

UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP LIBRARY
COUNCIL

JUN 26 1961



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1155
23 June 1961

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION

Twenty-seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 23 June 1961, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

U TIN MAUNG

(Burma)

Later:

Mr. BINGHAM
(Vice-President)

(United States)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [4f, 6] (continued)
2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru [4e] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1155 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEMS 4f and 6

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDING
30 JUNE 1960 (T/1574; T/L.1014)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE
PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1961 (T/1560)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Goding, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

General debate (concluded)

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): On behalf of my colleagues, Mr. Nucker and Mr. Nakayama, I should like to express their deep appreciation for the kindness and courtesy extended to them by members of this Council. I know that Mr. Nakayama will take back to the people of the Territory the warm expressions of friendship that have been extended to them by the Trusteeship Council. Mr. Nucker, who cannot be here today, wishes me to convey his heartfelt thanks for the tributes paid him by members of this body during this session. I concur in these expressions that Mr. Nucker carried out his duties as High Commissioner in a devoted and outstanding manner and that he will be sorely missed by the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

For my own part, I wish to express my appreciation to all members of the Council for the kind words of welcome they extended to me. I am especially grateful to the President for the patience and courtesy he has demonstrated towards me during the course of the meetings.

I propose to make a very brief concluding statement since I feel that the exhaustive examination which has been made of the Visiting Mission's report and our annual report during the past two weeks has covered almost every aspect of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and has presented clarification on almost all points. I do wish, however, to comment briefly on several specific points brought out in the questioning and in the general debate.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

I have been most impressed by the sincerity with which the members of the Council have approached the problems of our Trust Territory. Though we might not necessarily agree with all the interpretations, suggestions and recommendations, I have felt that, with the exception of those made by one delegation, all have been offered in a spirit of co-operation and constructive assistance. As such, they are worthy of serious reflection on our part, and I can assure the Council that they will receive careful review.

I am grateful for the interventions of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, Ambassador Salamanca, as well as those of his colleagues on the Mission, during the questioning, to amplify certain sections of the Visiting Mission's report. These amplifications I found to be most helpful and informative. They aided me greatly in placing the report in proper perspective.

As I assume my duties as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I am deeply aware that Micronesia, once remote, isolated and little touched by the outside world, is entering the mainstream of the political and economic life that is now quickening the entire Pacific area. It is our role as Administering Authority to encourage and assist the people of the Trust Territory to participate actively and fully in this development. Our own attitude was aptly summarized by the distinguished representative of Paraguay in the following words:

"...we wish to do everything possible to advance the moment when the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, like the peoples of other Territories, have achieved a sufficient degree of political maturity and training to enable them to establish their own political institutions and decide their own destiny."

The development of a Trust Territory-wide political consciousness and the establishment of central government organizations in which Micronesians will play roles of rapidly increasing responsibility are matters of great concern to this Council and to the Administering Authority. This concern underlies the interest in such specific areas as the transfer of the Northern Marianas District to civilian administration, the remolding of the Inter-District Advisory Committee as a legislative body, and the location of the Headquarters within the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The Inter-District Advisory Committee was organized some six years ago, and has been looked upon as the future legislative organ of the Trust Territory. We have outlined certain concrete steps which are being taken to establish within the near future a legislative council solidly based upon the experience and knowledge gained from the Advisory Committee. At the risk of repetition, we should like to point out again that it is proposed at the next session to create a Hold-Over Sub-Committee on Political Development. Its work will supplement and round out the work of the older Social Development and Economic Development Sub-Committees.

Secondly, the Saipan District will send delegates to the September meeting of the Committee, rather than observers as in the past. We anticipate that the active participation of the Saipan representatives as delegates will be a major contribution to the work of the Committee. Thirdly, we shall work toward the popular election of all delegates to the Inter-District Committee.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

In my opening statement I commented that, if the present rate of political growth and progress continues, we envisage the existence of a Territorial Legislative Council by 1965. We believe that the present rate of growth will continue and, in fact, hope that it will accelerate. We do not, therefore, regard 1965 as being the earliest possible date for the creation of a Territorial Legislature. It will be our policy to advance this date, if possible, and we are hopeful of being able to do so. Thus, we can assure the representative from the United Arab Republic and his colleague, the representative from France that, for our part, we shall seek to speed the formation of a Territorial Legislative Council.

A word is necessary with respect to the location of the Trust Territory Government Headquarters. I hasten to point out that the Administering Authority agrees that ultimately the headquarters should and will be located within the Trust Territory itself. While we would further agree that the location of national capitals has frequently been a matter of historical happenstance, we also believe that the people can and should have an opportunity to influence the selection, as has been the tradition in the United States. To this end, I have suggested that the Inter-District Committee should meet in the various districts so as to enable each member to become familiar with each district and thereby form a considered and informed judgement as to the future site of the capital of the Trust Territory.

The United States delegation has also been glad to hear the views of the Visiting Mission and members of the Council with respect to the desirability of unifying the administration of the entire Territory under the High Commissioner. As we have already stated to the Council, this matter has been receiving most careful attention at the highest level of our Government and I can now further say that the Departments concerned are agreed in principle that the administration of the Territory should be unified. The detailed steps for bringing about this unified administration are now in process of being worked out.

As essential underpinnings of political development, emphasis in the past has been put upon the development of democratic institutions at the municipal and district levels. For a people who a few short years ago had little concept of a political identity beyond the village or the clan, the development of representative self-government separate and apart from traditional allegiances has progressed satisfactorily and rapidly, given the geographic circumstances of the Trust Territory and its diversity of languages and cultures. We propose to

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

continue and to intensify political education and training programmes in the districts. It is, after all, on the local level that any people come into close and continuing contact with their government. It is on the local level that participation in governmental processes is a real and personal experience to the average individual.

As the representative from Belgium stated last Wednesday:

"... the rapidity with which a territory can be led to the stage where it would be in a position to govern itself is directly proportionate to the number of problems which are entrusted to the local leaders ..." (T/PV.1125, page 67)

Reference has been made to the programme of chartering municipalities and the thought has been expressed that the goal of chartering at least ten municipalities each year might be increased to fifteen or twenty. We would subscribe to the philosophy of this proposal but in doing so, we must point out that the chartering of a municipality is meaningful only when the people of the municipality understand the concepts embodied in the charter. We believe that the substance, not merely the form, of representative institutions is important.

The Visiting Mission suggested in its report that ways and means should be found to expand the effective functions of the District Congresses. Through the Sub-Committee on Political Development, through strengthening our political affairs staff, and through the efforts of the District Congresses themselves, we are confident that these legislative bodies will achieve increasing authority and responsibility. This matter will, of course, receive our full attention.

In connexion with the development of the District Congresses, and governmental institutions in general, I should like to quote a line from the Visiting Mission's report:

"Though strong attachment to tradition still exists in several parts of the Territory, the elders are beginning to recognize that responsibility should be placed in the most capable hands irrespective of a person's position in traditional society." (T/1560, page 20)

We fully share the view of the Visiting Mission that this is an encouraging development, and we submit that this development is due in large measure to policies of patient and progressive training and education in the political field.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

As the representative from the United Kingdom stated yesterday: "... the touchstone of political advance must be the wishes of the people themselves." (T/PV.1154, (page 20))

Our goal has been to turn over positions of authority to trained and qualified Micronesians in a continuing replacement programme. Some sixty important positions have been taken over by Micronesians in the past ten years and with the intensification of our training programme, both in-service and scholarship training outside the Territory, this replacement should continue.

A number of delegations expressed concern over the fact that senior administrative positions such as District Administrator and Assistant District Administrators have not, as yet, been taken over by Micronesians. The representative of India during the course of the questioning commented that it was his opinion, based on his observation in the Territory, that the Administration already possessed a pool of competent young administrators and therefore our target goal of one or more assistant district administrators by 1964 appeared to him to be rather slow. Other members of the Council put forth somewhat similar views. I agree completely that we have a corps of young, able administrators undergoing training from which our potential senior administrators will come. Our problem now is not one of seeking suitable candidates but one of providing the opportunity for seasoning and experience which a district administrator or assistant district administrator must possess if he is to do a good job for his district and his people. The Council may be assured that Micronesians will be placed in senior positions as rapidly as they gain the necessary experience and demonstrate their competence to handle these assignments..

