

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1285
11 July 1966

ENGLISH

Thirty-Third Session

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 July 1966, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BROWN

(United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern
Ireland)

1. Programme of work
2. Examination of the conditions in Nauru:
 - (a) Annual report of the Administering Authority [4 (a)]
 - (b) Petitions concerning general problems in the Trust Territory of Nauru [6]
3. General Assembly resolution on the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru [9]
4. Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General [12]
5. Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General [13]

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1285 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

66-18146

(50 p.)

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with our agreement of this morning, we shall turn now to the examination of conditions in Nauru, which is item 4 (a) on our basic agenda.

I would suggest that, following the course we adopted in the case of New Guinea, we should consider General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX) concerning Nauru in conjunction with an examination of conditions in that Trust Territory. Again, this would be done without prejudice to the right of any member of the Council who might wish to make separate remarks on the items or to submit separate draft resolutions if that were desired.

If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation is not objecting, Mr. President, but I wonder whether you are not presupposing what the delegation of Australia would like to do. Perhaps it would like to give its report, after which we could then consider the question of Nauru in the general debate, because the resolution, as I remember it, called for the report to be given by the Administering country.

The PRESIDENT: I confess I was going by the precedent which we had set on our previous item, New Guinea, but if any member has any further comment to make I am sure the Council will be glad to hear it.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On the basis of the lessons gained in the utilization of our precedent, as you described it Mr. President, I would suggest that we take the two items concerned separately because during the consideration of the item on Papua and New Guinea the Administering Authority in fact departed altogether from the report on the granting of independence to that Territory, and has not given us any comprehensive answer on the way in which the resolution is being implemented.

Accordingly, I would suggest that the view of the Soviet delegation in this instance be taken into account. We, for our part, fully share the views expressed by the representative of Liberia to the effect that these two questions should be considered separately from each other and that the Administering Authority should report separately on the question of the resolution and on the question of conditions in the Trust Territory.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Adopting his usual purely theoretical approach to these problems, the representative of the Soviet Union has said that these two questions are separate and distinct. They are not separate and distinct. He said that we had not reported on the two questions during the debate on New Guinea. I submit that on the contrary we reported fully on the two questions during the debate on New Guinea. I would recall to his mind that in answer to a specific question from him I provided in considerable detail the information he sought.

This resolution cannot be considered apart from the study of the general conditions on Nauru. We shall refer to the resolution. The Special Representative will do so in his opening statement. Later I shall be seeking permission from the Council for the distinguished Head Chief to make a statement, during which this very matter will be brought up.

I repeat that the whole of the conditions on Nauru are relevant to this resolution, just as was the case with the conditions in New Guinea, and both subjects will be covered in the same debate.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to insist that the Administering Authority present two separate reports: one on the implementation of the resolution and the other on conditions in the Trust Territory. It failed to do this during the discussion on Papua and New Guinea.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The Soviet representative is in no position to insist on the Australian delegation's doing anything. The Australian delegation will report on both these subjects fully. When the Soviet representative sees fit to report in detail on the Soviet colonies in the Pacific, we may listen to what he has to say.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the representative of the Administering Authority is not able to present two separate reports, as provided for in our agenda, I would request that the report on the implementation of the General Assembly resolution be

(Mr. Makarevich, USSR)

included as a separate item in the report of the Administering Authority on Nauru. I would wish to have a full report on what is being done in regard to the implementation of the General Assembly resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The Soviet representative will have a full report. I have been trying to explain to him that he will have a full report in the statement of the Special Representative and in a statement which the Head Chief will seek leave to make to this Council. After he has heard those statements, he will be in a better position to judge the adequacy or otherwise of the report.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard two opposing points of view. I would have hoped that for the sake of the convenience of our discussion we could follow the suggestion I made at the beginning of the meeting. However, the Soviet representative has made a definite proposal that there should be two reports. The agenda lists these questions as two separate items. Unless, therefore, the Soviet representative is prepared to give way to my proposal that there should be one discussion covering both points -- bearing in mind that he and any other member of the Council could make separate speeches and if necessary produce separate draft resolutions on each item -- I can see no alternative but to consult the Council on his proposal that there should be two separate reports.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to know whether the Administering Authority is prepared to report separately to the Council on the implementation of resolution 2111 (XX), on the one hand, and conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru, on the other.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The Administering Authority is prepared to report on both subjects in a single report.

The PRESIDENT: In those circumstances, the Council has before it two items, as they appear in the agenda. As I have said, I thought that it would be convenient to take them up together, as the Council has on previous occasions agreed to take up similar items together. If, however, agreement cannot be reached to do that, we shall have to consider the questions as two separate items, as listed in the agenda, unless a motion is made to consider them jointly. Does any member of the Council wish to make a motion that the two items should be considered jointly?

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): It seems only logical to me that these items should be considered jointly, because they are so closely interrelated. I really do not see how the political conditions in the Trust Territory could be intelligently discussed apart from the full report on the Territory. I should therefore like to move that the two items be considered jointly.

The PRESIDENT: Rather than bringing this question to a vote now, could I ask if, in the light of that definite motion, the representative of the Soviet Union and the representative of Liberia would not fall in with the proposal I made earlier, and on which we now have a motion from the representative of the United States.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I disagree entirely with the motion which has just been made by the representative of the United States. This resolution -- and I am sure that the United States representative is familiar with it -- does call for a definite date to be set for the independence of Nauru, in accordance with the wishes of the people. We should like to know whether the Administering Authority has fixed this date and what agreement has been reached by the people. This question should be considered entirely separately from that of other advancement made since the last visit of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We might have agreed to a joint discussion of these two matters if, in the course of the discussion of the previous item, the representatives of the Administering Authority had reported clearly to us how the decision of the General Assembly was being implemented. However, that was not done, and there is a trend once again to avoid a direct answer to the questions, so I would request that question of the implementation of the resolution should be reported to the Council first.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): What we have here is an attempt to divorce political development in this Territory, as in the case of New Guinea, from the other phases of development. It has been the custom in this Council, and not only in this Council but in the Committee on Information,

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

where we were not required to report on political development, for Australia to report in detail on political development in all of its Territories. We will say that political development cannot be divorced from economic and social development. We will give the answers which our colleagues from the Soviet Union and from Liberia wish in relation to this resolution during the course of the statements by the representatives of the Administering Authority, and, if they wish, during the course of the questioning.

Our colleague from the Soviet Union has taken leave to suggest that this matter was not adequately dealt with during the course of the joint discussion on New Guinea. If my recollection serves me aright, he asked a series of specific questions on this subject, to which he received a series of specific answers. Those answers came back not to the setting of a target date, as required by the Soviet Union, not to the setting of a target as required by the United Nations, not to the setting of a target date at the request of Australia, not to the setting of a target date at the request of any other Member of the United Nations, but to one simple fact -- that the people themselves will decide when they will give answer to this question. If there is any authority here superior to the authority of the people of these Territories, I do not know of it.

With regard to Nauru, I have said that we are prepared to deal with both of these questions jointly. We will provide information, as we have provided it before, on economic development, on social development and on political development in the Territory. And the resolution to which our colleague refers is very much part of political development in the Territory.

The PRESIDENT: In the light of what has just been said, and unless any other member of the Council wishes to speak on this particular point, I think we must come back to the formal motion, as I understand it, by the United States representative that these two separate items on our agenda should be considered jointly.

