

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1208  
4 June 1963

ENGLISH

---

Thirtieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 4 June 1963, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BARNES

(Liberia)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru:  
report of the Administering Authority [4a] (continued)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1208 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

63-12859

(47 p.)

## AGENDA ITEM 4 (a)

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/1606, 1614, 1616; T/L.1055) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R.S. Leydin, Special Representative for Nauru under Australian Administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: At our 1207th meeting yesterday the representative of the World Health Organization indicated that he would be in a position to make a supplementary statement this afternoon in connexion with the observations which were circulated by that organization to the members of the Council. Before we resume consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru, I shall call upon the representative of WHO to make that supplementary statement.

Dr. SACKS (World Health Organization): I wish to thank you for giving the World Health Organization this opportunity to provide the background for the statement which is made in paragraph 11 of document T/1614, the observations of the WHO on the annual report of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ending 1962.

First let me say that we profoundly regret the confusion which has resulted from the typographical error on the part of our staff. As I stated yesterday, the last sentence in our paper should have been a separate paragraph. There was no intention of linking the question of phosphate dust with the question of water supply.

The observations which WHO has placed before the Council at this session are consistent in content and form with the previous observations submitted on Trust Territories to this Council over many years. WHO has always been under the impression that these observations in the form submitted have been helpful to the Council and we have always been happy to provide any technical supporting information and explanation for any of the observations which have been made.

(Dr. Sacks, WHO)

It is my intention in this statement to try to amplify the basis of the statement in paragraph 11 that "The water supply is still inadequate and the storage facilities are poor." We recognize that this statement, unsupported by details, might have been misleading, and hope that the following comments will help to clarify the intention behind this observation.

The question of the water supply on the island of Nauru is a highly complicated and complex technical problem. As has been repeatedly stated in the annual reports of the Administering Authority and further confirmed to this Council yesterday, Nauru is an island in which the rainfall varies widely between 12 inches and 180 inches per year. The effect of this large variation is accentuated by the fact that the island is an atoll formed of porous coral, overlain by the phosphate deposits. The only natural source of water consists of rainfall which has percolated through the porous material and is held above the sea water by the difference of density between the fresh and salt water. This is a phenomenon which frequently occurs with this type of island. Comparatively small quantities can usually be obtained from shallow wells, but the amount stored underground is limited and, as this is drawn upon, a mixing of salt and fresh water begins to occur so that the supply becomes increasingly brackish. In periods of low rainfall this obviously happens much more speedily than in periods of high rainfall. The combination, therefore, of the type of porous coral and the extremely wide variation in rainfall poses a problem of great magnitude in the provision of local -- and I repeat, local -- fresh-water resources. These problems are indeed complicated by what was alluded to yesterday by the Special Representative, namely increasing population and the increased demand per capita of water because of increasingly sophisticated use.

The local water resources consist of shallow wells which tap the "bubble" layer of fresh water within the coral substructure, individual rainwater storage tanks, and district rain-water cisterns. There is a limit to which these latter can be extended because there is a limit to the length of time which water can be stored without possibly becoming a danger to health.

(Dr. Sacks, WHO)

The Administering Authority has recognized these problems, and during the year 1961-62 imported some 61,000 tons of fresh water, which is the equivalent of 14 million imperial gallons or about 170 days' supply for a population of 5,000 people, using 15 gallons per head per day.

With regard to storage facilities, in the 1962 report it is stated that there are three 1-million-gallon tanks completed, or the equivalent of about one month's supply; three 1-million-gallon tanks under construction, and six 1-million-gallon tanks planned. When all these are completed, taking as our estimate a reasonable per capita use of about fifteen gallons per head per day, this amount of storage should be sufficient for approximately five months and would, in the opinion of WHO, be adequate to meet the needs during the periods of low rainfall. If to this are added the improvements to house storage which are referred to on page 34 of the report of the Administering Authority for 1961-62, it would be our view that the problem of inadequacy referred to in our paragraph would have been largely alleviated.

We hope, therefore, that the above will indicate that there is recognition by all concerned that the local water supply is inadequate but that this is being supplemented annually by the importation of water. Similarly the storage facilities are being increased and, when the present plans are implemented, this should also deal with this point.



(Dr. Sacks, WHO)

Perhaps I should also deal briefly with the question of phosphate dust contamination of water in amplification of what I said yesterday.

As far as is known, there is no suggestion that the water within the ground or within the storage tanks is polluted. If the phosphate material is sufficiently soluble to constitute a danger to health, there is little doubt that in years of very high rainfall, for example 180 inches per year, the deposits would, in their natural state, have leached away and would have rendered the underground water so bitter as to be undrinkable in the past. There is evidence that dust in the air forms a film on drinking water drawn from storage in the same way as it does on exposed food and other objects, but this is a problem which WHO does not technically recognize as water pollution as such. We therefore consider that the dust problem in regard to the water supply should be considered as part of the dust problem as a whole and tackled as such rather than as a water pollution question.

We hope, therefore, that the above amplification clarifies the points raised during yesterday's discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the World Health Organization for his statement.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): The Council's work on Nauru over the last few years has come to concentrate increasingly on the over-riding problem of the resettlement of the Nauruan people. The Council's last Visiting Mission emphasized that "all the problems of the Nauruan people shrink into insignificance beside the main question of their future home". The Administering Authority, the Trusteeship Council and the Nauruan people themselves have been unanimous in agreeing that resettlement is the only feasible solution of the problem they face. It is therefore perhaps no waste of time to remind ourselves of the bald geographical facts which cause the problem and which have shaped the decision to resettle.

Resettlement is not so much the penalty of the phosphate mining as the consequence of its many benefits -- benefits enjoyed over a period of many years. Before the phosphate was discovered, Nauru was thinly-populated, poor and relatively infertile. It supported, we are told, a population of about a thousand at a subsistence level. The water supply was precarious. Doubtless periods of drought brought suffering, famine and death, as they did on other similar islands. When the phosphate is exhausted, Nauru will be neither more nor less fertile than it was before. The land could still support only a tiny population at subsistence level. But the population will have multiplied several times and the people will have become accustomed to a standard of living much higher than that of any other South Pacific island. The major source of employment will cease and large numbers of people accustomed to and trained for a semi-industrialized and so-called white-collar life will be idle. The phosphate ships will cease to call. These are the ships which bring the supplies of food and water which by itself the dry and infertile island of Nauru could never produce. Other ships might call, but Nauru is not on the normal shipping routes.

In these circumstances, depopulation would be likely -- a de facto resettlement, since many of the young people would be anxious to leave -- and a drastic drop in living standards. In ages past this kind of depopulation or forced resettlement was not uncommon -- for instance when population outgrew food resources or when some natural disaster occurred. Quite likely such factors were involved in the great migrations across the Pacific of the Polynesian navigators. But the Nauruans know that they have many alternatives open to them which give

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

them a freedom of choice which did not exist for their ancestors or for the Polynesian migrants. They have time, they have money, they have good leaders, they have a well-educated population, they have friendly countries to help them. From the several possibilities open to them they have chosen a planned resettlement. And the main reason, as I understand it, why they have made this choice, re-affirmed it and said repeatedly that there is no going back on it, is that they have a passionate sense of their identity as a unique people. They are a very old people; they have survived for centuries as a people, even in the inhospitable conditions of Nauru. They have a sense of their history, and so they want to stay together. It is not for us, therefore, at this stage to construct theoretical solutions or to devise ingenious alternatives. We are here in the Trusteeship Council to build upon the expressed desire of the Nauruans and to assist them to translate into reality the wish they have expressed.