It was encouraging to note the expression of confidence voiced by the representative of Burma in the progress being made in the social and educational fields. There are many problems to be solved but I am confident that, given the continued and whole-hearted support and co-operation of the people of Micronesia, we shall continue to achieve steady advancement in these important areas. As I indicated in my opening statement, the Social Development Sub-Committee of the Inter-District Advisory Committee currently is engaged in studying social and educational problems and will present a report of findings and recommendations at the forthcoming meeting of the Territory-wide conference of the Inter-District Advisory Committee this fall. This Conference will pay particular attention to elementary education problems.

AP/hm

T/PV.1155
9-10

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The rapidly expanding school population is posing difficult problems for the local communities and for district congresses which provide the funds for payment of elementary school salaries.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The recommendation made by the representative of New Zealand, and concurred in by the representative of China, that the Administration should give additional direct financial aid to the elementary school districts, specifically in the support of teachers' salaries, is one to which we shall give every consideration.

I wish also to note that the Administration already has under study the point brought forth by the representative of India with respect to the lowering of the compulsory age of schooling from the present eight year level. Over 1,000 children under the age of 8 years presently are enrolled in public and private schools. In any case, I wish to assure the representative of India that this recommendation, which was also made by the Visiting Mission, will receive every consideration at the forthcoming Inter-District Conference when problems of education are discussed.

It was most gratifying and encouraging to hear the favourable comments of members of this Council on the general health programme of the Administration. I use the words "gratifying and encouraging" deliberately since this is a programme which is completely handled by Micronesian district directors of public health and their staffs. The commendations of the various members thus will mean a great deal to these dedicated young Micronesian men and women who are working so valiantly in the field of public health in their communities.

I am particularly pleased to carry back to our public health staff the special interest in their work which was expressed by the representative of Australia.

I can assure the Council that we shall make every effort to provide the technical assistance and aid that the Micronesian medical officers may request. We are in full agreement with the Visiting Mission that increased attention must be given to the improvement of health services to the outlying islands. This, indeed, is one of the major programmes of the Department of Health and one which will receive the highest priority.

Action to speed programmes which will increase the productivity of the Territory and provide higher living standards has received the greatest emphasis in the report of the Visiting Mission, in the questioning by members of the Council, and in the very thoughtful and constructive statements made in the general debate. This emphasis on the economic field is by no means misplaced.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The relevant relationship of the economic field to that of the political was effectively highlighted in the careful and well phrased concluding statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. I would only add that this relationship to political development is one that also pertains to each of the other major areas under review, the social and educational. It relates also to land tenure. A sound approach to land use is obviously of fundamental importance to the economic future of the Territory.

While we have found the Visiting Mission's report to be most helpful and generally constructive, we cannot concur with some of the rather sweeping and unqualified observations in paragraph 73 in the introductory chapter on economic advancement. The Mission report states flatly, for example, that "the Territory's main natural economic resources have not as yet been exploited". We agree that they have not yet been fully developed and that with respect to the resources of the sea, for example, they have so far been little exploited in the commercial sense of that term.

However, we believe that the basic agricultural resources have been developed to a very considerable extent and that sound programmes for up-grading the agricultural productivity of the area have been initiated. As we have pointed out during the discussion, a good start has been made in commercial fishing.

Moreover, it seems to us that this particular paragraph in the report might be interpreted to suggest that the Territory enjoys great natural economic resources above and beyond those already developed and in process of development. That this is not the case, at least to any considerable degree, is clearly indicated by other more specific paragraphs of the report.

Great emphasis has properly been placed on the need for intensification of our efforts in the economic field. As I repeatedly indicated during the questioning period, we feel that the time is now at hand for an intensification of our effort. Our economic staff is being strengthened and I hope to increase materially the resources which can be used for an economic development revolving fund.

The potentials of the area are not unknown. Surveys in almost every field have been undertaken in the past and, as I elaborated in an answer to the representative of Australia, in the past several years we have had follow-up studies carried out in such areas of potential development as mineral resources,

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

forestry, fisheries, trochus, cacao, coconut fiber products and the like. I have stated that I conceive the first task of the strengthened economic section at headquarters essentially to be one of up-dating past surveys, as well as developing plans for broad and integrated economic development, rather than the conducting of a new basic economic survey. I would like to assure the representative of Burma that when I remarked that some of the past economic surveys were "out of date" I did not mean to imply that the basic resource data of these surveys were outmoded. I was referring primarily to the fact that marketing conditions may have changed and that the supply and demand factors should be re-evaluated in terms of present day conditions.

I assure the members of the Council that the many detailed recommendations in the economic section of the Visiting Mission's report will receive careful attention. We are indeed most appreciative of the various suggestions made by the Visiting Mission in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, poultry, handicrafts, as well as in matters pertaining to transport and communication. As was noted by the representative of the United Kingdom, we have already taken action on a number of recommendations made by the Visiting Mission in this field, and very likely will act favourably on others after further study. Certain recommendations we may not agree with or find feasible at this stage of economic development. But, again, I would assure the representative of the United Kingdom that, even though, from our viewpoint, certain recommendations, to use his terminology, might seem "somewhat fanciful", they will receive the same careful consideration that will be accorded to all others.

In summary, the United States delegation agrees with the report of the Visiting Mission and with various proposals by members of the Trusteeship Council that increased economic development of the Territory is most important and is indeed basic for the advancement of the Territory towards the objectives of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. The Administering Authority will give careful attention to these proposals and will see what further funds can be made available for stimulating the much needed economic progress of the Territory.

I would be remiss were I not to comment further upon the situation of the people of Rongelap, 82 of whom were exposed to radioactive fall-out in 1954 as

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

the result of a most regrettable mischance. There appears to be no question among the medical personnel who made an intensive study last March that the general physical health of the Rongelapese is satisfactory. The team has advised me that the physical complaints of the Rongelap people who were actually exposed to radioactive fall-out are no more numerous than those of the larger, unexposed population on the island. The medical team found no existing physical illnesses attributable to exposure to radioactive fall-out. With regard to the statement in the Visiting Mission's report that the complaints of the Rongelap people were confirmed by the local Health Aide, I should like to point out, first, that the Mission itself questioned the competence of the Health Aide and, second, that, as one of the persons exposed to fall-out, the Health Aide in question cannot be considered a disinterested observer. As we have previously stated, this Health Aide continues at his post at the specific request of the Rongelap people. We shall nonetheless continue regular physical examinations, making every effort to minimize their psychological impact on the Rongelap people.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The Visiting Mission and many members of this Council have suggested that rehabilitation efforts be intensified, including the stationing of American personnel on Rongelap to live among the people and so to help allay their fears. I should like to point out that an American agriculturist had been stationed on Rongelap for almost two years to assist the Rongelapese in re-establishing agricultural enterprises.

In my opening statement I mentioned that the agricultural rehabilitation programme has now been virtually completed and that the American Agriculturist had turned the programme over to his capable Rongelapese extension agent. The step of withdrawing the American agriculturist was partly taken in a further effort to encourage the community to stand on its own feet.

It should also be pointed out that the problems of rehabilitation are vastly complicated by the fact that many relatives of the people of Rongelap have moved to the island. There are now more than 200 people living in a community which in 1954 numbered 82. The stresses and strains resulting from this influx of population have added considerably to the psychological problems which must be overcome in the rehabilitation of Rongelap.

As to various other matters touched upon in the General Debate, I believe that they are sufficiently covered in statements previously made by me or by Mr. Bingham.

In closing, may I state that, as in previous years, we shall make available to Micronesians throughout the Territory the summary records of this meeting and the closing statements of all the Delegation. I might further add for clarification that these records will be distributed within the next few weeks since it is our practice to have them reproduced in quantity by our own Reports Office. Thus, Micronesian leaders, staff members, students and others will have the complete record for study before the end of July.

There is keen interest in the deliberations of this body throughout the Territory, and, rather than wait for the official printed records which do not reach us for many months, we have felt it well worthwhile to issue preliminary reports so that the people of the Territory may have them as soon as possible after the closing of the debate on our Territory.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

We shall also be glad to prepare and distribute as suggested by the Visiting Mission in paragraph 71 of its report, a document explaining the objectives of the Trusteeship.