Mr. KIANG (China): I apologize for being late. As I understand the situation, a request has been made that items 3 and 4 of today's agenda be dealt with separately. I should like to know from you, Mr. President, whether, when it was suggested that these items be dealt with separately, any preference is expressed as to which should be dealt with first. The reason I ask this is that, as I understand from the representative of the Administering Authority, the representative of Australia and the Special Representative would make their opening statements first. I also ascertained from the Head Chief myself that he would prefer to make his statement after the statements of the Administering Authority. In that case, I think it would be perfectly correct for us to hear the three statements, and I understand the Head Chief would even prefer to make his statement tomorrow, instead of today. If we want to deal with item 4 I think it is only proper for us to hear the statements first and then come to a decision. And when I say that we should hear the statements, I include the statement of the 'Head Chief, which is very important. We could then come to a decision whether or not we should decide to deal with the General Assembly resolution first. Therefore, I am not clear whether there is any preference as to which item should be dealt with first, and I would like to have that clarification from you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: I am very much obliged to the representative of China for what he has just said, but I cannot help feeling that, procedurally, there is a slight misunderstanding on his part. We start with two separate items on our agenda. A preference was expressed that they should be taken separately, but there was then a definite motion to have the items considered jointly. Although I agree that, from a practical point of view, there may be a great deal in which the representative of China has just said, I think that I am bound to put to the Council first the United States motion that these two items should be considered jointly. If it is agreeable to the Council, I will now put the United States proposal to the vote.

The United States proposal was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: As a result of the vote which has just been taken, the two items will be considered jointly.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 (a), 6 AND 9

EXAMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS IN NAURU

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1648; T/L.11C8)
- (b) PETITIONS CONCERNING GENERAL PROBLEMS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/PET.9/L.1)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU
(2111 (XX))

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Australia to make his opening statement on Nauru.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I propose to leave to our Special Representative and to his advisers the task of giving you the detailed information of conditions as they now exist in the Trust Territory of Nauru in their political, economic and social aspects. This they are particularly well-fitted to do.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

The Special Representative, Mr. Leydin, is no stranger to this Council. He appeared before it last as Special Representative in 1963. He was then Administrator of Nauru. He has now just retired from that position after two terms in it, totalling eight years of most distinguished service, during which he has proved himself an outstanding servant of the Australian Government and, I believe, a wise and loyal friend of the Nauruan people, with whom, as I say, he has lived and worked in that remote island for eight years.

In the circumstances of life on such an island, some twelve miles only in circumference, its nearest neighbour an even smaller island about 200 miles to the east, dependent almost entirely for physical communications on shipping, which takes eight to ten days for the voyage between Nauru and the two nearest and most interested metropolitan countries, Australia and New Zealand, the small indigenous Nauruan population of only some 2,700 to 2,800 people, inevitably Mr. Leydin has become extraordinarily well known, not only to the leaders of the community, but to all the Nauruans; and conversely, they themselves have become extraordinarily well known to him. It is, I believe, a great tribute to Mr. Leydin that in such circumstances his stature on Nauru has increased with the years of his service there.

Serving at once as a symbol of the Administering Authority and the confidant and counsellor of the Nauruan people, I might add that these years on Nauru have crowned a lifetime of public service by Mr. Leydin in the remote areas of Australia and its territories; and he represents, I believe, the best which is connoted by the phrase "public service".

To assist Mr. Leydin as members of the Australian delegation, he has Head Chief Hammer DeRoburt, the elected Head Chief of the Nauruan people and the senior elected member of the newly constituted Legislative Council, and Mr. Joseph Detsimea.

The Head Chief is, of course, well known here. This will be his fourth appearance before this Council. In some senses his position here is slightly anomalous. While appearing as a member of the Australian delegation,

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

inevitably he retains his identity as the leader and representative of the Nauruan people. This dual function he fulfilled with great credit and loyalty to his people and credit and loyalty to his second function. He and I have known one another and worked together for many years. During these years we have agreed at many points on the courses which should be developed in relation to Nauru. On some points, as individuals, we have disagreed. All of this, however, has steadily added through the years to a deep personal friendship, which, for my own personal part, I deeply value.

The Head Chief has always been a fearless spokesman for his people and an indefatigable planner for what he considers to be necessary and good for their present and their future. If he needed such from me, I would commend him to you and to the members of this Council as a most worthy representative here of the Nauruan people.

His colleague, Mr. Detsimea, is also an elected member of the Nauruan Legislative Council. Additionally, he is a magistrate in the Nauruan courts, a position which he owes to his own outstanding personal qualities and the impartiality and dignity and knowledge which is essential for such a high position, to which qualities he also owes the confidence reposed in him by his people as one of their elected representatives.

Accompanying the Nauruan delegation also, we are fortunate to have an old friend in Mr. Buraro Detudamo. This Council will warmly remember Mr. Detudamo's previous appearances here. He is also an elected member of the Nauruan Legislative Council. He is the son of a famous head chief, who for many years guided the destinies of his people and continued to do so in the years of disaster and suffering which war brought to this island and for some years after that war. The late Chief Detudamo is still a legend on Nauru. But it is to his own qualities, more even than his famous name, to which Mr. Detudamo owes his present position. Although not formally a member of the delegation here, he is here to assist the Head Chief and Counsellor Detsimea with his own counsel and in whatever ways they may require his assistance as a representative of the Nauruan people.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

It would please my delegation, Mr. President, if you would invite the Special Representative, Head Chief Hammer DeRoburt and Councillor Detsimea to take their places at this table and to give the floor officially to the Special Representative to make his opening statement.

At this point I consider it appropriate and necessary to say also that the Head Chief has, as I have indicated, requested permission himself to make a statement to this Council and would wish to be permitted to do so at the convenience of this Council, after the Special Representative has made his statement.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R.S. Leydin, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Nauru under Australian Administration, and Head Chief Hammer DeRoburt and Mr. Joseph Detsimea took places at the Council table.

Mr. LEYDIN (Special Representative): I am privileged to have this further opportunity of appearing before the Trusteeship Council as the Special Representative for Nauru, and the Head Chief of Nauru, Counsellor Hammer DeRoburt, and his colleague, Counsellor Detsimea Audoa, have asked me to say at the outset that they, too, are warmly appreciative of this opportunity to take part in the Council's work and to supply such information about conditions in and questions related to their homeland as the Council may wish to have.

At its thirty-second session last year, the Trusteeship Council noted that agreement had been reached on certain basic issues, namely, the establishment, on 31 January 1966, of a Legislative Council and of an Executive Council, the determination of new phosphate royalty rates for 1964-1965 and 1965-1966, the rate of extraction of phosphate rock for the then coming year, and the setting up of an independent technical committee of experts to investigate the possibility of rehabilitating the worked-out mining land in Nauru.

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

The accord reached on that occasion paved the way for important political developments in Nauru and for other activities which, although still in the exploratory stage, will, I hope, eventually provide a sound basis for continued mutually fruitful relations between the administering Governments and the Nauruan people and a firm assurance of the future welfare of the Nauruan people.

This statement will give as clear an account as I am able to construct of these developments and activities which have received the unremitting attention of the partner Governments, the Australian Administration and the Nauruan leaders throughout the year. Talks between a joint delegation representing the Administering Authority and a Nauruan delegation are, the Council will be glad to hear, continuing. They were adjourned immediately prior to the departure from Australia of the Head Chief and his colleagues to attend this meeting of the Trusteeship Council.

Preparations for and attendance at conferences, sessions of the Legislative Council, and other meetings have made heavy demands on the Nauruan leaders in recent times. It is a cause for satisfaction, therefore, that, as the Council's Visiting Mission noted last year, standards of living in Nauru are high, and that social, medical and educational conditions are excellent and the Nauruan leaders have thus been able to concentrate their attention on major questions unhampered by concern about the immediate welfare of their people. I am glad to be able to assure the Council that, as will be seen from the annual report which you have before you, these high standards are being maintained and are providing a helpful and fruitful background to discussions on the fundamental issues.