The urgency of this task is not disputed -- it has come to dominate the debates in the Council. But why the urgency? We know that the phosphate deposits on present estimates will last perhaps another thirty years. It may seem that the three partners in the enterprise -- that is the Council, the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people themselves -- are excessively prudent in attempting to settle matters now when the deadline is thirty years away. Once again the answer to this paradox is not hard to find. It was indeed the theme of the last Visiting Mission's report. The uncertainty of the future overshadows the present for the Nauruans. The putative depletion of the phosphate deposits becomes the fact and, more important, the fear to which all other considerations lead. As the Mission put it, "Only when this single dominating problem of the future is solved can answers to other questions fall into place". Until a new home has been selected and the necessary arrangements completed, the development of the Nauruan people and their planning for the future must inevitably be distorted. As the reports of the Administering Authority show, a great deal of progress is being made on Nauru itself -- in housing and other material conditions of life, in health, education, administrative training, in progress towards self-government. Most of this progress is useful preparation for settlement in the future home and is to be welcomed for this reason as well as for itself. But with so much thought concentrated on the future the present does not seem as real to the Nauruans as it should.

(Mr. Corner, New Zealand)

Once the basic decisions on resettlement have been made the present and the future will lock together and both will become equally real. A gradual resettlement could begin. It would be the voluntary migration of families, no hasty exodus or forced transfer of population. With ample time resettlement becomes a relatively painless undertaking. Families and individuals would leave when and as they wished. Some no doubt would wish to remain for some years yet. Those who left would, of course, retain their legitimate property rights on Nauru. No one resident on Nauru or the new home would sacrifice his ownership of or benefit from the phosphate lands which remained. The decision on resettlement would have no bearing on the phosphate revenues. Its main effect would be, as the Head Chief and others have indicated, to lift the gloom and uncertainty which now envelops the future.

The nature of the new home has been thoroughly discussed in Nauru, in Canberra and in this Council, even before a site had been found to embody it. The wishes of the Nauruans have been clearly set out on this question also. Their response to the original resettlement proposals of the joint Administering Authority gives a comprehensive list of requirements, which were cited again at this session. This list of requirements is an ideal picture, certainly a homeland any people, large or small, would be grateful to find, and the Visiting Mission suspected, as I suppose most of us did, that these conditions would not be easy to meet in their entirety.

But an intensive review of possible island sites undertaken in response to a suggestion made by this Council last year has come near to success. I believe the Council should be grateful for the energy and sympathy which the Australian Government has shown in this task which initially must have seemed an almost impossibly difficult one to be set. Curtis Island, in particular, seems to fulfil the most important of the Nauruan desiderata to an encouraging extent. It is an island entity, the ownership and administration of which could be vested in the Nauruan people to enable them to preserve their unity and identity as a community. It is large -- more than twenty times bigger than Nauru itself -- fertile, well-watered, suitable for farming and cattle-raising, with good harbours and good prospects for fishing. It is -- assuming a bridge and causeway are erected -- within easy walking distance of the mainland. Most important of all, however, there are excellent employment opportunities and a deep-water harbour only a few miles away; and the citizens of Rockhampton, in Australia, have indicated that they would welcome and value the presence of the Nauruan community as neighbours.

In other words, an island as conveniently sited as this gives promise of achieving the highest aim of resettlement: that the Nauruans should be able to preserve the kind of life and identity they most value, while maintaining, on an island without phosphates, the living standards which the phosphate revenues have made possible. The benefits which they will derive from resettlement are unusual -- very possibly unique. A completely developed new community will be handed over to them. Each Nauruan will receive a home, land and assistance in gaining employment. A town will be laid out, utilities installed, roads provided, public buildings erected -- in fact, all the complex plant and services of a modern community. The joint Administering Authority has indicated its willingness to provide all these things. The Visiting Mission considered the Nauruans' present return on the export value of the phosphate rock to be substantial. To that percentage should now be added the cost of the new home, which rough estimates have placed at \$20-\$30 million. For a population of 2,500 this contribution by the Governments of the countries which have used phosphates from Nauru represents a considerable bonus.



There is no dispute as to the willingness of the Administering Authority to build the new home; agreement on a site, although still to be confirmed by the Nauru Local Government Council, now seems to be close. What does remain is to settle the future form of government of the Nauruan people in their new home.

In the course of their continuing discussions, the Nauruan leaders have prepared proposals asking for sovereign independence. Both the Administering Authority and this Council are agreed that these wishes, put forward as they are by the elected representatives of the Nauruan people, must be given the most careful consideration. If the site selected for the new home were in international waters -- say, in the middle of the Pacific or Indian Oceans -- there might be little further difficulty. But for good economic and other reasons, the Nauruans have asked for an island close to the Australian coast and within Australian territorial waters. The island on which most attention has now settled is only a few hundred yards from the coast. The legitimate wishes of the Australian Government must then also become part of our consideration. It would be the same if the choice of the Nauruans had settled on territory in close proximity to the coast of any country represented on this Council. The Australian Government has pledged and given good proof of its desire to assist the Nauruans in finding a new home. But for constitutional reasons this must fall short of creating a new sovereign international State within the heart of its national territory.

There seems no reason to be unduly alarmed by this situation. There seems ample room for an accommodation between the requirements of Australian constitutional law and the basic wishes of the Nauruans. Once a definite site has been chosen, negotiations on future arrangements -- like those for the site itself -- progress inevitably from the hypothetical and ideal to the specific needs of establishing a new home. In such circumstances it should not be too difficult to reach a settlement that will give, as the Head Chief has said yesterday, "the maximum that could possibly be given by the powers concerned".

The requirements of the Nauruans are succinctly but admirably defined in the memorandum set out in Appendix A to the Visiting Mission's report. It reads:

"We and our people would like a new homeland in which we could resettle when this island will no longer be able to support our population. It should be a homeland we could call our own, where each Nauruan individual or family will have the same right to live without being subjected to selective screening and where we could always live together happily as a community." (T/1603, page 22)

It seems more than possible that the substance of these wishes can be met without needing to argue about sovereignty at all. The Nauruans desire a homeland where they -- and they alone -- will have the right to live as a community; control of land ownership and perhaps the entry to their island could surely guarantee this right. They want to manage their own affairs. It can be assumed, as the Special Representative has emphasized several times, that Australia will offer the maximum of autonomy that is consistent with its constitutional requirements. And finally they hope for an economic basis on which to maintain the same prosperous standards which they now enjoy on Nauru; provided care is taken in the selection of an island -- and Curtis Island seems to offer excellent prospects -- this hope should not be too difficult to attain. If all these very understandable requirements are met -- and the Australian Government has, in effect, pledged that they will be -- the other attributes of sovereignty, citizenship, fundamental law, defence and external affairs are largely of technical interest in so small a community. With the goodwill that has throughout characterized the discussions between the Nauruan leaders and the Australian Government, we share the Head Chief's hope of, as he said, "arriving at conclusions satisfactory both to us and the Australian Government".

Since the Nauruan people want resettlement, and want an early decision on the outstanding problems of this transfer, this must naturally be the major preoccupation of the Administering Authority and of this Council. But in the meantime, development on Nauru itself is no less important. There has been a steady rise in the material benefits enjoyed on the island. A new housing programme is providing modern concrete homes for all Nauruan families; the school-building programme has been completed. We, in New Zealand and Australia, perhaps



take a high standard of social services for granted; but the free medical and hospital benefits on Nauru must be matched in few other places in the world. Even allowing for the small size of the island, and the relative abundance of funds, we must all be conscious enough of our administrative difficulties to recognize what has been achieved on Nauru.

Political progress has kept pace with material improvements, and the steady devolution of responsibility to the Nauruans themselves has, in accordance with the Administering Authority's declared policy, been considerably extended. The new Nauru Local Government Council Ordinance grants the Council almost full powers over domestic matters. Disallowance is the only legislative power retained by the Administrator, and previous experience suggests it is more likely to be dormant as a safeguard than be invoked as an active part of the government.

Parallel with this, and no less important for Nauruan control of their own affairs, is the progress being made in training Nauruans for senior administrative positions. The appointment, at the end of this year, of a Nauruan to the post of Official Secretary -- which, after the Administrator himself, is the most senior post in the government -- is an encouraging indication of how far this progress has gone. It is encouraging because accelerating political development, important in itself, has also a vital part to play in the establishment of a new home -- that overriding question to which all thinking on Nauru must return. Increasing administrative responsibility on Nauru now will best equip the Nauruan leaders to deal with the problems of resettlement in the future.