May I again thank you, Mr. President, and all of the members of the Council, for your interest in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): With your permission, I would like to supplement briefly the closing statement of our Special Representative, Mr. Goding.

The Council will have noted that Commissioner Goding expressed our Delegation's appreciation for the constructive, realistic and disinterested comments of all but one of the Delegations. We were unable to view most of the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union during the questioning and in the general debate as either constructive, realistic or disinterested. Following the pattern the Soviet Union has established for itself -- a pattern happily not emulated by others -- it has used this Council as a forum solely for propaganda.

Naturally, our silence with regard to the specifics of the comments made by the Soviet Representative should not be understood as acceptance or agreement on our part. I do not wish to take the time of the Council to deal specifically with the various distortions of fact contained in the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, nor with his confused and unrealistic suggestions which have no relation to the wishes of the people of the Territory as so accurately reported by the Members of the Visiting Mission.

I feel it necessary to set the record straight, however, with regard to the Soviet representative's assertion that we "have been propagandizing the idea of converting the Trust Territory into the fifty-first State of the United States of America." The first such mention of this was, so far as I know, made yesterday by Mr. Oberemko, and had its source, I have no doubt, in his lively imagination. No such policy has been adopted by the United States.

It has been, is, and will continue to be our policy that the political future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands must be determined at the appropriate time by the people of the Territory themselves.

(Mr. Bingham, United States)

One final point. We have heard much of the plebiscite which was conducted on Saipan by the Saipanese. Without reference to the many aspects of this, and of the timing of it, I would like to make it quite clear that we in the United States are proud that the Saipanese people think so highly of our society and political system that they expressed the hope of sharing its benefits and responsibilities.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We do not intend in any way to reply in detail to the representative of the United States of America, particularly with regard to the last comment he has just made. Of course, the United States of America in their policy regarding the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are adhering to one policy and one line, and the Soviet Union is adhering to an entirely different position, and is adopting an entirely different course. That is why when we hear such statements as those that neither our comments nor statements are constructive, when, moreover, we hear how these comments and proposals are being labelled "propaganda" -- and apparently the idea is to attribute a majority of meaning to this word "propaganda" -- then we, of course, are obliged to make a short explanation.

In the first instance -- and perhaps only in the United States of America -- the word "propaganda" has any negative significance that if one is to think or reflect upon the actual meaning of that word, then the very meaning of the word "propaganda" does not mean anything in itself. The point is what you propagandize, what you defend. If the representative of the United States of America is to pick up our text and read it over anew he will see, if he wishes to speak of propaganda, that the whole of our statement is propaganda of ideas and premises which are contained in the Charter of the United Nations, and which are contained in the Declaration of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Our statement begins with an assertion of that principle or a confirmation of the fact that all of these provisions must be carried out and implemented in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands -- and our statement was concluded on that note. It was concluded by means of this same propaganda of these noble ideas contained in the Declaration of the General Assembly, and we are not ashamed of

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

that. If the representative of the United States is pleased to call our statement propaganda, let it be so. We do indeed propagandize. We defend, we stand by the provisions of the Declaration of the General Assembly, and we insist that the Administering Authority carry out these provisions.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Such a course of action the representative of the United States labels as not being constructive. On the other hand we have not seen anything constructive either in the concluding statement of the Special Representative of the Administering Authority or in the statement of the representative of the United States which we have just heard.

What does the Administering Authority finally intend to do concretely in order to carry out in practice the provisions of the Declaration of the General Assembly? We see a great gap between its words and the practical actions that it intends to undertake. That is why I must say that the delegation of the Soviet Union proceeded from that position of principle: that it is urgently necessary in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to implement the provisions of the Declaration of the General Assembly. If the representative of the United States does not agree with that, that of course is up to him. But we, the delegation of the Soviet Union, have always adhered to and still adhere to the Declaration of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960, and we believe that it fully and completely applies to the Pacific Islands and that it must be implemented.

As for the comment of the representative of the United States to the effect that allegedly facts have been wrongly presented and so on, I should like in this connexion to hear what specific facts the representative of the United States is reporting. When we mentioned facts, we based ourselves on the Visiting Mission; we quoted specific paragraphs. For example, when we mentioned the percentage of land under the control of the Administration, we took the figures which were given to us by the Special Representative of the Administering Authority: 55 per cent of the whole of the land which is under the Administration. That is something that does not come from our phantasy. This figure was cited by the Special Representative and can be checked in the record.

Finally, the representative of the United States asserted here that the first reference to the fact or the idea of the Trust Territory's being converted into the fifty-first state of the United States of America was found in the statement of the Soviet representative. This is not the case at all. If the representative of the United States had listened carefully he would have

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

known where we obtained that idea. Who was the first person to express that thought? We referred to a very specific statement and, if necessary, we shall repeat whose statement it was. It was a statement that was appended to the report of the Visiting Mission as Annex III, and in that annex there is a statement of the Naval Administrator of Saipan made to the Saipan legislature on 29 September 1960. We referred to that statement, and it was that statement that contained this reference to the fact that the Trust Territory might be united with Guam, that at some time in the future the Trust Territory might become the fifty-first state of the United States. All this is contained on page 4 of Annex III so that there is either some misunderstanding here or else the representative of the United States has not fully acquainted himself with the statements that were made by the local representatives of the United States Administration in the Trust Territory itself. Therefore this idea cannot be attributed to the Soviet representative, an idea whose paternity we, as a matter of fact, deny completely.

In conclusion, I must say that we note with regret that in his concluding statement the representative of the United States did not deem it possible to declare to the Trusteeship Council what concrete measures the Administering Authority intends to take for the speedy implementation of the Declaration of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960. What steps does the Administering Authority intend to take in order to implement the concrete and very clear statements contained in this Declaration?

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I have no desire to prolong this colloquy, but I must say that with regard to the question of a proposal or "propaganda", which was the word used by the Soviet representative, that the Territory become the fifty-first state of the Union, there is no such statement contained in the statement quoted or referred to by the Naval Administrator of Saipan. In his statement at that time he was referring to various alternatives for the political future of the Territory, but so far as I read the statement not one of those was the thought that the Territory might itself become the fifty-first state.

(Mr. Bingham, United States)

With regard to the question of the different approach of the Soviet Union to the problems of the Territory and the approach of the United States of America, it was not so much the purpose of my statement to point out those differences because perhaps we take those for granted. But it was rather my purpose to point out that in this respect the Soviet Union's position stands alone in the Trusteeship Council and that it is as much apart from the other members of the Council and from the views of the Visiting Mission as expressed in their statements and in the report of the Visiting Mission as it is from the position of the United States.

The representative of the Soviet Union took exception to or questioned my use of the word "propaganda", and I am glad to be corrected by him in this regard. If he is unhappy with my statement that his remarks during the course of the Council's meeting were for purposes of propaganda, I would be glad to substitute the fact that they were for purposes not of advancing the interests of the people of the Trust Territory, but for advancing the political interests of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank the Special Representative for his wholehearted co-operation in our work and trust that we will have the pleasure of seeing him here next year. Meanwhile, I wish him every success in his new post. I am sure too that the Council would wish me to convey to Mr. Nucker our great appreciation for the clear and conscientious manner in which he has always assisted this Trusteeship Council both this year and during past sessions. I extend to him too our best wishes in his future work.

I suggest that the Drafting Committee for the Pacific Islands be composed of the representatives of Australia, Burma, New Zealand and the United Arab Republic. If there are no objections, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Drafting Committee will probably meet next Tuesday morning, but confirmation of this will be given later on.