Before dealing with these latter questions, I shall give a brief outline of events of interest and significance in the field of general services since the end of the year covered by the annual report.

During the first two months of 1966, a survey was made of the eye health of the Nauruan people. To do this, the Administration appointed an experienced Australian ophthalmologist, Dr. Geoffrey Long. More than two thousand examinations were carried out. Results were reassuring, as no cases of serious disorders such as glaucoma, amblyopia or trachoma were found. A number of operations for cataract and for some minor conditions were performed and spectacles were prescribed and later on procured for those who needed them.

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

At the end of 1965, a Nauruan, Mr. Ludwig Dowong, who has been studying under a cadetship provided by the Administration, graduated in the University of Queensland as a Bachelor of Dental Science. Arrangements were made at his own request for him to accept an appointment for a year in a dental clinic in Brisbane, where he now is, so that he may obtain experience in as many aspects of dentistry as possible before taking up duty among his own people in the Dental Clinic at Nauru.

Another Nauruan, Mr. Mark Kun, graduated at the end of 1965 at the Central Medical School, Suva, as a Medical Practitioner. He is now employed in that capacity in the Administration Hospital at Nauru. A Nauruan nurse who had previously obtained a certificate in general nursing, qualified for a certificate in obstetrics and returned from Australia to Nauru to follow a career as a nursing sister in the Administration Hospital. Another Nauruan girl completed successfully a three-year course in Australia in hairdressing and has returned to Nauru to begin the practice of her profession.

Seven teachers graduated at the end of 1965 from the Teacher Training Centre in Nauru and are now attached to primary schools in Nauru to gain experience under the guidance of experienced Australian teachers.

Nauruan students who have begun new course of training in Australia this year include: 1 student at the Australian National University at Canberra who is studying law; 3 students who began courses in teacher-training colleges in Australia; 1 student who has begun a medical practitioner's course in Port Moresby at the Papua-New Guinea Medical School; 2 trainee nurses who have begun courses at the Brisbane General Hospital in Queensland; 1 student who is doing a course in electrical engineering at the Ballarat School of Mines in Victoria; and 1 junior clerk who is being given training in the Department of Territories, Canberra, in central correspondence registry work, personnel records and associated duties.

The construction of a modern cinema theater has been commenced by the British Phosphate Commissioners for the Nauru Local Government Council. The theatre was designed by the Commissioners in consultation with the Nauru Local Government Council and is expected to cost about \$A56,000, of which the Administration is contributing \$A20,000. The Council itself is meeting the

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

balance of the costs. The Commissioners have also assisted the Council by constructing a bulk storage depot for its general store, organizing a self-service system and providing on loan the services of experienced store manager.

Turning to housing, a project for the construction of twenty homes, jointly by the Administration and the Nauruan Local Government Council, and one for the construction of forty-eight homes by the British Phosphate Commission, for Nauruan families, are both nearing completion. The erection of the electricity mains around the island to carry light and power to all Nauruan homes has been completed and the majority of the homes have now been wired.

Also nearly complete is a two-storey apprentices' school. This building has been erected by the British Phosphate Commissioners to provide facilities for the practical and theoretical training of Nauruan and Gilbert and Ellice Island apprentices. It is already in use, and thirty-nine apprentices are under instruction. The trainees include twenty-four Nauruans.

Decimal coinage was introduced in Nauru in February 1966, in line with the similar change made in Australia. The population was prepared by a series of lectures and other forms of instruction and the change-over was effected without difficulty. Nauruan teachers took a prominent part in the giving of lectures to the Nauruan Community and in the conduct of quiz competitions and other activities which were designed to prepare the population for the change.

The proposed superannuation ordinance to which reference is made in page 16 of the annual report was passed by the newly established Legislative Council on 9 May 1966. It brings into being a superannuation fund in order principally to make provision for Nauruan officers of the public service to be entitled, upon retirement at the age of sixty years, or earlier because of invalidism, to pensions at a level of 60 per cent of their salaries.

Generally, all officers, including temporary employees who comply with certain conditions, will be required to contribute for one unit of pension for every \$A60 of salary received. The contribution for each unit of pension will vary on an actuarial basis with the age of the contributor at the time of the initial contribution for the respective units.

(Mr. Leydin. Special Representative)

There is, however, special provision for officers who are aged fifty-nine and sixty when the scheme begins and for officers who would be required under the general provisions to contribute a sum exceeding 10 per cent of their salaries. The contributions of officers aged fifty-nine or more at the time of their first contribution will be determined after a special examination of each case, and officers liable to contribute more than 10 per cent of their salaries may choose to contribute a sum not exceeding 10 per cent.

As an officer's salary increases because of promotion or for other reasons, he becomes entitled to contribute for a greater number of units of pension.

The Administration's own contribution to the Superannuation Fund will be equal to two and a half times the total of contributions by officers.

Each unit of pension will carry an entitlement of a pension amount to just over \$436 per year.

Thus, an officer receiving a salary of \$41,200 per annum who is twenty-five years of age will be required to contribute \$42.34 from his fortnightly salary of \$446 and would be entitled to a fortnightly pension of nearly \$428. The widow of a deceased officer will receive 5/8ths of the pension to which her husband had been entitled.

Turning now to the more important events to which I earlier referred, the Council will recall that the opening statement of the Special Representative last year included a reference to substantial increases in the phosphate royalties payable to the Nauruan people, and in the 1964-1965 annual report the Trusteeship Council is informed that the royalties have now been increased from a total of 3/8 per ton in 1963-1964 to 13/6 per ton in 1964-1965, and 17/6 per ton in 1965-1966.

At the request of the Nauru Local Government Council, the royalty of 17/6 per ton has been allocated as follows:

For cash payment direct to the landowner	3/6 or 35 cents, Australian currency, per ton
For payment to the Landowner's Investment Trust	4/- or 40 cents per ton
For payment to the Nauruan Royalty Trust Fund	1/6 or 15 cents per ton
For payment to the Nauruan Long Term Community Fund	<u>8/6 or 85 cents per ton</u>
Total:	17/6 or 175 cents per ton

The retrospective royalty payments due to Nauruan Landowners and their personal Trust Fund were made during the first half of 1966. On 1 April last, an amount of \$4310,342 was paid direct to landowners and on 29 March an amount of \$4465,512 was paid to the Landowners Trust Fund.

Following agreement between the Nauru Local Government Council and the British Phosphate Commissioners on the method of retrospective payments to the Long Term Investment Fund, these will be made in two equal instalments, the first on 30 September 1966 and the second on 31 December 1966. Meantime these outstanding payments carry interest at the rate of 5.75 per cent, which is the highest rate at present being earned by any investment by the Long Term Community Fund.

During the year to 30 June 1966, all royalty payments were made at the new rate of 17/6 per ton.

It is mentioned in the annual report that in addition to the royalties paid for phosphate that has been mined, advance royalties, at current rates, are paid in respect of phosphate land occupied by permanent installations which stand in the way of mining operations. At the annual Conference between the Nauruan representatives and the British Phosphate Commissioners held in November 1965, it was agreed that when the phosphate is actually mined in such cases, the royalties advanced will be adjusted to the rates in force at that time.

The Council will also recall the information given at its last session that an independent technical committee of experts would be set up to examine the question of rehabilitating or restoring the worked out mining land at Nauru. The Trusteeship Council requested the FAO to consider favourably the invitation to make available a representative for this Committee.