The most solid achievement of this past year is that, after years of discussion and effort, the future home is at last beginning to assume a more definite form. The Nauruans have decided that a new home must be found and that there can be no going back on that decision. Since the last meeting of the Council, an active search has been carried out, covering some twelve or so possibilities. The situation has now been clarified to the point where either Fraser or Curtis Island seems acceptable, and Curtis Island perhaps preferable on economic grounds. We are now awaiting a decision by the Nauru Local Government Council. As soon as this decision on the site has been taken, discussions can begin in detail on the constitutional and other arrangements which must be agreed upon before the actual preparation of the new home can begin. The wishes of the Nauruans, governed as they have been by the practical needs of their community, have shaped the long efforts to find a new home. Now an end is in sight to this most immediate problem of a suitable site. There is still much to be settled and much to be negotiated, but for the first time in many years that pall of uncertainty about the future which the Visiting Mission described so vividly begins to lift from the Nauruan people.

Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Council is faced with three fundamental problems in its consideration of the situation of the Trust Territory of Nauru. The first problem is the future of the population of the island of Nauru; the second is the activities of the British Phosphate Commission; and the third problem is the living conditions of the Nauruans.

Let us take a look at the first problem. The course of events on the island of Nauru shows that the question of the fate of the local population should be decided immediately and that the granting of self-government and independence to the Nauruan people should be carried out this year. Members of the Council know quite well the will of the people of Nauru with regard to this question.

At the twenty-ninth session of the Trusteeship Council, the demands of the Nauruan people to be granted independence was the subject of broad discussion, and the will of the Nauruan people with regard to granting independence to it was quite clearly and categorically stated in a memorandum submitted to the Visiting

Mission by the Local Government Council. It was submitted to the Government of Australia on 19 June 1962 and is contained in document T/1600. They were also made here at the last session of the Council by the Head Chief of Nauru and confirmed by him at the present session. In the memorandum of the Nauru Local Government Council, which was submitted to the last Visiting Mission, we find the following straightforward demand:

"... the granting of independence to the people of this Trust Territory in accordance with provisions of the United Nations Charter and more pertinently with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)."

(T/1595/Add.1, annex I, page 9)

In that same document T/1595/Add.1, annex I, we find the following in another memorandum -- this is the Nauruans speaking: "Once more we propose the drawing up of realistic target dates for our independence". Moreover, the Nauru Local Government Council took upon itself the task of the concrete working out of questions of principle involved in the structure of the future State, including the organization of legislative and executive power, the functions of Government, the interrelationship between the people of Nauru with Australia and other States, and so on. In these proposals of the Nauruans, the following is stressed: "... we desire the Nauruan nation to be sovereign and free to govern itself".

(T/1600, page 2)

In this same document the Nauruans go on to say the following with regard to the question of future relationship with Australia:

"These matters and other matters of friendship and co-operation we believe would be possible without, in any way, breaching the sovereignty of either Australia or the Nauruan nation." (Ibid., page 11)

This shows the goodwill of the Nauruans and their desire to live in a spirit of amity with Australia. Australia has nothing to fear from the small Nauruan people. Such is the completely unambiguous will of the Nauruan people as expressed through the elected Nauru Local Government Council.

Now what is the position of the Trusteeship Powers, the States which have assumed the solemn responsibility to lead the Trust peoples to independence and self-government, in deference to the will of these people? What measures have

been taken by the Governments of Australia, the United Kingdom and New Zealand towards the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which was adopted two and a half years ago and which concerns the Trust Territories directly? No measures at all have been taken. Nauru is a classic example of the colonial Powers ignoring the principles of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and of the will of the people of Trust Territories. Moreover -- and we shall prove this later -- no attempt has been made to carry out even the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council -- and these recommendations are notable for their extreme moderation, since most of the members are colonial Powers.

As long as two years ago, at its twenty-seventh session, the Trusteeship Council called upon the Administering Authorities:

"... to draw up realistic plans fully reflecting the urgent need" -- and I stress "the urgent need" -- "for a speedy and planned development of the Territory in all aspects of its political life."

The Trusteeship Council also requested the Administering Authorities:

"... to draw up such plans in the light of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples."

Since that time two years have gone by and nothing has so far been done by the Administering Authorities with regard to the request of the Trusteeship Council. Thus these recommendations, these appeals, of the Trusteeship Council have not at all been carried out.

At the present session of the Council the Administering Authorities have continued their former policy of refusing to grant self-government and independence to the Nauruan people. What then remains of their expressions of respect towards the Council, their expressions of full readiness to co-operate with it in the interests of the Nauruan people? To say the least this constitutes disrespect towards the Council and disrespect towards themselves.

Attempts have been made here to convince us that the Administering Authorities are giving the highest priority to the interests of the people of Nauru and that the task of the Administrator -- who, as he said himself, is a good man -- consists of protecting the rights of Nauruans. No, gentlemen, the Administering Authorities and the Administrator see as their principal task the protection of the interests of the British Phosphate Commission, in the face of the legitimate, equitable and, one might even say, extremely moderate demands of the Nauruans, and certainly not the defence of the interests of the Nauruans themselves. This is what they see as the purpose of Trusteeship. The Trusteeship Council cannot and should not accept with equanimity such a situation or such an approach.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

Everyone remembers the heated discussion at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly of colonial problems. Representatives of an overwhelming majority of the countries of the world, expressing the will of all mankind, acknowledged that to preserve the remnants of colonialism would be intolerable. Indeed, paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1810 (XVII) urges all administering Powers:

"to take immediate steps in order that all colonial territories and peoples may accede to independence without delay in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the Declaration".

But this wind of change in anti-colonial problems has not reached the shores of Nauru, where the people continue to live, as they did in the period of the strengthening of colonialism, in an atmosphere of oppression, without any real hope of attaining freedom and independence.

Today, at the thirtieth session of the Trusteeship Council, we are once again obliged to point out that, not only have no measures been taken for the immediate granting of independence to the people of Nauru, but not even a first step in this direction has been taken. The Administering Authorities insist on standing by their old position, namely, that it is impossible to separate the problem of the independence of Nauru and the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of its people from a solution of the problem of the future homeland of the Nauruans. We shall show later what this means in practice.

From the very emergence of this plan, the Soviet delegation has rejected it as unsuitable and as representing only a screen designed to hide attempts to maintain the colonial domination of the island. Such a position is in flagrant contradiction with the principles of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, paragraph 5 of which states unequivocally that:

"Immediate steps shall be taken ... to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories" --

and of course this means in the first place Trust Territories --

"without any conditions or reservations ...".



(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

Thus, there can be no conditions or reservations, and this of course applies to reservations concerning the transfer of the Nauruans. When the report of the Trusteeship Council was discussed in the Fourth Committee during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, the statements of the majority of representatives clearly supported the thesis that the granting of independence could not depend on the search for a new home for the Nauruans, that independence must be granted immediately.

Resolution 1858 (XVII), concerning the report of the Trusteeship Council, calls upon the Administering Authorities to bear in mind the recommendations and observations expressed by delegations during the debate on the report. In the light of that provision and of the opinion expressed by the overwhelming majority of delegations participating in the discussion, it is quite obvious that the General Assembly has once again come out against the position on this question taken by the Administering Authorities. Once again, that position has been rejected by the General Assembly. Despite this fact, the question is simply and completely ignored in the last report of the Administering Authority and in the annex to it which was distributed a few days ago.

Such a position is inadmissible. The whole world is now living in the hope that all colonial countries and peoples will very soon gain their freedom. This is demanded by our Organization, under whose mandate Australia, the United Kingdom and New Zealand are administering the island. But the most important point is that the people of Nauru themselves demand self-government and independence. The Administering Authority is doing nothing in that direction; in its official documents and statements it completely ignores the question, whereas it is in fact the most important, the most fundamental aspect of the problem.