Mr. Goding withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 4e

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 1960 (T/1562, 1571; T/L.1012)

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

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

Political advancement

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to say that my delegation is happy to see that Mr. McCarthy is once again with us. I have possibly two or three questions. At times the international community is over-zealous in displaying its concern for the fate of the 2,000-odd inhabitants of Nauru. My first question concerns a letter from the Minister of State for Territories which was addressed, I assume, to the Nauru Council and was signed by Mr. Hasluck, who is a good friend of mine and with whom I have had the opportunity to get acquainted at other assemblies. My first question is very simple. With respect to the new approach presented by the Administering Authority, I do not know whether it has actually taken into account some of the questions which I put at past sessions. On those occasions I inquired as to whether the Administering Authority was prepared to change its immigration laws so as to permit the entry of Nauruan inhabitants. In the past I did not get a satisfactory answer to this question. However, I see in the opening statement that a reference is made to the possibility of resettling the Nauruans in Australia.

Before proceeding to my question, I should like to make a very concrete point. For many years the Council has spoken of the possible resettlement of these people. We have reached the conclusion that their resettlement in other islands is fraught with very serious difficulties. Finally, Australia has decided to open its doors to the inhabitants of Nauru. I should like to quote from the statement of Mr. Hasluck. He said:

(continued in English)

"Because of the failure to find a suitable island home and the unsuitability of an idea of forming a separate settlement in a national territory of any of the trustee powers, the Governments of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia reached the conclusion that the offer that was both practicable and likely to give opportunities for a happy and useful life to the Nauruan people was their admission to permanent residence in Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom."

(T/PV.1154, p. 69-70)

(continued in Spanish)

'Therefore, three nations have opened their doors.

(continued in English)

"I explained to you that on being admitted to permanent residence they would live as the other residents of those countries and would have exactly the same opportunities." (Ibid.)

(continued in Spanish)

In another part of the opening statement, which I think is more important than the report itself, reference is made to the possibility of conferring citizenship upon the inhabitants of Nauru.

Having made this brief preliminary explanation, I should like to ask the following question. Is there a difference between residence and citizenship? The people of Nauru who wish to have the opportunity of going to either Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom would probably select Australia. But is there a difference between them and those who wish to remain?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I would merely like to say that in respect of what the representative of Bolivia called the immigration laws of Australia this particular question does not arise in the Trusteeship Council. The policy of the Australian Government in respect of Nauru is directed towards the discharge of its obligations under the agreement with the United Nations. There is no question arising with respect to the immigration laws of Australia.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): As I understand the question, the representative of Bolivia is referring to the fact that citizenship may not necessarily carry with it the right of residence in this or that particular country. I do appreciate that difference.

With regard to the offer which has been made by the Minister for Territories on behalf of Australia to the Nauruans, and conveyed by me personally on instructions from the Government of Australia to the Nauruans, there is no distinction between residence and citizenship. The offer which was conveyed to the Nauruans is one both of residence and citizenship in the fullest sense of the term as it applies to all Australian citizens in Australia from the moment they arrive there, if they wish to accept this offer.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): In view of the reply of the Special Representative, I feel compelled to put a second question.

On the assumption that some of the inhabitants of Nauru will decide to seek resettlement and travel there, at what time would they begin to exercise their citizenship rights?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): If this offer which was placed before the Nauruans were accepted by the Nauruan communities, my understanding of the offer is -- and this is necessarily still in terms which do not lend themselves to a final legal definition at any particular point -- that from the moment any Nauruans arrived in Australia, they would then, without further delay, become residents and full citizens of Australia, with rights, as I said in my opening statement, to all the benefits that are enjoyed by existing Australian citizens and, to make the situation perhaps a little clearer, with all the benefits that are enjoyed by myself and my family.

Mr. SAIAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the Soviet Union suggested that a plebiscite might be held in Nauru. Now we have the following problem. There are 2,500 people involved. I am not speaking in legal terms but in terms of the actual situation. I acquired some experience from visiting islands of the South Pacific which are probably similar to Nauru. Now it may be that some members of the community do not wish to leave Nauru. We have the paradoxical situation of a small community which can no longer work the soil but, at the same time, no other island seems to be available for the resettlement of that community, nor could that community gain admission to Australia. We have here a Trust Territory which seems to be condemned to a very restricted life. My question, which is one of human psychology and not of a legal nature, is the following: Among the inhabitants, who are those who wish to remain on this small island? I would assume that some of the younger generation would wish to seek resettlement in Australia.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): It has been anticipated that even if this offer were accepted by a majority of the Nauruans, a number would remain on the island. It has been assumed that in the immediate years that number would constitute the older section of the population, but not exclusively. This plan envisages that whatever the decision of the Nauruans might be at the present time or later, there will always be a population remaining on Nauru. We had an experience about one hundred years ago with Norfolk Island, at which time a small community was transferred from remote Pitcairn in the Pacific Islands under conditions somewhat similar to those obtaining in Nauru. The island could not longer support life in this community principally because of the disappearance of water. An island community was therefore moved. But within a few years a group of people returned to their own island. We do not anticipate with the Nauruans that it would be so much a matter of returning to their own island but rather a matter of a certain group always remaining on the island, largely people of the older age group along with a smaller number of the younger people. During my period on the island I assured the people of Nauru that those of them who wished to remain on the island if this offer were accepted -- and there was no compulsion whatsoever about this -- these people would remain the trusts of the Australian Government, for which I was speaking, and of the partner Governments in the administration of the Trust Territory.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): It is my impression that in this debate on the Territory of Nauru the statement made by the Special Representative may well be considered more important than the annual report. Here I would follow the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union. If there is a plebiscite -- and a plebiscite for 2,500 persons does not present very complex problems -- it may well be that a majority may decide to accept the proposal made by the Australian Government, and a minority may decide to remain in Nauru. The Council would then be in an extremely interesting position. It would have to continue to protect the interests of, let us say, 500 or 600 persons. This, of course, is a hypothetical situation, but clearly such a situation would be senseless at this phase in the development of the situation in Nauru. What are the views of the Australian Government with respect to the following situation: if the population of Nauru is consulted and the minority chooses to remain in the Territory, who then would be responsible for that minority -- the Trusteeship Council, or the Australian Government, the New Zealand Government and the United Kingdom Government? I address this question to the representative of Australia.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): The representative of Bolivia has addressed a very pertinent question to me as the representative of Australia. I can say only this, that this is a matter of consultation at the present time with the people of Nauru together with the other Administering Authorities in respect of Nauru, namely the United Kingdom and New Zealand. In all frankness, and I can go no further than that, I would invite the confidence of the Council in this respect, that we are consulting with the Nauruan people in an attempt to ascertain their views. We hope that we will have an ascertainment within a certain time which will enable proper arrangements to be made.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I am fully aware of the limitations which are placed on the representative of a Government in connexion with a problem like this one. Before proceeding to my next question, I would make the following very simple comment.

The Government of Australia has to consult not only the population, but also the Council. If the mandate is affected by the emigration of "X" number of inhabitants to Australia, I feel that an exceptional situation would be created. Perhaps some members of the Council may disagree with me, but I feel that we cannot carry the principle of self-determination to this microscopic extreme. In any event, the Trusteeship Council has a continuing interest in the welfare of these people. I shall not at this stage seek further elucidation from the representative of Australia. I would simply say this: The Government of Australia must consult the population of Nauru and the Council and arrive at a better defined policy in this connexion.

I come now to my next question, and I would ask the representative of Australia whether the representative of the Nauruan Council, Mr. Raymond Gadabu, could reply to it.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I appreciate the motives of the representative of Bolivia, but I would also like to make our position in this respect very clear.