The agreement to establish such a Committee was made following the decision by the Nauruan people not to resettle at Curtis Island and to remain at Nauru, and their request that the Administering Authority should accept responsibility for restoring the worked out lands. Without committing itself to an acceptance of this request, the Australian Government undertook to arrange for a Committee to examine the feasibility of restoring those lands.

Accordingly, agreement was first sought and obtained with the Nauru Local Government Council on the kind of qualifications or experience which should be sought in the persons to be appointed to the Committee, and subsequently there was detailed consultation with that Council on the actual persons to be appointed. After these discussions, it was agreed that the Committee be constituted as follows:

(Mr. Leydin, Special Representative)

Mr. G.I. Davey, a Consulting Engineer of Sydney, New South Wales, to act as Chairman; Professor J.N. Lewis, a Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, to be a member; and Mr. W.F. Van Beers, Soils and Land Classification Officer of the FAO, at Rome, Italy to be a member.

The Committee's terms of reference were also framed in consultation with the Nauru Local Government Council. These asked the Committee:

- (i) To examine whether it would be technically feasible to refill the mined phosphate areas with suitable soil and/or other materials from external sources or to take other steps in order to render them usable habitation purposes and for cultivation of any kind;
- (ii) To consider effective and reasonable ways of undertaking such restoration, including possible sources of material for refilling; and
- (iii) To estimate costs of any practicable methods of achieving restoration in any effective degree.

In the event that restoration appeared feasible, the Committee was asked to:

- (i) Investigate the water resources of Nauru; and
- (ii) Examine fully the possibility of growing in the areas to be restored, trees, vegetables and other plants of a utilitarian kind, having regard both to what was done in this way in the past and what might be most useful to the Nauruan people in the future.

The Committee was directed to report to the Australian Government and to the Legislative Council of Nauru. It convened in Sydney on 26 January 1966 and on 3 February the Chairman and members had discussion with officers of the Department of Territories in Canberra. On 4 February the Committee had talks with officers of the British Phosphate Commission in Melbourne.

Members of the Committee then went by air to Nauru where they remained for ten days. During that time they had talks with the Administration, the Nauru Local Government Council and the British Phosphate Commission Manager at Nauru and his staff. The phosphate areas and other parts of the Island were closely inspected by the members of the Committee, in the company, as occasion required, of representatives of the Nauru Local Government Council.

After their return to Australia, the Committee had further discussions with British Phosphate Commission officials in Melbourne and the Secretary of the Department of Territories in Canberra.

The Committee submitted its report to the Minister for Territories, the Hon. C.E. Barnes, on 8 June 1966, and posted it to the legislative Council at Nauru on the same date.

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

The Australian Government, in consultation with the partner Governments, is at present examining the conclusions reached by the Committee, and it is presumed that the Legislative Council of Nauru will consider the report at its next meeting. Copies of the report, when available, will be supplied to the Trusteeship Council.

This Council was also informed last year, by the Australian delegation, that it was intended that, following the establishment of the Legislative Council, discussions on the future basis of operation of the phosphate industry, including some form of partnership arrangement, would be held between representatives of the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people. The broad basis contemplated for the partnership arrangement was that the Nauruan community would receive 50 per cent of the financial benefit resulting from the operations of the industry. Such important questions as the precise definition of "financial benefit", the rate of production, and participation by Nauruans in all levels of the industry were to be among the matters listed for discussion. The timing of the talks was to be decided in consultation with the Nauruan leaders, but they were to be held as soon as the Legislative Council was fully established.

The further discussions on the phosphate industry so planned began in Canberra last month. The Administering Authority was represented by a joint delegation of officers representing the Australian, British and New Zealand Governments, and the Nauruans by the Head Chief, Councillor Hammer De Roburt, OBE, Councillor A. Bernicke, and Councillor B. Detudamo.

After an exchange of views and preliminary discussions on the question being examined by the delegations, the Conference adjourned to enable the Nauruan delegates, excepting Councillor Bernicke, to attend this meeting of the Trusteeship Council, and in order that additional information could be gathered for later consideration by the Conference. The delegates agreed to resume discussions in Canberra in October or November next.

At its thirty-second session, the Trusteeship Council was informed by the Special Representative on Nauru that, in the 1965 talks between delegations representing the Administering Governments and the Nauruan people, it had been agreed that as an immediate step a Legislative Council and an Executive Council should be established by 31 January 1966. The Trusteeship Council was also informed

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

that a committee to work out details for the constitution and operation of the Legislative and Executive Councils would be established forthwith. The Trusteeship Council last year welcomed the proposal to establish the two Councils as a major step in the political development of Nauru.

The first meeting of the Working Committee was already begun while the Trusteeship Council was in session last year, and its second meeting was held in Nauru in August 1965, when officers of the Department of Territories flew to the Territory for further discussions with the Administration and with the Nauru Local Government Council. At that meeting, agreement was reached on the basic provisions of the necessary constitutional legislation.

The formal agreement made by the three Administering Governments to give effect to these proposals appears as Schedule 2 of the Nauru Act, subsequently passed by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia. The preamble to that new Agreement states that the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Government of New Zealand, and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have, conformably with the Trusteeship Agreement of the Territory of Nauru, and after consultation with the Nauruan people, agreed that further provision should be made for the government of the Territory and, in particular, that there should be established a Legislative Council and an Executive Council in order to enable the Nauruan people to participate more fully in the Government of the Territory and that, for this purpose, the three Governments have agreed to modify the existing agreement between them.

The preamble further relates agreement that these modifications should have effect until, in conformity with the Trusteeship Agreement, and after consultation with the Nauruan people, the three Governments otherwise agree.

Following this Agreement, a bill for the enabling statute to be called the Nauru Act was submitted to and passed by the Australian Parliament towards the end of 1965. It was assented to on 18 December 1965. Among other things, the Act provided for the establishment of a Legislative Council, to be known as the Legislative Council of the Territory of Nauru, consisting of the Administrator, nine members elected by the Nauruan community, and five official members to be appointed by the Governor-General of Australia on the nomination of the Administrator.

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

To be eligible for election to membership of the Council, a candidate is required to be a member of the Nauruan community as defined by ordinance, and to be enrolled as an elector. There are several disqualifications for election as a member of the Legislative Council -- namely:

One, to be the head of a department of the Public Service of the Territory;

Two, to be insolvent or an undischarged bankrupt;

Three, to be convicted and under sentence, or subject to sentence, for an offence punishable by death or imprisonment for one year or longer.

Although in Australia a public servant may not be a member of Parliament, it was believed that to apply a similar rule to the Territory of Nauru, where the number of Nauruans employed in the Public Service constitutes a high proportion of the total number of electors, would unduly restrict the number of possible candidates for election to the Legislative Council. For this reason, a public servant of Nauru may be a candidate for election and may hold office as a member of the Legislative Council, provided he is not the head of a department of the Public Service. Heads of departments, as this Council is aware, have the responsibility for giving effect to Government policy, as well as for explaining it and defending it as occasion requires; and this responsibility could not reside very appropriately in one person alongside the duties of an elected member of the Council. At present, heads of departments are not therefore eligible for election as elected members of the Council, but may of course be nominated for appointment as official members.

So that a high standard of service and conduct may be maintained, a member of the Legislative Council is disqualified from continuing as a member if:

One, he is absent without permission of the Council from three consecutive meetings of the Council; or

Two, he takes, or agrees to take, any fee or honorarium for services rendered in the Council, except insofar as he has been authorized by Statute so to do.

The Nauru Act empowers the Administrator to direct, at any time, the holding of a general election, and requires a general election to be held at the time, and in such manner as may be provided for by ordinance. A duty is placed upon the Administrator to ensure that general elections are held at intervals not exceeding three years.