In such circumstances what can the transfer of the people of Nauru mean? Let us consider this question. The Nauruans will be handed over to the hazards of fate; Nauru will disappear as a nation -- a small nation, it is true, but our attitude should be the same towards large nations and small nations. Nauru will disappear as a nation. This is exactly what happened to the aboriginal population of Australia itself.



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

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Australia and the people of Australia are not under discussion here: the Council is discussing the island of Nauru and the situation of the Nauruans.

The PRESIDENT: Australia is the Administering Authority of Nauru, and I think that it may be considered that the representative of the Soviet Union has the right in his statement to make some references to the administration of Nauru by the Administering Authority.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I had in mind the reference made by the Soviet Union representative to the aboriginal population of Australia, which has nothing to do with the subject of Nauru.

The PRESIDENT: The point of order now is that the representative of the Soviet Union has referred to the aboriginal population of Australia. I trust that that representative will address himself to the question being discussed by the Council. He may now continue his statement.

Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The present position of the Administering Authority is based, not on the interests of the Nauruans, but on a desire to maintain the possibility of exporting phosphate from the island without even bearing the moral responsibility for that, either before the Nauruans themselves or before the United Nations.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

This is understood by the Nauruans themselves, who, in a memorandum last year, stated:

"The proposals of Australia do not satisfy our demands in many respects. They envision the assimilation of our people with the populations of Australia and New Zealand, and they are providing for that assimilation. That would be the end of the Nauruan race, and we cannot possibly agree with such a decision."

In fact, if they are not given power now and if their requests are not satisfied, if they will thus be transferred in this situation, what will happen to them? They will be put at the mercy of fate, and the Trusteeship Council will then not have any kind of right to discuss their situation. They will disappear as an idea, as a concept. Thus, the island will remain fully within the possession of the Administering Authority -- that is, the British Phosphate Commission -- and the Nauruans will exist somehow or other. How they exist, on what they will exist, whether anybody will be concerned about them or not -- we will not know anything about it, and the question will disappear, go down into history, as has happened with many similar problems in the past.

This is the meaning of the refusal today to grant self-government and independence. We are not talking here about independence as a concept which applies, say, to a Member of the United Nations. No, the Nauruans understand very well that they are a very small nation. We understand that, too. They do not claim that they should become a powerful country such as Australia itself, for instance. No, not at all. Their demands are very simple and elementary and represent a threat to no one. They are not trying to deceive anyone. Then why not meet these demands? The Administering Authority refuses to meet these demands because that would not be favourable to the British Phosphate Commission.

The Soviet delegation has pointed out before, and we repeat once again, that there are genuine possibilities of ensuring normal living conditions for the indigenous population of the island of Nauru in conditions of freedom, independence and prosperity. If a man can violate nature, then he has the skill to embellish it and to create conditions. Why, on the island of Nauru,

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

do we find only the destruction, the violation of nature? This is going on only because we have the evil system of trusteeship going on there.

Carrying on a sensible mining of phosphate and taking measures for the restoration of the surface layer of the island is possible, and the island could be preserved as a place to live in. But this needs money; this means a lessening or a reduction of the profits of the British Phosphate Commission. But they do not want this, because a transfer, according to the calculations of the Commission, will be much cheaper. Thus, since both of these conditions are not being observed, the island is being transformed into a desert -- or was already almost turned into a desert -- and further survival on the island is almost impossible.

The history of this island is a very eloquent and very clear example of the genuine aims of the trustees. The distressing fate of the island of Nauru speaks eloquently of the system of trusteeship carried to its logical conclusion. Concern for the interests of the local population and their prosperity is replaced by concern only for personal enrichment at the cost of the exploitation of the indigenous population and of their natural resources, at the expense of depriving the trust population of its sovereign territory, at the expense of their physical destruction. This is what is represented by the trust administration over the island of Nauru; this is trusteeship in all its so-called beauty.

That is why the Soviet Union, together with the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations, is in favour of the immediate liquidation of the whole of the colonial system. The fact that the people of the island of Nauru are not doomed to speedy extinction and have not perished is explained by the sentiments of our time, when the anti-colonialist forces have been considerably strengthened and have taken under their protection the interests of all colonial peoples, including such small ones as the people of Nauru. The Australian Administering Authority cannot fail to take account of the opinions of mankind. That is the only thing which prevents them from pursuing their policy to its logical end.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

The actual situation on the island of Nauru is such that the Nauruans see their only prospect of survival in the transfer of the population. The will of the people of the island on the question of the transfer has clearly been expressed in official documents submitted to the Council. The Nauruans put forward three basic and fundamental conditions: first, that the full independence and sovereignty of the Nauruans should be preserved; secondly, that the Nauruans should enjoy territorial sovereignty over the new place to which they will be transferred; and, thirdly, that the island of Nauru should remain under the sovereignty of the Nauruans themselves as their homeland. The last condition reflects their desire to preserve their homeland, just as any man retains in his memory the place where he was born.

The transfer should genuinely meet the legitimate desires of the Nauruans. First of all, they should be given full self-government and independence, as they demand and in such forms as they require. Secondly, there should be returned to them their national wealth -- that is, there should be given into their keeping the property of the British Phosphate Commission, and there should be returned to the Nauruans their legitimate profits, which have been hidden by the authorities in the course of all the previous activity of the Commission. From these sums, there should be set up a resettlement fund.

If the requirements of the Nauruans and these conditions are not observed today, then there is every reason to fear that the resettlement will lead to the annihilation of the Nauruan nation. The Council cannot trust the word of the Administering Authority, as has been very clearly demonstrated at the present session. As has been shown by experience, and particularly by the answers given by the representatives of the Administering Authority at previous meetings during this session, the Administering Authority does not consider the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council binding and does not implement them. How can we trust any new promise in regard to whatever recommendations may be made? Whether it is the setting up of target dates for independence, or the question of royalties for the Nauruans and the payment to them of a just and equitable share of the profits and the creation for this purpose of an advisory committee, or the question of

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

the Nauruans' holding senior posts in the British Phosphate Commission, all recommendations remain unimplemented. In fact, steps have not even been taken toward implementing them. Recommendations by the Trusteeship Council remain on paper, while the Administering Authority pursues its policy, basing itself exclusively on its own selfish interests, on the selfish interests of the British Phosphate Commission.

We would go further: The Administering Authority is not even keeping its own promises given to the Trusteeship Council. A year ago, the Administering Authority promised here in the Council to begin talks with the Nauruans on increasing their share of the income from phosphates. However, the beginning of the talks has been strung out for a very long time, and the representative of the Administering Authority says that the Nauruans themselves are to blame for this.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

However, the plundering of the holdings of the indigenous population by the British Phosphate Commission is going on. The reforms which are represented as a radical improvement in the situation of the people on the island are simply designed to deceive the Council. The riches of the island should not be used as a source of profit for the so-called Trust Powers or as a source of threatening the national existence of the Nauruan people. As has been shown, with a sensible exploitation of the phosphate reserves, they would last for more than thirty years. With a reasonable exploitation, they would last for 100 or 150 years and the income from the phosphates should be used for the improvement of the situation of the inhabitants and to preserve normal living conditions for the island population. But now this profit goes to enrich the people who purchase this phosphate. Why is this so? On what basis is this being done?

There can be no doubt whatsoever from a moral and juridical point of view that the property of the British Phosphate Commission should be handed over to the Nauruan people. Let us take the practice of trusteeship in any country. If any country has obtained the right of trusteeship over another territory, can it be said that the Trust Power can sell all the property of the Trust Territory and enrich itself at the expense of the inhabitants and, in the final analysis, lead to the extinction of the Trust Territory? We could adduce numerous examples where such phenomena occur in the capitalist world. The Trust Powers live at the expense of the Trust Territories, but the law should punish such Trustees. If this does not happen, this is only because in capitalist society money is stronger than the law. But in international practice, we are dealing here not with separate persons but with whole national entities, and strict international law should operate and the responsibilities assumed by the Trust Powers should be followed. Lawlessness is intolerable here, and the Trusteeship Council has the responsibility to see that the Nauruan people do not suffer the fate suffered by other people in capitalist countries.