As I said yesterday, Mr. Gadabu is here to meet members of the Trusteeship Council and as an adviser to the Special Representative, Mr. McCarthy. If the Council wishes to address questions to Mr. Gadabu on subjects about which he is able to give the Council information, of course it may do so. Mr. Gadabu is here for that purpose, and we welcome such questions. However, questions in respect of the policy of the Australia Government should be addressed to me or to Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Gadabu will reply to questions in the context which I have attempted to outline, and he will be glad to do so.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I do not know whether I may put my question directly to Mr. Gadabu. The question is really a very simple one. I should like to ask him what the Nauruan population feels about the proposal made by Minister Hasluck.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I hope that this matter will not lead us into difficulties. Mr. Gadabu is certainly available to the Council; there is no question about that. With all respect, however, I submit that only the representative of my Government and the Special Representative can answer questions on policy. If the representative of Bolivia wishes to address a particular, concise and relevant question to Mr. Gadabu, I would say that Mr. Gadabu is available to the Council. But I also submit that, from the point of view of the Council's procedure, it would not be proper for members to address questions related to Governmental policy to Mr. Gadabu; he is not here for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the representative of Bolivia has posed a particular question, and I should like to ask the representative of Australia whether he wishes Mr. Gadabu to reply to it.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would assure the representative of Australia that I do not propose to put any questions to Mr. Gadabu regarding the policies of the Administering Authority. What I was proposing to ask Mr. Gadabu, who is a member of the Nauruan Council and a representative of the Nauruan population, was a question with psychological validity. I was proposing to ask him how the Nauruan population felt about the proposal of the Australian Government. I greatly regret that the representative of Australia could think for a moment that I wished to complicate matters for Mr. Gadabu by putting questions to him which directly involved the policies of the Administering Authority in Nauru. I think that it is important for the Council, psychologically, to have some sort of impression of the views held by the population of Nauru. As a Councillor in Nauru, Mr. Gadabu could tell us the views of that small country. I think that

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

the Council has perhaps been too patient and demonstrated too much goodwill about this matter. I should like to have the reactions of the population to the Australian proposal. All that I want to know from Mr. Gadabu is this: What do the young people feel about it? What are the views of the leading families about it? Do they prefer to remain on the island? Are there any who wish to leave their land? Does the idea of resettlement appeal to the people? Certainly I would not put any question to which Mr. Gadabu would find it difficult to reply. I merely would assume that this small community would not choose to live this kind of confined existence forever.

Mr. HOCD (Australia): The Council is at an early stage in the examination of conditions in the Territory of Nauru; the questioning of the Special Representative has just begun. The representative of Bolivia, at this stage in the discussion, has seen fit -- and he has a perfect right to do this -- to suggest that certain questions might be put to Mr. Gadabu, who certainly is here as a member of the Australian delegation and a representative of his people.

I suggest that, in order to avoid the creation of any kind of false impression, we allow the questioning of Mr. McCarthy to continue for a certain time. That will permit an elucidation of the general attitude of members of the Council to this question, which no doubt is a very difficult one. Then, at a later stage in the debate -- in the next day or two -- Mr. Gadabu could be invited by the President to make any replies which he may see fit to make to questions addressed to him; there will undoubtedly be more than one or two such questions. In other words, would the representative of Bolivia agree to delay putting his question to Mr. Gadabu?

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. OBEPEMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps this is not in keeping with our rules of procedure, and I wish to apologize to the representative of Bolivia for intervening now and interrupting his questioning, but it seems to us that there was a precedent, as it were, which we consider to be a good one, when the adviser of a delegation, who was as a matter of fact a member of your delegation, Mr. President, answered some of the questions that were being put by members of the Council, these questions being related to that field, of course, which was best known by the given representative of the indigenous population. Now we see that in the membership of the Australian delegation there is Mr. Gadabu, who is the representative of the indigenous population of the island of Nauru. It therefore appears to us to be completely understandable that the representative of Bolivia could address himself to him. In fact, all of the members of the Council would wish to know Mr. Gadabu's view, the view of all Nauruans, on this highly vital issue for the Nauruans. That is why I should wish to support the request of the representative of Bolivia, and this seems to be the view as well of all of the other members of the Trusteeship Council. We are very eager to know the views of Mr. Gadabu on this particular question, and if this can be done now -- in other words, here and now directly -- so much the better. It would be preferable to having a statement made two or three days from now, a statement which might not quite be completely in line with what could have been said by Mr. Gadabu spontaneously at this time.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the situation, the representative of Australia has asked the representative of Bolivia if it would be agreeable to him to have any questioning of Mr. Gadabu, the adviser to the Australian delegation, deferred to a later stage in the debate, and I now recognize the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would agree with the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union, but the problem goes a little deeper than that. There is a dialogue between 2500-odd inhabitants and the Government of Australia regarding the future of Nauru. On this point I should have liked to have some information, since we are naturally interested in the future of the inhabitants who are under international trusteeship. I will leave it to you, whether the reply should be given by Mr. Gadabu or not. My only question to Mr. Gadabu was that he should tell us, as representative of the local council, what are the feelings of the population which he represents. My question is a very simple one, but in putting the question to the population of Nauru I am in no way, and at no time disputing the intentions of the Administering Authority. I assume that Mr. Gadabu, who has come as an adviser and who has a direct link with the Territory, can give us valuable psychological information which would make it possible for us to get to the main problem in Nauru: that of the eventual liquidation of this Trust Territory. My question is not a difficult one, and I repeat that the policy of the Administering Authority, its intentions regarding the future of Nauru, and all the other aspects of the problem are matters which I would not raise with Mr. Gadabu. All I wanted to ask him was whether, as representative of the people of Nauru, he could give us some information regarding the feelings and sentiments of the population which he represents, and I am assuming that he is a good representative of his people.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I am very sorry indeed to disagree profoundly with my colleague. We have here before the Council the Special Representative in respect to the Territory of Nauru, according to the rules of procedure. He is here to answer questions. In our discretion as a delegation we may, with the agreement of Mr. Gadabu, ask your permission for him to be seated at the table. We do not propose to do that at this moment. Perhaps the representative of Bolivia could continue to address his questions to the Special Representative.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Very well.

I take it, then, that Mr. Gbadu will not reply to my question. In that event my question may be a little more difficult. I would ask either the Special Representative or the representative of the Australian Government to reply to the following question. Once the population has been consulted regarding the proposal that one portion of the people be resettled in Australia, there is one point in the statement which was not very much to my liking, to the effect that in the following years the situation is going to be resolved. I think we have reached a very interesting stage. If the majority of the population of Nauru accepts Mr. Hasluck's proposal, then I think that the mandate immediately loses its validity.

Bearing in mind the question which I wanted to put to Mr. Gbadu, I should like to ask the Special Representative the following question: "If the Nauruan population agrees to the proposals put to it by the Australian Government, what will be the status or situation of that Trust Territory with respect to the Trusteeship Council?"

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): The proposals with which this Council has been made familiar were framed initially without knowledge of what the answers of the Nauruan population might be. They were framed bearing particularity in mind discussions that had taken place in part around this table, and the resolution last year that the Joint Administering Authority consider resettlements in the metropolitan territory. As they stand, the proposals are firm and honourable ones and, as I said, I believe generous ones. They are not final proposals in the sense that they have been refined into a document or a charter which answers every question which may arise; but they have been drafted to their present stage as a basis for consultation with the Nauruans so that they themselves may consider what was in the minds of the Administering Authority, and as a guide to further consideration by the Administering Authority.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

Naturally, the question of their status has arisen. This is a very involved legal question and I would not attempt to join in legal discussion with the representative of Bolivia. But the question has not been answered, nor has it up to the present required to be answered, and the question will not be answered without further consideration in this Council itself, which naturally has a very vital interest in it. It was for the purpose of clearing its own mind, putting proposals to the Nauruans, obtaining the Nauruan reactions, and informing this Council at an appropriate stage, that these proposals have been developed, but they have not yet been developed to this stage of finality.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): There is one aspect of the reply given by the Special Representative on which I should like to comment. He referred to my raising of a legal issue. Perhaps at times, when I take the floor in this Council, it may be felt that I am actuated solely by legal concerns. However, I speak also in political terms. Let me make that point clear.