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

Times for holding sessions of the Council may be appointed by the Administrator, who is also empowered to terminate its sessions. However, the Council must meet within six months of the holding of a general election, and there must be at least one meeting every twelve months. It is also mandatory for the Administrator to arrange the holding of a session of the Council when one is requested by six or more members of the Council. In practice, a meeting of the Legislative Council is being held about once every three months.

The Administrator is President of the Council, and presides at its meetings. A quorum of at least six members, including at least four elected members, is necessary to constitute a valid meeting of the Council.

Although the Administrator may be counted as a member to constitute a quorum, he has no voting power, except for a casting vote to decide a question which has attracted equal numbers of votes for and against.

The Legislative Council is to have a general legislative power except with respect to defence, external affairs and matters associated with the phosphate industry. Responsibility for the defence of the Territory and for conduct of its external affairs remains with the Administering Authority. Matters associated with the phosphate industry have been excluded from the powers of the Legislative Council, with the agreement of the Nauruan representatives.

Ordinances passed by the Legislative Council are subject to assent and disallowance in accordance with provisions set out in the Nauru Act. The Administrator has power to assent or withhold assent or to reserve ordinances for the Governor-General's consideration except that he must reserve ordinances on several specified subjects. If an ordinance is assented to by the Administrator, the Governor-General has power to disallow it within six months. The Governor-General may recommend amendments arising out of his consideration of ordinances passed by the Legislative Council.

In respect of defence, internal security and the maintenance of peace and order, external affairs and matters associated with the phosphate industry, the Governor-General has power to pass ordinances. If an ordinance made by the Governor-General is inconsistent with an ordinance made by the Legislative Council, the ordinance made by the Governor-General prevails.

Ordinances made by the Governor-General are to be tabled in each House of Australian Parliament and are subject to disallowance by resolution of either House. In the event that assent to an ordinance made by the Legislative Council is withheld or such an ordinance is disallowed, the Minister is required to lay before each House of the Parliament a statement of reasons for that action.

The Nauru Act also established a Council to be known as the Executive Council for the Territory of Nauru and consisting of the Administrator, two elected members of the Legislative Council and two official members of the Legislative Council. The members are appointed by the Governor-General, the elected members on the nomination of a majority of the elected members of the Legislative Council and the official members on the nomination of the Administrator.

The Administrator presides at meetings of the Executive Council and questions are decided by a majority of votes. The Administrator has a deliberative vote and, where the numbers are equal, a casting vote as well. The Executive Council exercises such functions as are conferred on it by ordinance and advises the Administrator on any matter referred by him to the Executive Council.

Finally, part VII of the Nauru Act deals with the judicial system of the Territory. This part is to come into operation on a date to be proclaimed. It does not, however, introduce any major changes in the structure of the law courts at present established in the Territory. New provisions are, first, that there is an appeal to the High Court of Australia on decisions of the Court of Appeal and, second, that the Central Court must be constituted by a judge if it is adjudicating on a question relating to the qualification of a member of the Legislative Council or a matter involving interpretation of a provision of the Nauru Act.

Using powers conferred by the Nauru Act, the Administrator on 24 December 1965 made the Electoral Ordinance 1965. This provided for the adoption of certain electoral districts for Legislative Council elections, for the maintenance of electoral rolls, writs for elections, and the nomination and election of candidates in accordance with the provisions of the Nauru Act. Subject to the disqualifications I have already mentioned, every Nauruan who is over the age of twenty-one years, whether male or female, is entitled to be enrolled as an elector.

Voting is by secret ballot on a preferential system providing for the election of a candidate who obtains an absolute majority either by receiving the greatest number of first preference votes or after the distribution of the lower preferences shown on the ballot papers of excluded candidates. This is the system in force for the election of members of the Nauru Local Government Council, and both it and the electorates used in election of members of that Council were retained at the request of the Nauru Local Government Council for use in elections for the Legislative Council.

Elections were held in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance on 22 January 1966, and twenty-six candidates sought election to membership of the Legislative Council. The elections resulted in the election to the Legislative

Council of all the members of the Nauru Local Government Council -- that is: Cr. Hamner DeRoburt, O.B.E. (unopposed), Cr. Austin Bernicke, Cr. Ruraro Detudamo, Cr. Roy Degoregore (unopposed), Cr. Edwin Tsitsi, Cr. Agoko Doguape, Cr. Alegen Bop, Cr. Victor Eoaeo, and Cr. Joseph Detsimea Audoa.

The five official members appointed to the Council were Mr. R.E. Vizard, Official Secretary; Mr. J.W. Carey, Administrative Officer; Mr. W.N. Allison, Director of Education; Mr. J.S. McConnachie, Director of Police; and Mr. D.J. Dickson, representing the Departments of Health and Works.

In compliance with a wish expressed by the Nauru Local Government Council, 31 January, the anniversary of the return of the Nauruans to their homeland from exile during the 1939-1945 war, was fixed as the date for the first meeting of the Legislative Council and the first meeting was held on that date in the presence of a distinguished gathering which included the Minister for Territories, the Honourable C.E. Barnes; the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Australian Parliament, the Honourable Sir John McLeay; the Opposition Whip in the Senate in the Australian Parliament, Senator Justine O'Byrne; the New Zealand High Commissioner in Australia, His Excellency J. Luke Hazlett; and a representative of the Government of the United Kingdom, Mr. F.B. Arnold. The Australian House of Representatives also made available the services of its Assistant Clerk to help the new legislature with the formalities of the inaugural meeting.

The Australian delegation presented to the Legislative Council on behalf of the Australian Government a Chair for the use of the President of the Council. Gifts were received also from His Excellency Mr. Hazlett, who presented on behalf of the New Zealand Government a collection of books for the Legislative Council Library; and from Mr. Arnold, who presented on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom an engraved silver ink stand for the President's table.

The new political development was greeted in Nauru by celebrations in all the districts on the day the Legislative Council was inaugurated. Floral and other colourful decorations by day and illuminations at night provided a gay background to the dancing and feasting which marked the opening day and continued for some days afterwards.

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

The Minister for Territories delivered the inaugural address at the opening of the Council and was supported by the Speaker, Sir John McLeay; Senator O'Byrne; the New Zealand High Commissioner, His Excellency Mr. Bazlett; and the representative of Great Britain, Mr. Arnold. During his address the Minister announced that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II had appointed the Head Chief of Nauru, Mr. H. DeRoburt, to be an officer of the Order of the British Empire in recognition of the marked devotion shown by him in his untiring efforts to advance the interests of the Nauruan people.

After the ceremonial opening and the provisional adoption of standing orders, the Legislative Council adjourned and resumed the following week when the Executive Council Ordinance 1966 was passed. Other business included the introduction of several other bills, notably the Superannuation Bill already mentioned, the debates on which were adjourned until a later meeting. Meetings of the Legislative Council were held also in April and May.

At the resumed first meeting of the Legislative Council, also, Councillor Hammer DeRoburt moved for the appointment of a Select Committee consisting of two official and four elected members of the Council to inquire into and report upon "the most suitable means by which the people of Nauru can achieve complete independence by January 1968".

The motion was passed by the Council, but the official members thought it would be inappropriate, if not improper, for them to accept appointment to the Select Committee. Accordingly at its second meeting, which was held in May, the Legislative Council appointed to the Select Committee five elected members, namely Councillor H. DeRoburt, O.B.E., Councillor A. Bernicke, Councillor J.A. Bop, Councillor J.D. Audoa and Councillor B. Detudamo.