The position is well known to everyone. The people of any country or any territory have a sovereign and inalienable right over the natural resources of their territory. Therefore, the indigenous people of Nauru have a similar sovereign right over all the resources of the island, including the phosphates. It is impossible to deny this general principle, and it was not by accident that



(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

the Australian representative refused to answer my question as to what was the view of the Administering Authority on the question of the possession of the sovereignty of the island, since this principle is impossible to deny.

The time has come for this question to be decided in a practical way. The right of the Nauruan people to obtain full control over the exploitation of the phosphate is intensified by another important factor. The phosphate deposits have been worked for about sixty years. During this time about 30 million tons of phosphate have been exported from the island. This has been pointed out in last year's report of the Visiting Mission and in documents submitted by the Nauruan Local Government Council. The phosphate is of the highest quality and it is mined very cheaply, but it is sold to consumers at prices which are much lower than those prevailing on the market. This is where the profit which is obtained by the British Phosphate Commission is being concealed. It does not want to share this profit with the Nauruans, who really own the phosphates. Australia, Great Britain and New Zealand, who use this phosphate and own the British Phosphate Commission, have already received considerable advantages from the exploitation of this phosphate, and their profits have increased their investment by many hundreds of per cent. All the property, the shares, and the equipment in the possession of the British Phosphate Commission should be handed over immediately to the full ownership of the Nauruan people. This would be the only fair method of solving the second problem we are faced with in connexion with the discussion of the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru. The fundamental issue connected with the attainment of independence by the Nauruans and their search for a new habitat should not be used to screen the present living conditions of the Nauruans which, as is well known, are bad. The adoption of immediate measures to improve these living conditions should be the concern of this Council.

The British Phosphate Commission is prospering and its affairs are going very well, but the people of Nauru, at whose expense all this is being done, have expressed profound dissatisfaction with their material and communal facilities and their living conditions.

Let us take, for example, the question of the water supply on the island. The lack of water on the island began after the appearance of the British Phosphate Commission and is the result of its activities, but this has not been fully explained to us here. Now a great deal of water is being imported on the island,



(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

and the officials of the Commission and the Administration, who, of course, are not on an equal but a much better footing than the indigenous population, receive that water free. The Nauruans must pay for their water. It is difficult to imagine a more monstrous outrage and oppression of the local population. Its wealth is plundered and, moreover, it is forced to pay for the consequences of this plundering, while those who do the plundering do not have to pay for water.

The Trusteeship Council should insist that water be supplied to the Nauruans free of cost, as is done for the officials of the Commission and the Administration, and this measure should be carried out immediately and the Administering Authority should inform the Council of the implementation of this recommendation.

To go further into the problem of phosphate dust, of course, the representatives of the Administering Authority find it easier to feed the Council with promises than to do anything, but the situation of the Nauruan people does not improve. In the memorandum of the Nauruan Local Government Council submitted to the Trusteeship Council as early as 1959 it was stated that the question of phosphate dust had become serious in all homes and in all domestic circumstances. The houses were covered with layers of dust and clothes, foodstuffs and water were covered with dust. According to the World Health Organization phosphate dust was found in the water which was provided for the children. Can it be that the adults drink water without dust and the children drink it with dust?

This question was raised by the Nauruans with the representatives of the British Phosphate Commission as early as 1956, and seven years have gone by since then. But what has been done? Nothing. What sort of concern does this show by the representatives of the Trust Powers for the people over whom they have trust?

The Soviet delegation considers that first of all the Administering Authority should take urgent measures to solve this problem and, secondly, should pay the Nauruans compensation for the damage done to them by the British Phosphate Commission. It must pay for the fact that the Commission covers everything with dust. What would happen if they tried to do such damage to people's homes in New York? The Administering Authority, furthermore, should inform this Council immediately of the measures it has taken.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

In addition, other measures should be taken to improve the situation of the Nauruans so that their living conditions would be equal to the living conditions of the Australians and other expatriates living on the island. There should be no discrimination in this respect. I am sure that there is a basis for thinking that the situation with regard to water on the island is not unique. There are many other cases, but we do not know about these other cases where the officials of the Commission and of the Administration enjoy more favourable conditions and advantages over the local population. We should put an end to such a situation which has been described by the Nauruans in the documents they have submitted to the Trusteeship Council. In the memorandum submitted by the Nauruan Local Government Council it is stated:

"Sometimes, it makes us feel that we, the indigenous people, are being looked upon as a bit of a nuisance and a humbug and should have been somewhere else away from this phosphate island.

"Therefore, we submit that the island is being exploited primarily for the benefit of countries and people other than the island itself and its indigenous people." (Trusteeship Council, Official Records, twenty-ninth session, Supplement No.2, Annex 4)

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

Having listened with close attention to all the recommendations made by the Trusteeship Council in recent years and also having acquainted ourselves with the fact which demonstrates that the Administering Authority has reacted to these recommendations, the Soviet delegation has come to the conclusion, which any observer cannot fail to come to, that is, that the policy of systematic non-implementation of the extremely moderate recommendations of the Trusteeship Council, the policy of conscious and stubborn ignoring of the basic principles of the United Nations, is the basic content of the activities of the Administering Authority and this, of course, sounds like a kind of pulling the wool over the eyes of the United Nations, and particularly the Trusteeship Council.

Viewing in this light the answers of the Administering Authority to the questions of the Soviet delegation, one can understand why they all basically and fundamentally remain unanswered.

The representatives of the delegation of Australia, answering the questions of the Soviet delegation, have departed from the answer -- to quite clear and straightforward questions -- and have distorted the facts and have been reluctant to talk on the theme of implementing the principles and recommendations of the United Nations and the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council in connexion with the island of Nauru. In not answering on the substance, and avoiding the facts, the representatives of the Administering Authority have in vain tried to hide the truth since this conflicts with what is required of Trust Powers by our Organization, and which is required of them by the very justice which they so very often like to proclaim.

The Trusteeship Council, if it really wants to be an effective organ and not a screen for the Administering Authority, should demand the implementation on the Trust Territory of Nauru of the aims and purposes contained in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. This should be the determining factor in our discussion and in the adoption of decisions.

The Soviet delegation expresses its full and unreserved support of the requirements and demands of the Nauruan people concerning the setting up of its own independent and sovereign State, in whatever form they wish. We consider that it is essential to demand from the Administering Authority satisfaction of these demands of the Nauruans and the adoption of immediate measures for transferring

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

in their entirety all power to the indigenous population of the island in accordance with the Declaration of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960.

We have already mentioned, and we think it is necessary to repeat once again, that no foreign administrator can be more familiar with the situation and the affairs of the Nauruan people than the Nauruans themselves and their own organs. As I have already said, he may be very good and clever, but the mind and skill of the whole nation is much better than that of a single man, of a stranger.

The implementation of the legitimate and just demands of the Nauruan people is an obligation on the Administering Authority, and in this question, the Trusteeship Council cannot permit any wavering. Without the agreement of the people of Nauru there should be no decision taken and no plans for the transfer or resettlement of the population, and I would add even, and no pressure should be exercised either on them in this respect.

The Nauruan people, in the form of its representative organ, the Nauruan Local Government Council, should be compensated in full by the property and shares of the British Phosphate Commissioners on the island so that the people of the island could have the opportunity of implementing their legitimate right to control their natural resources of the island as dictated by their vital interest.

The Trusteeship Council should also demand of the Administering Authority the adoption of measures to meet those just demands which are contained in the memorandum of the Nauruan Local Government Council and which we have mentioned before.

The life of the small Nauruan people has arrived at a critical moment. We are faced with the question of whether the Nauruan nation is to survive. Will there be a guarantee of the implementation of the aims and purposes of the Trusteeship System as envisaged in the Charter and in the principles of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples in respect of the island of Nauru?