In his opening statement, the Special Representative quoted the following passage from the understanding subscribed to by the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom:

"These proposals were discussed with representatives of the Nauruan people at a meeting which took place in Canberra between the Minister for Territories and the delegation from Nauru, between 6 and 12 October 1960. The outcome of these talks was summarized in a letter from the Minister to the Head Chief dated 12 October 1960." (T/PV.1154, pages 67 and 68)

My question is strictly a political question. Does this mean that we are in a preliminary stage, that the Nauruan population has not yet appraised and understood the discussions held with Mr. Hasluck? Or has the population already developed some views on the question? There are three elements here which are strictly political ones: the population of Nauru, the Trusteeship Council, and the Government of Australia. In this dialogue, all that I should like to find out is whether, finally, the population has been consulted -- because, if you have been discussing this matter with the representatives of Nauru, and at the same time do not know whether the Nauruan population would support its representatives or the Administration, then we are simply discussing a very nebulous and hypothetical question.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I forgot to say that I think the Council could hardly expect the Special Representative to make a reply to a conjectural inquiry of that nature. Outside the precincts of this building, I will be glad to tell my colleague from Bolivia what he wishes to know. I think, in other words, that the President may well take the next question from the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): When the population of Nauru is in a position to give its views democratically, by a majority and a minority, to the proposal put to it, which I consider to be one of many

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

possible solutions to this problem, when does the Special Representative feel that the population of Nauru will mobilize itself psychologically or democratically vis-à-vis the alternative put to it?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I think that perhaps reference to my opening statement may help in this situation. I said:

"In summary, the Council then informed me that the Nauruan people were not yet ready to accept the proposals as they still hoped that a place might be found in which they could continue to live as a Nauruan community."

(T/PV.1154, page 76)

The situation is being reconsidered by the three Governments from that aspect. I have the impression that that may perhaps help the representative of Bolivia in this matter.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would have liked to have made that question my last, but I feel compelled to put one additional question. We are trying to ascertain the wishes of the population. At present, indirectly, the Special Representative has told us that a part of the population does not want to leave for Australia and is still thinking in terms of being resettled on another island. I am not as experienced as many members of the Council, but I am alive to one factor: Many times, a population, however negative the circumstances under which it has to develop its life, is very reluctant to leave the place where it was born. This gives rise to very serious problems. The reply given by Mr. McCarthy means, I take it, that the population is as yet of a divided opinion on this subject, that its views have not crystallized in regard to the Australian proposal, and that part of the population still thinks in terms of resettlement on another island. For many years, the Administering Authority has explored the first alternative, but now we are coming to a second choice, and that is why I bring this up -- and I hope it will be my last question: Does the Special Representative believe that, if the youth of Nauru is gradually resettled in Australia, the problem could be resolved in this way with the support of the population of Nauru?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): We have always believed -- and that was the basis of this offer -- that, if the youth and the other sections of the population of Nauru were gradually resettled in Australia, the problem would solve itself over the period of years which exists for its solution. I myself believe that the problem would be solved in that way. That is why the offer was made in this form. Part of the basic thinking, when these proposals were framed, was that it would be resolved in that way, because it never was envisaged that there would be anything like a mass migration of the Nauruans to Australia in one movement. The thinking was that, to overcome the problem which the Council, from its experience, knows to exist in every remote and less advanced community represented by adult people who have grown to adulthood without skills and experience in a more advanced community, the schooling of young people in Australia and the movement of these young people from school into employment and into an already established place in Australian life would then slowly solve the situation. The Government did envisage that, as young people became settled in that way, their families would join them, a Nauruan community or communities would grow, and there would be no difficulty in people's finding a place in Australia -- or in any other foreign country, for that matter -- as there would be in the case of adults. The Administering Authority is alive to the difficulties of resettling adult people: they have deeper roots, they have grown up in a different environment. But the basis of this was that, if young people were resettled, schooled and trained, the problem would gradually solve itself.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I hope that my colleagues will forgive me if I put one last -- and this is definitely the last -- question. I am aware that the question I am about to put is simple but rather difficult to answer. I think that it is useful in this Council to be sincere and to be realistic. Bearing in mind all the factors we have discussed, how and when does the Administering Authority plan to terminate its mandate in Nauru?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I have listened with the utmost interest to the questions which have been addressed to the Administering Authority, myself, and to Mr. McCarthy, most of which we have attempted to answer. I can refer the members of the Council to the very full statement which was given yesterday by the Special Representative outlining in some detail the policy of the Australian Government -- acting on behalf of all three Governments in this particular matter -- and what it has in view.

I find it difficult to answer questions which refer to abstract situations. I can say only that our policy in the discharge of obligations towards the Trust Territory of Nauru is in accordance with our interpretation and belief of the spirit of the Trusteeship Agreement and, indeed, the letter of the Trusteeship Agreement.

This is a Territory which is, indeed, unique in the sense that it is not a vast political area having relations with other political areas. This is a community of Nauruans in a small Territory. We, the Australian Government, have responsibilities towards them. We recognize them. We will carry them out.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I have no further questions. However, before ending the participation of my delegation in this question and answer period, I should like to say that I am grateful for the replies given to me by the representative of Australia and the Special Representative. At the same time, I should simply like to say to my good friend, the representative of the Australian Government, that my questions are not abstract. International organizations are at times excessively patient. In this case, I think that we are reaching the stage when it is necessary to terminate this mandate in the near future.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

The views of the representative of the Soviet Union have great weight in this Council in one way or another; but I do not believe that he or any other member of the Council feels that self-determination should be reduced to this microscopic type of self-determination. But in any case it is our responsibility to see to it that if these inhabitants are to be resettled in Australia, these inhabitants should enjoy full rights and have equal opportunities with the other inhabitants of Australia. That is my interpretation of the role of the Council. I make this statement in anticipation of the statement and views which we will express at the end of this debate.

In conclusion, I should like to express my thanks to the Special Representative for his courtesy. I am very sorry that Mr. Gadabu could not give us some information regarding the feelings of the Nauruan people with respect to this problem. I hope that the Australian Government will at our next session give us a clear-cut approach and a clear-cut plan for terminating the mandate within a given time.

Mr. KIANG (China): May I first of all say that I am simply delighted to see in our midst Mr. Gadabu whom I met in 1959 in Nauru. He took a very active part in the three meetings of the Local Government Council, in which we also took part. I understand he came here as an adviser to the Special Representative. Before I put my questions, I should like to make one observation on one of the questions of procedure raised by my friend from Bolivia. This question related to the invitation of Mr. Gadabu to the Council table. I also heard the observations from the Australian delegation. All that I wish to say is that my delegation will certainly abide by the spirit and the letter of rule 18 of our rules of procedure. I think it is certainly up to the Australian delegation to decide for itself the designation of any adviser or any alternative representative to represent the Australian delegation in answering any questions put to them.

Before I pursue the major question which was put by the representative of Bolivia, I should like first of all to seek some information from the Australian delegation in regard to the visit of Nauruans to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. As the Council is aware, it was reported to us in 1960 that

(Mr. Kiang, China)

in 1959 a group of fifty-eight men, women and children of the Nauruan community departed from Nauru in May 1959, to visit relatives and friends in the Marshall and Caroline Islands. I should like very much to hear from the Special Representative whether there was a further visit of the Nauruans to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1960?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I know of no such additional visit. This visit to which the representative of China refers took place to the benefit and satisfaction of the Nauruans, and I know of no visit since that one.

Mr. KIANG (China): Now I come to the major question which, as I said, was pursued by the representative of Bolivia; that is the future of the Nauruans. I think that everyone in this Council knows that this is really the most important of all the problems facing the Nauruans. I even think that our consideration of Nauru in this Council would not be realistic if we failed to deal with this question of the future of the Nauruans.

In the first place, I should like to ask a preliminary question which, I think, may be relevant to the main question. Could the Special Representative tell us how the students studying or apprenticed in Australia have adjusted themselves to their new environment?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): There have been problems of adjustment among these students, as one would expect. There are problems of adjustment among our own students. There is scarcely a family which does not have its problems of adjustment in connexion with the education of children at various ages. Therefore, to admit that there have been problems of adjustment does not imply any criticism of the Nauruans; on the contrary. Those problems are being overcome, borne out by the increasing numbers of Nauruans who are now proceeding through a complete cycle of a secondary school course and into tertiary educational establishments of various kinds -- few in number, it is true, but still, the population from which they come is small. At the present time -- and I speak from memory and subject to correction from the printed documents before us -- I am aware of two Nauruan students at the Australian National University at Canberra, one doing a civil engineering course in Melbourne, and one or two cadets whose education is financed by the Administration in relation to their future employment in the Administration in tertiary or tertiary-type education. Arrangements have been made in Australia to oversee as far as possible the scholastic and adjustment problems of these students. It is our hope that those arrangements -- which the Nauruan Council itself asked

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

me, it will be recalled, to inform the Trusteeship Council it was not satisfied with in some three cases referred to in the annual report -- can be improved even further, and the Administering Authority is endeavouring to do this.