The Executive Council Ordinance passed, as already mentioned, by the Legislative Council at its first meeting and assented to by the Administrator on 14 February 1966, amends twenty-seven Ordinances by transferring authority previously exercised under them by the Administrator to the Administrator-in-Council, that is the Executive Council. The effect of the amendments is that the power previously exercised by the Administrator under the Ordinances listed in the

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

first schedule to the Executive Council Ordinance may in future be exercised by the Administrator acting in accordance with the advice of the Executive Council, but not otherwise.

The Ordinances amended in this way represent a first selection made, in such time as was available, in order to endow the Executive Council with powers and functions which would enable it to be established without delay. It is intended that the Legislative Council itself should consider and recommend the amendment of other Ordinances to effect a further transfer of powers.

The Executive Council had its first meeting on 28 February 1966, and has met once fortnightly since.

The Trusteeship Council will have noted that the near future promises a resumption of the friendly discussions now under way between the joint delegation representing the Administering Governments and the delegation representing the Nauruan people on the future arrangements for the control of the phosphate industry and on the report of the expert Committee on the possibility of rehabilitating the worked-out lands.

In the events of the past twelve months the Trusteeship Council will, I believe, see substantial developments and advances in the political and economic fields. The establishment of the Legislative Council on 31 January and of the Executive Council not only met the request of the Nauruan people but also created the opportunities they have sought to widen their experience in the processes of government and in the day-to-day administration of the island.

These developments and widening experience will provide an appropriate and valuable approach to the later discussions on the possibility of further movement towards greater Nauruan executive responsibility which the Administering Authority has proposed should be held two or three years after the establishment of the Legislative and Executive Councils.

This, then, is an account of the events and decisions which have affected the Trust Territory and its people since the 1965 session of the Trusteeship Council. In it I have sought not only to bring the 1964-1965 annual report up to date, but also to provide the Trusteeship Council with the information called for in resolution of the General Assembly 2111 (XX) of 21 December 1965.

(Mr. Leydin,
Special Representative)

In his speech to the Legislative Council at its inaugural meeting the Minister for Territories, Mr. C.E. Barnes, said inter alia to the members:

"Since the establishment of the Nauruan Local Government Council in 1951, the people have had experience in conducting their own local government affairs. The experience which has been gained through the Local Government Council will be invaluable in dealing with the problems of government with which you now will be faced. Improved communications, better standards of living and nutrition, excellent health services, in which practically the whole of the work is within their own competence, and advancing education which is beginning to yield the vocational and professional people to support further advances -- all these things augur well for the future growth and well-being of the people of Nauru."

Councillor Hammer DeRoburt, in moving a vote of thanks to the Australian Parliament for the gift of the President's Chair to the Legislative Council, said among other things:

"It is with feelings of pride and satisfaction that I move this motion. Pride because after many years of patient effort by our people, their democratically elected representatives are now being admitted into the intimate deliberations and operations of government. This higher political status has been granted willingly, as the gift of the beautiful chair shows, and we, the elected members, believe the gift was made in a spirit of friendliness and friendship... I believe that we, the elected members, also have some knowledge and experience of what the chair symbolizes. This understanding will be expanded and strengthened by further experience in this Council... Although there is no doubt that we, the elected members, will always endeavour to make worth-while contributions to this Council and to the government of this, our Island homeland, we are, at the same time, very glad to have this opportunity of acknowledging the basic knowledge and experience which we have gained from long years of association with the Australian Administration."

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Mr. President, I would be very grateful

if you could now give the floor to my distinguished colleague, the Head Chief of Nauru, who has expressed a wish to make a statement. You will recall that I said, in introducing the Special Representative and the representatives of the Nauruan people in this delegation, that the Head Chief, Councillor H. De Roburt, appears here inevitably in a dual capacity. He is a member of the Australian delegation and he is also the elected Head Chief of the Nauru people. He has expressed a wish to make a statement, and, Mr. President, if you would give him the floor it would please my delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure it would be the wish of the Council that we

give the Head Chief, Councillor De Roburt, the floor now.

Mr. DE ROBERT: Mr. President, I thank you for welcoming me and my colleagues to the Trusteeship Council, and I thank you also for allowing me to take up the valuable time of your Council to make this statement.

Before I proceed any further, may I also be permitted to thank my Australian leader in this delegation for his kind words and compliments to me and my fellow colleagues.

From 1961, when we first began to accompany Australian delegations as Advisers to the Special Representative to Nauru, up until now we have never sought leave to make statements. We have merely replied to questions by members of this Council and have made statements only in clarification of specific points as required of us by them. We have also never taken advantage of occasions when Presidents of this Council have invited us to speak on Nauruan affairs, as we might have wished.

I recall with deep gratitude and appreciation such a gesture made to me by the representative of Liberia, Mr. Barnes, who was President of this Council at its session in 1963.

At this time, however, for reasons which I hope will become obvious as I continue, my colleagues and I feel compelled to seek an exception to that rule, to volunteer a statement on important Nauruan matters, as we ourselves see them at this juncture. May I hasten to acknowledge that the rule to which I have just referred was mainly one of our own making, but which nevertheless strongly took into account the circumstances and ethics of our official position in Australian delegations to the Trusteeship Council.

There is a very strong and earnest desire on the part of the Nauruan people to remain the people of a distinct small nation, which in a sense they are. No matter how small they are and how unimportant they may be to others, they want to be free to perpetuate their homogeneity and to preserve themselves as a distinct people and nation. They want to shape their own destiny in this world and want to be in a position where they will be able so to do.

To have no destiny or to have it shaped for them by others because of no other reason than they are small, indeed are very poor alternatives for them. They want to own themselves and not be owned by others. They are firmly convinced

(Mr. de Roburt)

that their entire affairs are controlled better by themselves and for themselves on the spot rather than by remote control from offices thousands miles away and by officials who have their own people's interests to look after.

Our people are firmly convinced that they are not only entitled to aspire and to think, but that they should gain these objectives; and, in their opinion, the quicker the better. They feel that there is no need to apologize for having these desires and aspirations, as they understand the world agrees with them in general and in principle. Our people are firmly convinced that these desires and aspirations can be achieved only if we are granted sovereign independence.

Here again, as we understand it, there is no open opposition, except perhaps a questioning attitude from some quarters. This attitude, we believe, stems from a genuine and sincere concern for our welfare. We believe that some people find it difficult to imagine how we could be an independent nation when we are so small. To these friends we have no ready consolation to give.

Nauru was created small. The number of Nauruans in this world also happens to be small. It does not follow from these facts of nature, however, to our way of thinking, that we should not strive to the best of our ability to preserve ourselves in order to exist as the small people of such a land. Such an existence is dear to our hearts, and if that is to be upheld, all friends then must lend a helping hand so that we can achieve it by the best ways and means. Our friends not only could help us to ensure its attainment, but also to obtain protection over the years to come.

We believe ourselves that only a state of sovereign independence could provide the best possible guarantess and protections for the things which we are seeking. It has not occurred to us that we will lose the friendship of good people if we choose independence. It does not occur to us to fear independence because of our smallness. Rather, on account of our size, and perhaps insignificance to people, we fear more the apparant alternatives in a state where we lack sovereignty over ourselves and our destiny. We fear being governed by others in a manner which they themselves feel to be fit and convenient but with which we may not agree.

(Mr. de Roburt)

Because of our smallness, integration or assimilation into a bigger country would mean complete disintegration and extinction of the Nauruans as the people they want to be in a relatively short period of time. We believe that our friends, however well intentioned they are, would not seriously wish for that to happen to us.

