I am afraid. What we are doing now is nothing new, except perhaps that we are intensifying our efforts to persuade them to accept the opportunities offered. However, we have kept Nauruans in Australia up to the age of nineteen or twenty years to pass examinations usually passed by boys of fifteen or sixteen. The opportunities have been there; before the War we had one Nauruan who showed some interest in the opportunities provided and he was doing his second year in medicine. But for reasons which I will not make public to the Council he had to discontinue his studies. I merely mention that to show that the opportunities have definitely existed. There is however one encouraging sign which has been visible during the last few years, particularly among the younger people, who I think are now starting

(Mr. Jones,  
Special representative)

to realize that, since they will have to move to a new home, they must qualify themselves to take their place in the world. There is a definitely increasing interest on the part of the younger people which is encouraging. I have already mentioned that the retardation in the age groups in various classes is showing definite signs of improvement and recently we had the best results in examinations in Australia that we have had for some considerable time. I will not repeat the details, which I gave in my opening statement, but they were very encouraging and included three leaving certificates and twenty-one intermediate certificates, the meaning and the value of which I explained at the time. It is, however, far too early, even in view of that experience, to attempt to judge how long it will be before they reach any particular stage, and I would not attempt to mislead the Council by giving an estimate which would be valueless.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course the Administering Authority is better acquainted with the situation in the Territory, having had forty years of experience, and I think the members of the Visiting Mission are also better informed, but in all sincerity I must tell the special representative that it is difficult for me to imagine that the policy he has described has not, over such a long period, provoked among the population enthusiasm for education and ambition to become doctors, teachers and so forth. To my delegation, the lack of such enthusiasm for cultural advancement is very difficult to understand, although as I have said the Administering Authority is better acquainted with the attitude of the local population.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I do not quite know what the representative of the USSR meant by his last remark. He asked the special representative a number of questions, some of them hypothetical, and the special representative gave full and frank answers. When the representative of the USSR says that he finds it very hard to imagine a state of affairs such as that outlined I hope that he will understand that I feel it necessary to say that the Administering Authority and I as its representative are quite satisfied that the picture given by the special representative is a correct one.

Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not suggest that what was said by the special representative was incorrect. I have the highest regard for what is said by representatives here. I said that the special representative knows better than do I or other representatives here what is happening in the Trust Territory, but that from a general point of view it was difficult for me to visualise how, over such a lengthy period, there have not emerged among the population individual enthusiasts who would want to receive education. That is what is difficult for me to understand. I think that it is perfectly proper for any delegation to have such questions in its mind without doubting in any way the accuracy of statements made to it. As I say, it is surprising to us that there are so few persons among the indigenous population who wish to become educated and literate, or to receive professional training in order to become doctors, for example, or engineers who could work for the phosphate commissioners. As for the replies of the special representative, I am most grateful for them and I consider them as entirely worthy of attention.

Mr. CUTTS (Australia): I am most grateful for the clarification given by the representative of the USSR. I regret very much that we cannot do more to dissipate his difficulties, and I must say that some of his difficulty in understanding this situation and the reasons for it are shared by the Administering Authority.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.