Mr. KIANG (China): My delegation will study very carefully the proposals regarding resettlement which have been put to the people of Nauru, but at this juncture I should like to put some preliminary questions which may help us to form our opinion.

First of all, I should like to say that the proposals offered by the Administering Authority appear to us to be very generous and, as I said, we shall take time to study them.

The Special Representative came to the Council to tell us of the manner in which the proposals regarding resettlement were put to the Nauruan people. Mr. McCarthy himself went to sound out, he said, practically all the people of Nauru and he made known to the members of the Local Government Council, as fully as possible, the result of his own assessment of the situation. Later on he went to Nauru to talk to the Local Government Council.

There are two different situations here: one is the sounding-out of the Nauruan people by groups in each of the fourteen districts, and the other is Mr. McCarthy's consultation with the Local Government Council. What I should like to know first is what percentage of the population of 2,456 people he actually met in his discussion of this proposal with them.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I believe that for all practical purposes, and possibly in toto, I met all Nauruans. By "met" I do not mean that I met each one personally and had a personal word with him, but I spoke to, was heard by, virtually all the Nauruans on the island. One of my purposes in going there was to achieve that if possible. I was able to do it, as I have said, with the concurrence, active assistance and friendly co-operation of the Nauruan Government Council, my impression when I left there, was that I had been heard and seen by virtually every Nauruan.

Mr. KIANG (China): The Special Representative has told us of the reaction of the Local Government Council to those proposals, but I do not believe that he has told us the general reaction of the people themselves whom he consulted. I should like very much to hear from him his own assessment of the reaction of the people whom he contacted. That is to say, in his opinion, what was the general reaction of the majority of the people whom he consulted?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I would not presume to be able to judge in such precise terms. I was, of course, capable of forming an opinion. I would not speak in terms of majorities or minorities. What I am able to say -- and this is as near as I can remember it -- is that the substance of what I told the Trusteeship Council was that there were people on the Islands who did not view these proposals with favour. How many, I have no means of knowing.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

I said also that while it was so I believed there were substantial numbers of people on the island who did view those proposals with favour. Both of those thoughts were opinions only, and opinions are awkward things to handle. That was my assessment on this very close consultation.

I would like to go a little further in answering this question, if I may. My chief impression of these discussions was the extent to which the Nauruans were thinking about this problem which had been placed before them, and they are keenly aware that the problem exists, and the extent to which they were desirous of examining every aspect of the proposals and the implications that were involved. I myself in going to the island was well aware that what was proposed was a very big decision for people to make. I did not expect a decision in a short time. I do not think, faced with similar circumstances, any group of people, even this group of people here, could make a decision in a short time.

There was much discussion with me about what would happen in this circumstance or that, what might develop in this circumstance or that, as the people tried to resolve their minds. As a result, some people remained unsympathetic to the proposals. Some people were not, I believe, unsympathetic to the proposals. But there were a great many factors involved -- so many factors involved that it is a problem which must go round and around in people's minds for a long time.

Mr. KIANG (China): I saw two very important things conveyed by the Special Representative's reply. One of them I fully shared from the view of what we ourselves have experienced in Nauru. It was very difficult for us to expect a very early decision on the part of the Nauruans. That view I fully share.

The second point which I would confirm is that no matter how long their indecision, not only the majority, but all the Nauruans will definitely be in favour of resettlement elsewhere. I suppose Mr. McCarthy can confirm this impression of mine -- that is, regardless of their reactions to the proposals made by the Australian Administration, they are definitely in favour of resettlement elsewhere, because they fully realize there is no future for them on the island of Nauru. Am I correct?

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): My impression was that the majority of the Nauruan people, most of the people I talked with, realized that some time they had to reach a decision in this matter because they would reach the stage when their island would not be able to support them. That realization in itself is a most difficult one for any people to come to. But I would confirm, as the representative of China has asked me to confirm, that my impression was that the Nauruans realize that resettlement is a matter which they must face some time or another.

My further impression was that, as one would expect, the greatest opposition to the proposals came from the older groups of people who said to me in effect and fact: "This is an academic question for us because whatever happens we will live out our lives on the island. It is a matter which concerns the young people more than it concerns us."

I could conclude this brief explanation by saying that in my opinion the Nauruans face the problem of resettlement somewhere, and even those who had no wish or no intention of leaving their island did not, as far as my apprehensions and knowledge carry me, dispute this necessity. The Nauruans appreciate that situation, if only for one reason -- that the Nauruans are by no means fools, and they are as capable of analysing the logical implications of a necessity like that as anybody else.

Mr. KIANG (China): In his opening statement Mr. McCarthy said that when he consulted the Local Government Council he found the Nauruan people were not ready to accept the proposal. Did the Local Government Council come to this tentative conclusion as a result of their own deliberation in the Council or also in the light of the reaction that might have been indicated to them -- that is to say, they must have heard how the people reacted after Mr. McCarthy went around consulting the people in the Territory.

The question which I would like to raise is how the Council came to this conclusion and told Mr. McCarthy the Nauruan people were not yet ready to accept these proposals.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I would not attempt to answer that question, nor am I capable of supplying information regarding the way in which the Council made up its mind, which it conveyed to me. I can only say that I had long and frequent discussions with the Council. I was aware of a body of men with a great sense of responsibility reckoning with this problem -- as one would expect -- but what their final answer represented in the way of population support, or what the other factors were in causing them to frame that answer, I do not know.

Mr. KIANG (China): I would like to say that my delegation, as I said earlier, will not at this stage comment on the terms of the proposals that have been offered.

One of the things I have in mind is: would it be a practical proposition for the Australian Administering Authority to enable some Nauruan families which have expressed their desire to go to Australia -- is it within the realm of reality that one or two or three Nauruan families who already may have expressed their readiness to do so -- could they be assisted in going to Australia to see how they would fare while living in Australia? Is that possible? Is this a practical suggestion?

Mr. McCarthy (Special Representative): That is a question which was put to me on the Island during the course of these long discussions. I said that my understanding of the situation was that the three Governments concerned had developed these proposals for consideration at this stage by the Nauruan people. I was not empowered to offer to individuals who might disagree with a majority view of the Nauruan people, if it were the majority view not to accept this offer, to make them individual offers. Nor has the matter been pursued. I did inform the Local Government Council before I left there that this very question had been placed before me. I did say that I had no authority to discuss it. I did make the Council aware of the existence of this possibility, and no attempt has been made up to the present to make any individual offers to the Nauruans apart from the general proposals, if only because the Australian Government, for which I spoke, and I have no doubt the other two members of the Administering Authority, wishes the Nauruan people to consider this as a community and not for the proposal to develop into a matter for individual decision. At this stage the matter is too important to be resolved into an individual one and the proposals were placed before the Nauruan people as such.

Mr. Kiang (China): I am very grateful for that reply, but I wish to make one observation.

The reason why I asked this question was due to our appreciation and understanding of the psychology of the Nauruan people, particularly during those long meetings which the 1959 Visiting Mission had with the Local Government Council on this major question. The Mission was given the impression that some of the families would like to try. Then, most important of all, they said that the reason why, "we cannot immediately decide on this question is that we are really not sure what is going to happen". This psychology is very important. Actually I think this is one reason why they cannot come readily to any -- I would not say definite -- decision, even a tentative conclusion on this question. I think that Mr. McCarthy will bear me out that this is really a very important psychological thing in the minds of the Nauruan people. They really do not know. We know that we have to resettle them, but we do not know what is going to happen if we leave the Nauruans. That is the reason why I made this proposal, that if

(Mr. Kiang, China)

the families which had already expressed the desire to go either to Australia or to New Zealand or elsewhere should go there and find that the environment was favourable and that they are in favour of living abroad in such a place, they would certainly still have the chance to go back to Nauru.

I think the reaction would be favourable, and I am sure it would be if they settled in the places which they think are suitable. They will come back and tell all their fellow countrymen, "we went to such-and-such a place and we find it very nice; the climate and environment are good". Then these people will actually help the Administering Authority in the way of -- may I again use the word which was very much disputed in this Council -- "propagandizing" that the resettlement is really a very good thing for them. That is the very reason I asked that question, and I am very glad to hear from the Special Representative that this question was raised in the Territory.