Despite the fact that we have addressed ourselves in this regard to one of the earlier Visiting Missions to Nauru, I have again spoken at some length now on the question of our smallness because we feel there are well-meaning friends who still seem to be genuinely and sincerely concerned, for our sake, over it and with regard to the granting of independence to Nauru.

My distinguished leader of the Australian delegation, on which my colleagues and I are glad to serve, Mr. McCarthy, who, although we have not always agreed on how our mutual problems should be solved, has not only remained as a friend of the councillors and people on Nauru, but has become over the years of association a greater and closer friend to me personally.

My distinguished leader, in his address on Nauru at the last session of the General Assembly, referred to the fact that the number of Nauruans were so small that they could all be contained in the hall of that great Assembly. He no doubt gave the world this picture to illustrate the smallness of our population, and we ourselves think it is an interesting illustration.

With due respect to him, however, the purpose behind this illustration was not understood by his Nauruan friends. Was he, in fact, trying to convey the possible view of his Government that because of their smallness the Nauruans should not be granted independence? This is an honest question, asked with friendliness and sincerity.

If, in fact, he was doing that, then we are in the unfortunate position again of not comprehending the Australian Government's views on the question of independence for Nauru, since at the Canberra talks last year, agreement was reached on the establishment of our Legislative Council and Executive Council as a step towards self-determination by the Nauruan people. We thought, and we still think, there was only disagreement as to the question of timing, not principle.

I must not give this Council the impression that the Nauruan people envisage that they will encounter no difficulties whatever when they achieve independence. We believe that there are bound to be troubles, teething troubles.

(Mr. de Roburt)

No doubt there will be mistakes made. Even the present Administering Authority makes mistakes. We ourselves will hope and pray that the ones we might inadvertently make will be small, that they will not be many, and that they will become even smaller as we gain great experience.

(Mr. De Roburt)

We can see that we shall have to suffer some inconveniences in doing certain things and in worrying about certain things for ourselves, things which previously we had done for us. These, however, can hardly be regarded as serious disadvantages in having independence. It does not occur to us that we shall lose the good-will of people simply because we have chosen this road, and in independence there is nothing we can see that would prevent us from making friends with other peoples. With the Governments and the peoples of the three countries constituting the present Administering Authority, we take it for granted that our friendship will continue and prosper, but with mutual respect for each other's sovereign rights and as equals. It simply does not occur to us that it can be otherwise.

What then is there that still remains problematical on this question of independence? The problem lies in timing, and so far it seems a serious one.

I would like now to be permitted to express our heartfelt gratitude for a resolution adopted in favour of Nauru by the Committee of Twenty-Four, and particularly for General Assembly resolution 2111 (XX), adopted at its last session. These resolutions, which to us were quite momentous, were broadcast by Radio Australia, and accounts of them were published also in the local weekly news-sheets. The United Nations records of them have been received by our Council, and we have here with us our copies from Nauru.

I cannot explain how much we appreciated and welcomed these resolutions. They have given us encouragement, inspiration and reassurance when we needed these and have given us greater faith in ourselves and the justness of our cause. They certainly have not given us the means to become careless or irresponsible; neither would they lead us to become unmindful of the legitimate interests of others on account of our own quest for freedom on Nauru. I trust that the representatives of the countries in this Council will not take that to mean that I have committed the Nauruan people in advance to relegating their interests to second place whenever clashes of interest occur in the future on Nauru.

I beg the further indulgence of this Council to take the opportunity now of expressing our very sincere thanks and our feeling of indebtedness to this Council for its resolution, passed at last year's session, which has

(Mr. De Roburt)

relevance to the timing of independence for Nauru. Without that resolution there would have been confusion and disillusionment, and perhaps also greater feelings of frustration in Nauru.

I think the members of this Council know that our people look more to the Trusteeship Council for assistance in their problems. It is the Trusteeship Council, they know, which sends them the Visiting Missions that they have always taken advantage of every three years. It is the Council which has always received their petitions and which has helped them over the years in the past. While Nauruan awareness of the other larger United Nations Councils and their functions and effectiveness is definitely growing, their relationship to them is not, I think, as intimate as it is with this Council.

By the resolution to which I have just referred, your Council has paved the way for talks to be held in 1967 between ourselves and the Administernig Authority, to discuss when Nauru should be granted independence. For that fact alone we are in debt to this Council. It is now up to us and the Administering Authority. There has been no move made as yet by either side to suggest at least a date or time when they should meet. However, this should be no problem.

The problem lies in the fact that the Nauruan people want to achieve independence by 31 January 1968, that is, after they have had two years' experience of government at the legislative and executive council level, which they now enjoy under provisions of the Nauru Act which was passed by the Australian Parliament. I feel that I ought to tell this Council that in the whole period between now and the time when that objective was enunciated, we have not been aware or conscious of any factor which we could use to convince ourselves that any delaying of independence would be in the interests of our people. On the contrary, our carefully considered judgement is that it will be better for us to have independence sooner than later.

With this sense of urgency, as elected members of the Legislative Council we have tried to have a motion passed in that Council for the establishment of a select committee for independence, the main functions of which are to study the best ways and means for the Nauruan people to achieve independence by 31 January 1968, and our efforts have been relatively

(Mr. De Roburt)

successful. According to the motion which was duly passed at the first meeting of the Legislative Council, in February last, two official members were to have been members of the Committee. However, official members of the Council had voted against the motion and when it was passed they had refused to serve as members on the committee. At the second meeting of the Legislative Council last May, therefore, the elected members had to amend the original motion in order to replace the two official members with elected members. As my colleague the Special Representative for Nauru has described, the amendment was duly passed, and the membership of this Committee now consists of myself and my two colleagues who are here with me; Councillor Austin Bernicke, the member for Buada, who is still in Australia; and Councillor Ategan Bop, the member for Menang, who is in Nauru.

The select committee has met only once, more or less informally, when the majority of its members had to leave to attend discussions in Canberra with representatives of the three partner Governments in the conference which has been referred to by my colleague the Special Representative for Nauru.

In the same general direction, and with the same sense of urgency, the Nauru Government Local Council, at its meeting on 16 May last, agreed to establish a developmental planning board or committee to initiate research and planning of necessary developmental projects for Nauru. It is to function as soon as possible. It will make recommendations to the Nauru Local Government Council.

At the same time, the Local Government Council has agreed also to create a new fund, to be called the Nauru Development Fund, with which it is intended to finance approved projects as recommended by the Developmental Planning Committee. It is our intention to allocate money to this fund from additional phosphate royalties when these are paid in the near future.

Preparations are being made also for the introduction of appropriate legislation in Nauru to provide for the formation of a board of trustees which would handle all investments of funds in the best interests of the Nauruan community.

The Nauru Local Government Council is also consulting the Administration and the Department of Territories in regard to the proposed establishment of a Nauru Office in Melbourne, which is to be a sort of base from where general Nauruan interests and public relations in Australia, and perhaps also in New Zealand, will be pursued and handled. These interests will include some of the functions I have just mentioned, as well as the commercial activities of our own, which are at present being handled by the British Phosphate Commissioners from their Melbourne office. At an appropriate stage it is hoped that affairs of our growing student population in Australia will also be dealt with from this office. And when Nauru achieves independence, recruitment of expatriates for employment on Nauru, if and when they are required, could also be processed by this office.

We are also trying to foster trading between Nauru and the United States Trust Territories to the north of us. We have expressed thanks to our own Administration for its co-operation in this new field, and through their distinguished representative on this Council. I should like to thank the United States authorities for their encouragement of these relations and activities. May I also thank them for looking after the welfare of Nauruans and for welcoming Nauruans on every occasion they have visited those beautiful islands in recent years.