If today, the Trusteeship Council does not take a clear and decisive stand on this question in favour of the Nauruan people, then it will be flying in the face of the whole Organization of United Nations and in the face and the will of all mankind, which is to put an end to the colonial system.

Mr. KING (United Kingdom): My delegation has followed the discussion on this item in the Council with close interest. Our starting point in considering the question of Nauru has been the report and recommendations of the 1962 Visiting Mission. We have been deeply impressed by the annual report of the Administering Authority for the past year and by the statements made in this Council by the representative of Australia and by the Special Representative for Nauru, which have made it clear that the recommendations of the Visiting Mission have been given close attention by the Administering Authority, that the Administering Authority has in the great majority of cases fully met the recommendations, as endorsed by the Trusteeship Council, and that where full compliance has not been practicable the reasons for this have been fully and fairly explained and steps have been put in hand to bring about the closest possible conformity with the spirit of these recommendations.

Subject to the overriding importance of the question of resettlement, which was recognized by the Visiting Mission, many of the recommendations relate to economic and social matters and to matters of local government. Such recommendations are indeed important and a great deal of discussion in the Council at the thirtieth session has been concerned with them. Yet, when all is said and done, we have the unequivocal statement in the Visiting Mission's report that "There is no want or hunger in the island ..." (T/1603, page 5, para.40), that social services are extensive and free of charge, that public services are well organized and well run, that the relationships between the various authorities on the island are on the whole friendly and profitable, and finally, in the words of the report, that the state of affairs in the island is indeed enviable.

I venture to suggest that few of the countries represented in the United Nations are in a comparable position, and it gives my delegation pleasure that the wards of the United Nations should be in a better material position than many of their guardians.

My delegation is inclined therefore to view a great deal of what has been said here about charges for water, dust pollution and the like as of minor importance by comparison with the need to ensure that the enviable position of the islanders should continue when the source of their prosperity -- the extraction of phosphate -- has been exhausted. This is the cloud in their future

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

and it is to this problem that the Visiting Mission asked the Trusteeship Council to turn its attention. My delegation understands that the Nauruan people, the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council are at one in believing that resettlement elsewhere is the only solution for the Nauruans when the phosphate resources are exhausted.



(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

We know the views and proposals of the Nauruan Local Government Council on the type of location that would be suitable, and we were reminded of their requirements by the Special Representative at our meeting on 29 May. It is clear that the Administering Authority has made a genuine and intensive effort to meet these requirements and has brought to the attention of the Nauruans locations which fit the great majority of them.

The one point of difference which now emerges is the question of sovereignty. Here I should like to point out that the Visiting Mission itself appears to have foreseen that this particular question of sovereignty might be a source of difficulty, and I note that in its report it speaks of resettling the Nauruans in a way that would maintain their identity as a people, without specifying the form that this should take. It is my delegation's hope -- shared with the Administering Authority -- that when a location, with the geographical advantages prescribed by the Nauruan Local Government Council for the Nauruans' future home, has been found, the question of the future form of government will prove amenable to solution by discussion between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people.

I must admit to sympathy with the view of the Australian Government that the complete transfer of sovereignty over an integral part of Australia is a difficult proposition for them to accept. Indeed I wonder whether other Powers represented in the Trusteeship Council which have territory in the Pacific -- in one case with possession dating only from the end of the Second World War -- and which might, in the normal course of events, have been expected to be under United Nations supervision, would be willing to consider a renunciation of sovereignty to the Nauruan people in similar circumstances to those now facing the Australian Government.

My delegation feels that the progress that we have to recognize since the last session of the Trusteeship Council lies in the fact that the Australian Government has taken the initiative in putting forward specific proposals for the Nauruan resettlement, that these proposals have covered both the possibility of an island home and resettlement in a single community centre in Australia, and that the Australian Government has recognized the principle that the Nauruans

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

should maintain their identity. With these principles, which were put forward by the Visiting Mission and accepted and implemented by the Australian Government, all that remains to solve the question of the resettlement of the Nauruan people are matters of practical detail. Given the happy history of co-operation in the past between the Nauruans and the Administering Authority, my delegation sees no reason to believe that these practical details will present insuperable difficulties.

These are my delegation's views on the major item of substance.

It has been asserted, however, that in some way the Nauruan people are not getting a fair return on the phosphate exported from their island owing to the fact that it is being supplied to consumers in Australia at a price below the prevailing world level. Yet in paragraph 112 of the Visiting Mission's report we find costs of superphosphate fertilizer to consumers in various countries compared with those in Australia. In this table we note that the cost to the consumer in Australia is comparable with costs to the consumers in two other countries and considerably more than the cost to one of the principal consumers in the world, the United States. On the surface it certainly appears that there is no question of the Australian consumers enjoying an advantage at the cost of the Nauruan producer.

I have one final point to make about this question of the extraction of phosphate. A great deal of the discussion in the Council on this matter seems to me to resemble the age-old debate as to which came first, the chicken or the egg. Some delegations have taken the view that phosphate extraction, by denuding the island of its only economic asset, has resulted in the exploitation of the Nauruan people and is the sole cause of the difficulties which face them in the future. My delegation's view is that this puts the argument the wrong way round. It is the extraction of phosphate which has made the Nauruans prosperous and healthy and which has enabled their population to expand beyond the agricultural capacity of the island. It is the extraction of phosphate that now enables the Nauruans to seek a location for resettlement that is geographically and agriculturally superior to their own island. We can therefore conclude that the activities of the British Phosphate Commissioners have benefited the Nauruan people because, as the representative of Australia has pointed out, phosphate

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

rock in the ground does no good to anybody. The only argument which could concern this Council is whether the benefit received by the Nauruan people from the extraction of phosphate has been as great as it might have been. It is, in short, an argument about degree and not about absolutes, and it is the belief of my delegation that something near a fair balance of benefit has in fact accrued to all concerned.

In conclusion, my delegation would hope that the result of the Council's discussion on this question would be such as would encourage the Administering Authority and the Nauruans to continue their dialogue on the best geographical location for resettlement and on the future form of government for the Nauruans in the place ultimately chosen, without committing the Council to supporting the initial views of either party. Compromise is obviously going to be needed and, in my delegation's view, a compromise can be reached which does provide the Nauruans with an economically sound base for the future and the Administering Authority's assurance of their identity as a people.

Mr. DOISE (France)(interpretation from French): I do not think that it is necessary this year again to evoke matters the reply to which will be furnished when a definite solution has been reached of the problem of the future of the Trust Territory of Nauru. Indeed a too detailed examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority would distract us from our essential objective, namely, to provide for the 2,500 inhabitants of this small island a proper resettlement, taking into account the wishes expressed by that community to retain its identity.

It would not be fair, however, to pass over in silence the efforts of the Australian Administration to ensure the welfare of the inhabitants of the Territory. We recall that the Visiting Mission stated in 1962:

"The Nauruans now enjoy favourable conditions and we consider that, subject to certain comparatively minor criticisms which have been made by this and earlier Visiting Missions, the interests of the people have so far been well served by the Administering Authority. ..." (T/1595, para. 144)

(Mr. Doise, France)

The Mission continued:

"There is no want or hunger in the Island - and no taxes. Social services are free... Public services generally are well organized and well run... The Mission was impressed by the work of the Department of Education... All these material benefits are accompanied by relationships which are, on the whole, friendly and profitable... It would be easy to extend this list of assets and advantages. From so many points of view the state of affairs in the Island is indeed enviable." (Paragraphs 40 et seq. of the report of the Visiting Mission, T/1595)

But the Mission correctly concludes that these favourable conditions are only temporary, since within twenty or thirty years the source of Nauruan well-being will be exhausted.