I hope that the joint Administering Authorities will forgive me if I ask the following question, particularly Australia. In my opinion, to a certain extent and in some respects New Zealand might be an even better place for resettlement. We say this because, as we know, in New Zealand there are people of Polynesian stock and origin and the society in New Zealand -- I think everybody knows this -- would in many ways be much more suitable for the Nauruan people. In this observation I say, because my Australian friends are sometimes sensitive on this point, that I am not dealing with the racial aspect of the question. I think this may very well be. Thus I should like to ask: what is the personal feeling of Mr. McCarthy because I think he knows better than anyone else in this Council? So far as that aspect is concerned, would New Zealand be more suitable for such resettlement? This may perhaps be a very academic question but I should like to hear the reaction of the Australian delegation.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I can understand the curiosity of my colleague from China on this point, but with all respect I do not think it is a proper question to be addressed to the Special Representative who is here to inform the Council, when all is said and done, on conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru.

If the question refers to the position of the Australian Government, I can answer it very simply in these terms: that, as we have pointed out to the Council, this matter has been the subject of close consultation between the three Governments that are jointly responsible in respect of Nauru, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia. The offer that was made, if my colleague from China will read it carefully, as I have no doubt he has done, was made with a certain reference to Australia, but not with entire reference to Australia. This is a matter of a concert between three Governments.

Mr. KIANG (China): I am very grateful for the point raised by the representative of Australia in reply to the question I raised. I have not only read the terms of the proposal, but also I read very carefully the letter which the Minister for Territories wrote to the Head Chief, and I should like to invite the attention of my very good friend, Mr. Hood, to one important paragraph from which my question arises. The extract reads as follows, that:

"... the Governments of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia reached the conclusion that the offer that was both practicable and likely to give opportunities for a happy and useful life to the Nauruan people was their admission to permanent residence in Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom. I explained to you that on being admitted to permanent residence they would live as the other residents of those countries" -- not Australia alone -- "and would have exactly the same opportunities." (T/PV.1154, p. 69-70)

I want to rest there because I am quite satisfied with what I heard the representative of Australia say.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

I have another fanciful idea which I would like to throw out for the consideration of the Australian delegation. In order to prepare the minds of the Nauruans for resettlement within the framework of the terms that have been offered by the joint Administering Authority, would it be practical for the joint Administering Authority, particularly the operating agent, Australia, to invite the Nauruans to go to any of the three countries mentioned in that letter as a tourist?

Nauru has a small population; it consists of 2,456 people. Of course, many of them do not like to travel. But those who wish to travel could be invited to go there to look around. I am sure that many of them, after seeing such nice countries like Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, would return and tell their people, "I think these are the places where we should resettle and find our future home".

Would it be practical for the Administering Authority to enter into a programme of this type so that the Nauruans can go to these countries and acquaint themselves with the physical and social conditions there?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I appreciate the motives behind this question of the representative of China. But with all respect, I think he is making something out of nothing. A person from Nauru, like anybody else, can go to the Australian National Travel Service in any city of the world and find all possible information and help on these matters.

Mr. KIANG (China): I think my very good friend, Mr. Hood, knows very well that the best advertisement is for the people to see those places in which you have proposed they should settle. As I said earlier, in a meeting of the Local Government Council the Nauruans definitely told the members of the Visiting Mission that they would be unable to reach a decision as to where they would like to settle until they saw the proposed site. For example, if one wanted them to settle on a particular island -- of course, that proposition has definitely been abandoned -- I do not think the Nauruans would be able to reach a decision until they saw the island and until a great many of their people were told what kind of an island it was.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

Of course, I do not know whether the Nauruans have a clear picture of Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom.

It was for this reason that I presented my views, that is, to ascertain the reactions of the Australian delegation. I must say I am very much satisfied with their reaction. I do not think I can go any further.

I have no further questions, and I want to thank the Special Representative of Australia, because he gave some very interesting answers. I understand that, with regard to some of the questions, he was placed in a difficult position to answer them.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of India would prefer to defer questioning until Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. VELIOTI (India): Yes, I would prefer to ask my questions on Monday. However, with your permission, I would like to make a short statement arising out of the questions which Mr. Salamauca put.

Before I make a very short statement, I should like to extend on behalf of my delegation our warmest welcome to Sir Hugh Foot, who is among us for the first time since the completion of the debate on the Pacific Islands. I am quite certain that the Council will benefit considerably from the presence of Sir Hugh Foot, who has had such a distinguished career on behalf of his country.

I did not want to interrupt the representative of Bolivia when he asked a procedural question as to whether Mr. Gadabu could answer a question. We agree entirely with the view expressed here, that it is for the Australian delegation to decide whether Mr. Gadabu should or could answer a question. At the same time my delegation feels that the presence of Mr. Gadabu as an adviser or as a consultant in the Australian delegation should not be confused with the presence of official advisers or official representatives in the various delegations here.

I have before me the report of the Visiting Mission which went to Nauru in 1959. In paragraph 44 of the report it says:

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

"During its second meeting with the Visiting Mission, the Nauru Local Government Council proposed, in its own words, that the indigenous representative or representatives attend the United Nations Trusteeship Council's meetings when the territories concerned are discussed and also the Council's meetings when the Visiting Mission presents its report for discussion. It was the opinion of the Council that the plan has more advantages than disadvantages. It would facilitate discussions and at the same time help to clear up certain matters and thus avoid misunderstanding. For example, there may be instances where explanation of certain matters may be insufficient in that it represents the views of one party only, and it will be some time before the matter can be cleared up, but with the presence of the representatives at the meeting the matters can be cleared up at once." (T/1448, pages 18 - 19)

In the report again we find the view of the Australian Government as presented to the Visiting Mission. It says:

"Nevertheless, the view consistently maintained by Australia before the Trusteeship Council that the composition of its delegation is a matter for determination solely by the Administering Authority, and that every member of a delegation must express the official views of the Administering Authority, has never been seriously challenged." (Ibid.)

As I said, we have the honour of having Mr. Gadabu among us. He is a member of the Local Government Council in Nauru; and the Local Government Council told the 1959 Visiting Mission very clearly and specifically that they would like to have one of their representatives participate in or attend the meetings of the Trusteeship Council.

I would presume that Mr. Gadabu -- and here it is not merely a presumption -- when he accepted the invitation of the Australian Government to come along to New York, had in mind what the Local Government Council in Nauru had submitted to the Visiting Mission.

We are not trying here to embarrass the Australian delegation in any way. We know that Mr. McCarthy has had prolonged consultations in Nauru on the question of the future of the Nauruan community. I am absolutely certain that Mr. McCarthy will be able to answer sincerely and honestly with respect to

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

what the difficulties of the Nauruans are in accepting the offer of the Australian Government as well as the offer of the other two Administering Authorities, which I must say is a very gracious one provided it meets with the wishes of the people of Nauru.

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

While I do feel that Mr. McCarthy's answers, if they are full, could satisfy us, I would like to reserve the position of my delegation to request to have Mr. Gadabu's views, I repeat, provided we are not completely satisfied with the explanations given by the Special Representative. I would appeal very sincerely to the Australian delegation to think this matter over during the week-end and make it possible, if members of the Council wish to do so, to put questions to Mr. Gadabu.

The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the meeting, I would like on behalf of my delegation, and speaking of the representative of the United States, to join in welcoming once again Mr. McCarthy as Special Representative, and Mr. Gadabu as adviser to the Australian delegation.

I should also like to express our delight and feelings of welcome at the arrival at this Council table of Sir Hugh Foot. He has indeed had a distinguished career in helping to bring a number of Territories to full independence. He comes as a successor, in some part at least, to Sir Andrew Cohen, with whom we were all well and favourably acquainted. I think I could bestow no warmer words of welcome upon him, and I think he will appreciate that fact, than by saying that my delegation expects that he will be a worthy successor to Sir Andrew Cohen. We are very happy to welcome him here.

The Council will meet next on Monday, 26 June, at 2.30 p.m., when it will continue with the questioning of the Special Representative on political conditions in Nauru.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.