This leads us to the heart of the problem, that is the future resettlement of this community. For the first time the Council has before it concrete suggestions. The Administering Authority, in response to the desire which we voiced last year, has informed us that it has made a thorough-going study of conditions on a dozen islands along the coast of Australia with a view to resettlement of the population. This study was conducted very wisely, with the interests of the population -- representatives of which joined in the study -- taken into consideration to the fullest possible extent. The choice seems to have finally settled on Curtis Island, the proximity of which to the Australian continent satisfies the express desires of the people. The Nauruans did not conceal the fact that they did not wish to be resettled on some little island remote from the great trade routes and from the Australian markets.

It would seem relatively easy for a community to exist on Curtis Island. Our Nauruan friends who at present are examining in their Local Council the possibilities offered by this island, should not be too demanding and should take into account that all the conditions they desire to see met -- particularly those involving climate, fauna, flora, subsoil, etc. -- cannot all be met at the same time and in the same place.

Furthermore, in looking forward to enjoying full sovereignty in a place so close to Australia, even belonging to Australia, they have posed a very complex problem.

(Mr. Doise, France)

The Council should above all be careful not to be too theoretical. The notion of independence and sovereignty should be entertained in this debate only with extreme caution. The size of the Nauruan community must always be borne in mind. Let us not be too dogmatic; let us rather attempt to find appropriate solutions to the human problems which will arise when the transfer takes place. It seems to us that the orientation of education and technical training should take into the fullest account the conditions of the future economy of the Nauruan community.

Doubtless the Administering Authority will likewise wish to increase, as it intends to do, the present powers of the Local Council so as to allow it to provide its own orientation.

I will conclude these brief remarks here, and I will end by addressing to the Australian delegation my sincerest thanks for the co-operation which Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Leydin and the Head Chief of Nauru, Mr. de Roburt, have given to the work of our Council. In addition, I ask Mr. de Roburt to be so good as to communicate to his compatriots the good wishes of France for their well-being and for their future.



Mr. KIANG (China): Mr. President, on your election as President of this Council, my delegation considered it most fitting that a man of your ability, conviction and wisdom should preside in the Council's final phase of responsibility for the attainment of the objectives of the International Trusteeship System and the liquidation of the System itself.

We welcome the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom who have joined this Council for the first time, and we look forward to close co-operation with them in the work of the Council.

It is our pleasure to see our friend Mr. Dudley McCarthy returning to the Council this time as the representative of Australia. In his previous association with this Council as the Special Representative he had won admiration for his able presentation and for his understanding of our temperament in the Council. We wish him success in his present new role.

Like all other Administering Authorities, Australia has now sent to the Council a Special Representative from the Territory direct. We are pleased with the arrival of Mr. Leydin, the Administrator of Nauru. When some of us in the Council visited Nauru several years ago we heard our Nauruan friends speaking well of Mr. Leydin as one of the former Administrators. We appreciate his able assistance to the Council's deliberations.

I do not have to say how delighted we are to have the leader of the Nauruan people once again in our midst. It is very good of the Head Chief to let us share his thoughts on the problems of Nauru.

In the year under review progress has been made in many important fields of the Territory's development. The definite plan to initiate in 1964 a single and integrated primary-school system for children of all races in Nauru is indeed a commendable one, though the Council would like this to come a little earlier. It is hoped that along with the establishment of a single primary-school system, the training of Nauruan teachers at the professional level as recommended by UNESCO will be given special attention. In view of the urgent need to assist Nauruans to qualify for higher posts in the Administration to which the Special Representative himself has referred in his opening statement, we hope that the recent efforts of the Administration, as mentioned in the annual report and in part II of the Special Representative's statement, will bring about fuller participation by the Nauruans in their own government at the earliest possible time.



(Mr. Kiang, China)

With respect to public health, we hope the Administering Authority will give due consideration to the suggestion of the WHO about a sound, carefully prepared and long-range education campaign on the improvement of the diet of the Nauruan population.

In the matter of the basic wage for the Nauruans we have noted with satisfaction the adjustment to be made as a result of the review in October 1962. We hope further adjustment will be made from time to time if the findings of a periodic basic-wage review so require.

In the field of economic advancement the acceptance by the Administering Authority of the Council's recommendation for annual meetings between the elected Nauruan government and the representatives of the British Phosphate Commissioners will forge future partnership in the long run. As to the annual meeting, we wonder if it could be so scheduled that the results of such regular review could be made known to the Council in the same year, when it meets in the month of June, unless there are administrative considerations that would make the annual meeting to take place earlier in the year less advisable. Pending the outcome of the first such encounter between the Nauruans and the British Phosphate Commissioners, my delegation will refrain from reiterating the views we have previously held in this council, except to say that, the phosphate deposits being the only asset on the island, the Nauruans are legitimately concerned with any future decisions concerning the phosphates which are so essential to their livelihood and the future of their whole community.

Let me now turn to the political developments in the Trust Territory. First of all, there is notable advancement in the strengthening of the judiciary by additional appointments of Nauruans to both the Central Court and the District Court. Now all District Court proceedings are being heard by Nauruan magistrates.

We have also noted that progress has been made in the advancement of Nauruan officers to senior positions in the Public Service, as well as in the commendable plan of preparing a Nauruan to be the Public Service Commissioner.

As my delegation has on previous occasions expressed its concern with the reluctance to take measures broadening the powers of the Local Government Council, we are now glad to know that amendments to the Nauru Local Government Council Ordinances have been proposed with a view to removing the restrictions upon the exercise of powers by the Local Government Council. We hope the introduction of such amendments will assist the people of Nauru in every possible way to be self-governing in all their domestic affairs. At the same time, may we also express the hope that the Local Government Council itself will utilize all its powers to the fullest extent so that the Nauruan people themselves can be better prepared to bear the responsibility for the services which the Administering Authority has been rendering to the people of Nauru. I am sure the Head Chief will agree with us that it would be a test of the will and ability of the Nauruan people themselves. We are confident that the people looking far ahead towards their future would want to practise their self-government when such opportunities are given. The people of Nauru, as I have said, should be assisted in every possible way to take full participation in the legislature and in the executive administration of the island. With the encouragement of such a development by the Administering Authority, the question of resettlement of the Nauruan people will in all likelihood become a normal one and consequently take a natural course in its solution. A self-governing Nauru will have a salutary effect on the morale of the Nauruan people who choose to settle elsewhere and look back to Nauru as their native land.

This Council is once again facing the baffling problem of the future of the Nauruans. I cannot agree more with the representative of Australia that it is a human problem.

Mr. Leydin devoted twelve pages of his seventeen-page opening statement to the fascinating story of the continuous search for a future home for the Nauruans. If temperamental Joseph Conrad had lived and joined in the search out in the sea, he would have had colourful and illuminating tales to amuse us.

The representative of the Administering Authority has given the Council to understand that the proposal for the creation of a sovereign Nauruan nation is unacceptable as long as the people of Nauru are to resettle either on the mainland of Australia or on an island so close to Australia like any of the six islands that have been visited so far. On the other hand, the Head Chief has made it quite clear to us that while the people of Nauru would not go back on their decision to resettle elsewhere, preferably at a place close to Australia, the creation of a sovereign Nauruan nation, as such, remains their desire. So far as the islands themselves are concerned, Curtis Island appears to be more acceptable as a site for the new home of the Nauruans. It is the first time that the recent search for a new home has yielded results apparently not disappointing to the Nauruan leaders. The members of the Resettlement Committee who had visited the islands are now on their way back to report to the Nauru Local Government Council on their impressions. We believe it will take time for the Nauru Local Government Council to ponder and arrive at a decision on such an important matter. It will also require time for the Administering Authority to discuss further with the Nauruan leaders the future form of government of the Nauruan people at any such new home. It is obvious that a decision of this kind is not to be made in haste. Nor can the Council at this time go into great detail on the question and give suggestions of its own before we hear more from the Local Government Council and the Administering Authority. However, we are glad to hear the Head Chief say that he saw some progress in the recent negotiations. We in this Council have full sympathy with the Nauruan people in their desire to retain national identity.

Before I close, may I say how grateful we are that the leader of the Nauruan people intimated his views to this Council. It is encouraging to hear that upon his return to Nauru the Head Chief will request the Local Government Council to consider seriously the possibility of having Nauru become a self-governing entity

within itself but associated with a larger independent community as a practical solution to the problem of the future of the Nauruan community. Needless to say, the solution to the problem of the future of the Nauruan community can only be sought by agreement between the people of Nauru and the Administering Authority themselves. The United Nations must respect the wishes of the Nauruan people.

One final word. We are not sure that when the Trusteeship Agreement for Nauru was negotiated and approved, both the Administering Authority and the United Nations realized at that time that the exhaustion of the phosphate deposits on the island would pose such a problem that the people of Nauru, the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council have to face today. To consider this unique Trust Territory of Nauru, we in the Council must be free from dogmatism and think of the realities which the people of Nauru are facing. In this connexion, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not discussing here the point whether the main objectives of the International Trusteeship System mean the goal of independence alone. If we carefully examine the terms of Article 76 b of the United Nations Charter, we should have no difficulty in understanding the meaning and implication of that part of this crucial Article of the Charter. I also wish to say that what was alluded to by the representative of Liberia in her very able statement yesterday in reference to the goal of independence has in no way induced me to make this remark. However, I must assure the representative of Liberia that there can be no disagreement whatsoever on this important point between our two non-administering members in this Council. In the event that the Nauruans finally decide of their own free will to resettle at a place of their own choice outside of Nauru with such rights and opportunities as they wish to enjoy, and come to agreement with the Administering Authority concerning their native land, Nauru, certainly including the phosphate deposits, the United Nations would be justified in claiming that the objectives of the Trusteeship System in respect of Nauru have been achieved.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I thank you, Mr. President, and may I also thank the representative of China for the gracious and generous words of welcome he accorded to me.

I listened with great interest to the representative of Australia, to the Special Representative of the Administering Power, and to the Head Chief; and I think that all of them merit the thanks of the Council for the complete and clear account they gave us of the affairs of the island and of its most unique and most important problem. I appreciate the forthrightness with which they answered our questions, and certainly all of us now have a better understanding of conditions on the island.

I have called the problem of Nauru unique. It is true, as was so well pointed out by the representative of New Zealand, that there have been instances in history where catastrophes of one kind or another, or destructive forces, or the ravages of time, have compelled the migrations of whole peoples. But I recall no instance in the annals of international relations of the type of migration with which we are presented here. The problem of finding a new home for the people of Nauru, under the conditions they have set forth, while at the same time reserving sovereignty for themselves, certainly is a problem of the greatest complexity.

It is clear, from all we have heard, and from the history of the association of the peoples involved, that a close bond and a close understanding exists between the Australians and the Nauruans. Here we have two diverse peoples whom history has brought together in a most extraordinary and challenging partnership -- peoples who are attempting, with the help of this Council, to work through an unusually difficult situation. In our opinion, the Australians are to be congratulated for having invited the Nauruans to join them in full citizenship and to share their homeland. They have been very generous in their negotiations and in the opportunities they have offered to the Nauruans for educational, social, and economic improvements. It is difficult to conceive of a nation taking a more generous attitude. One can understand and one can sympathize with the desire of the Nauruan people to maintain both their identity and their independence.



Yet, we are inclined to agree with the Australian representative that it goes too far to expect that a nation will permit the creation of an enclave within its sovereign borders, for a separate people over whom it would have no control. I do not know of any nation which would grant total independence to a group of newly-arrived migrants. However, even though the Nauruans may not receive full sovereignty, will they still be able to retain their separate identity as a people, and as they so profoundly wish? The representative of the Soviet Union says no; he says it is inevitable that the Nauruans will lose their separate identity. The Soviet representative may know whereof he speaks, for history -- even modern history -- reveals that small nations have been devoured by predatory larger ones. History reveals that entire peoples, long accustomed to an individual way of life, and desiring passionately to maintain their ancient folkways and customs, have been forcibly and ruthlessly required to accommodate their lives to the demands of a stronger Power.

We do not believe, however, that this is the case here. The Australian representative has solemnly pledged that the Nauruans will be permitted to continue their way of life; and we believe that Australia will keep that promise. The Nauruans have been assured that they will be permitted to manage their own local affairs, to make their own local laws and regulations, to govern their own community. We believe that every opportunity will be given to the Nauruans to preserve their individuality and to maintain their own particular standards. But whether they can do so, however, is in great measure their own responsibility and their own challenge. In a new home adjoining modern Australia they will have emerged from the protective isolation which now permits them to preserve their traditional ways. Their objective will inevitably become more difficult as they establish themselves in close proximity to a much different and a more sophisticated society. As was pointed out by the last Visiting Mission, more and more of their young men and women -- referring to the Nauruans -- were turning to the occupations and habits and tastes of highly developed societies, with steadily increasing education. It could hardly be expected that they would ever wish to go back to the restricted and isolated life of a remote island without the peculiar advantages of the island they are now occupying.



Now, that was on Nauru. How much more difficult will it be for the young men and women to resist the attractions of a more active and sophisticated world? This, we think, is the task of the Head Chief and the task of the elders, as they face the challenge of trying to preserve their way of life. My delegation wishes them the best of luck in their endeavours.

My delegation notes with approval the progress reported in expanding the power and authority of the Local Government Council and in advancing Nauruans to positions of responsibility. We feel confident that these developments will continue; we believe that granting additional authority need not await final arrangements for the new home.

We also want to commend the Administration Authority for revising the wage scales upward, for reducing the work-week, for improving the school system, and for maintaining and improving standards of health and education. It is well that provision is being made for increased consultations between the British Phosphate Commissioners and the representatives of the Nauruan people. We believe such conversations are necessary to eliminate friction which has existed over the years over an equitable sharing of the proceeds of phosphate mining.

Finally, we cannot fail to note with interest the visit of eighty-one Nauruans to relatives and friends in the Marshall and Caroline Islands within the Trust Territory of the Pacific. We are delighted to call attention to this link; we hope the years will strengthen it, either on Nauru or in their new home.

The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded the general statements on conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru.

Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to say a few words in answer to the statement of the representative of the United States: On the agenda of our Council we find the question of Trust Territories -- and we should discuss it. I think that no references to history, to the history of other States, can take place here. Can the representative of the United States really agree that we should discuss here the question of the situation of the Negroes or the coloured population of

the United States? I understand the reference of the representative of the United Kingdom when he spoke of the other Oceanic Powers who can, as it were, be mentioned here, because they are also Administrative Powers, such as the United States; this is a permissible reference.

(Mr. Brykin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation considers that when we discuss all questions, the discussion should strictly remain within the limits of our competence and of our terms of reference, and within the limits of the questions we are discussing. This is a rule which should be observed. Otherwise, we will never be able to decide on those questions for which the Council has been set up.

In our statement we said that there were modest desires on the part of the Nauruan people, and these, together with the principles of the United Nations, the Charter, the Declaration and the tasks of our Council, are basic and fundamental for the solution of these problems. Attempts to make references to other things lead nowhere. I think that the members of the Council would agree with this treatment of questions because that is the only rule we can abide by.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I do not believe that an answer is required to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. I made no reference to the USSR itself in my remarks. Reference was made to history and to the remarks that the Soviet representative made with respect to the possibility of the loss of identity of the people of Nauru as a result of the proposal that has been made before the Trusteeship Council.

I think it is clear to anybody who checks the source books as to what history will reveal in terms of the loss of identity of nations throughout the epics of world history. Beyond that I have nothing to say.

Mr. BRYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In my comments I did not refer to the history of the United States either. My remarks amounted to saying that we should confine our discussion within the limits and tasks of the Council, which is dealing with the question of the situation in Trust Territories. That is all I have to say.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I am delighted to say that on this point the representative of the USSR and the representative of the United States are in agreement.

The PRESIDENT: I daresay that other members of the Council are also in agreement that statements should be confined to the issues under consideration. On Friday we shall hear the closing statement of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of Nauru. The Trusteeship Council will meet tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock when we shall hear the opening statements on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The meeting rose at 5.5 p.m.