I mention these things in passing because we feel they are significant developments, and they are important in themselves, and are indicative of Nauru's progress in the right direction. They are also relevant to the main subject on which I am addressing this Council, as I hope I shall be able to show. My purpose in mentioning them is also to highlight some aspects about them which I think are either not known or are not obvious to your Council.

These are: that the response and attitude of the Department of Territories in the preliminary discussions we have had with them so far on most of these matters have been quite positive, most heartening and most encouraging. They have been eager to listen and keen to help when and where necessary. I know our Council on Nauru will be very pleased with such response and attitude and I thought that your Council might like to share with our people these pleasant and

(Mr. De Roburt)

valid thoughts. Some of these matters which we discussed will have very far-reaching and good effects for our people and therefore prospects for Nauru's future in this regard are not at all gloomy. What I have just said should show that there is not "always strife" between Canberra and the Nauruans on matters of importance, and that there are assured and strong grounds for hope that the other major problems of mutual concern could be tackled successfully in the same spirit of understanding.

I should like now to present the remaining aspect I have in mind, and that is that, at the practical level of any undertaking which is likely to arise from the developments I have mentioned, we will rely on non-Nauruan skills in some area. This is pointed out in order to reveal, next, that it is our intention, also, when we are independent, to use expatriate skills and know-how, but only when it is absolutely necessary. However, we do not think this should be too rigid a policy. There should be flexibility to enable us to exploit other skills as and when it suits us. The important thing to us will be to have full control and final say.

It will be quite detrimental to the interests of our people if worthy projects were not to be undertaken because we must wait until the suitable Nauruans emerge to fill all positions. Already on Nauru, in the Nauru Co-operative Society, today, we have an Australian supervisor, loaned by the British Phosphate Commissioners, to manage the stores while I am absent on other work. He works under control of the Nauruan Board of Directors, who are quite happy with his efficient services. The arrangement is highly satisfactory and workable and there is no reason why it should not be used elsewhere.

As we see it now, there will be some positions in the Administration in January 1968 which we will not be able to fill with our own people. There is no Nauruan doctor in sight yet, and we shall still require the services of some expatriate school teachers in 1968. We are already engaged in the search for expatriate people whom we might wish to employ, if necessary. Present incumbents of certain Administration positions have also been approached with the view of finding out whether they would be willing to work under an independent Nauruan government. Prospects in both categories are bright.

(Mr. De Roburt)

We therefore say that if the Administering Authority would be willing, Nauruan independence by January 1968 will not only be possible but the transition thereto will be quite satisfactory and smooth. We certainly do not expect that the Administering Authority will delay our independence on the grounds that a doctor or a teacher we may employ is not a member of our own race.

Now, since there is no manifest dispute that we should be granted independence, there remains the aspect of timing for it.

As far as my colleagues and I know -- and we are subject to correction in this -- the concept of setting target dates for the granting of independence to colonies and territories is fairly widely practised.

The Western Samoans under New Zealand knew beforehand when they were to achieve their independence. Various colonies of the United Kingdom enjoyed the same privilege. Mauritius will be granted its independence soon and the two distinguished officials from its Foreign Service who are in New York at present know when that happy occasion for them is going to take place. Our fellow-colleagues in the Australian delegation here, from Australia's senior Territory of Papua and New Guinea, at least have some idea as to when they could have their independence. The Honourable, our Minister of State for Territories, in opening the Vudal Agricultural College on 15 May 1965, said -- and I quote from the record of his speech:

"... I should like to emphasize that it is for you and you only to say when you want self-government."

Against all that background, it is very confusing and disconcerting for us to be given only a hand-down from our Administering Authority which recognizes no target date for Nauru's independence, and which concedes only that they will have a look at the position again, after we have had two or three years of legislative council experience, to see whether or not, in the light of that experience, it would be possible for them to give us greater executive responsibility.

Even at that, the picture of Nauruan problems would still be incomplete, and I therefore beg this Council to bear with me a little longer. May I continue by saying that there are essential ingredients to the independence we are seeking and which the United Nations supports without which independence could not be securely attained. And if, notwithstanding, it were gained, it not only would be utterly meaningless, but would be fraught with so many dangers and insecurities that it might well in fact be untenable or even unsafe for our people to have. The major essential ingredients which we ourselves can clearly see are: firstly, a homeland, on which we could survive as an independent community and live permanently; and secondly, an economy which should be as viable as we could possibly make it.

(Mr. De Roburt)

Although I do not think the correctness of our views could be seriously contested, the detailed substance and their ramifications are important subjects of the recent Canberra Conference, which was adjourned on 1 July 1966 to enable me and my colleagues to attend this session of the Trusteeship Council. We are therefore bound by points of ethics and common decency, to which we subscribe voluntarily, and I find myself, therefore, in the position where I have to refrain from commenting on matters which have been discussed at the Conference, which is in fact technically still continuing. However, I feel entitled to explain to this Council the problems surrounding the questions of our permanent homeland and our need to have a viable economy to sustain our future independence on it. To the best of my ability -- and I shall be brief -- I shall endeavour to present them in summary form to avoid details and, thereby, honour our commitments to the Canberra Conference, which will resume again in October or November.

The question of a permanent homeland for our people is a problem -- a serious one -- for reasons which are well known to this Council, and I shall not dwell on that. Suffice it to say that, upon the failure of the Australian Government and the Nauruan people to reach an agreement on resettlement, there was no other alternative left for the Nauruan people, and they had to decide to remain on their own island of Nauru.

To remain on Nauru, the Nauruan people would require the island to be fully rehabilitated, and we submit that the responsibility for rehabilitating the island, in so far as it is the Administering Authority, remains with the Administering Authority. If it should turn out that Nauru gets its independence in January 1968, from then on the responsibility will be ours. A rough assessment of the portions of responsibility for this rehabilitation exercise then is this: one-third is the responsibility of the Administering Authority, and two-thirds is the responsibility of the Nauruan people. The one-third I refer to is that part of Nauru which was mined in the past and from which the royalties of phosphate benefits have undoubtedly enriched the three Administering Authority Governments. We ourselves will be responsible for two-thirds of the rehabilitation requirement. To be able to do this, we require all the benefits that could be obtained from the only natural asset of the island -- and that is the phosphate.

(Mr. De Roburt)

This Council has the reports of the views of the Administering Authority and our people on who owns the phosphate deposits on Nauru. The Administering Authority says -- and it insists -- that the deposits are owned by the British Phosphate Commissioners, who bought them from another company, which company bought them from a German company. We dispute this, and say that we are the owners of the phosphate and do not recognize the right I have referred to, which was a right of conquest by the Germans.

My colleague the Special Representative has referred to the possibility of a fifty-fifty share in a partnership arrangement on the rest of the life of the phosphate industry on Nauru. We, the Nauruan people, are seeking ownership of the industry. In seeking this, we feel we are compelled to do the fair thing vis-à-vis the people who at present call themselves the owners. And the fair thing to us is to use the BPC as managing agents and pay them a fair fee. A fair thing, in our mind, also is that we should buy the equipment they have on Nauru; we should compensate them for it. However, I cannot go into more details of these important things, because they are subjects of the Conference in Canberra. The talks are going on, and we have hope in their outcome.

You may well wonder, then, what the Nauruan people expects from this Council on all these problems. I have the honour to say that we shall expect your support if, in your considered view, our course is just and the things we are seeking we are entitled to.

Finally, I should like to pay tribute to my Australian chiefs here, who have allowed me to speak to this Council this afternoon. I am sure they do not agree with all the things I have said, and I am sure they may have reservations about some of them. However, such is their sense of fair play to Nauru that they have allowed its humble leader to speak, in their presence, to this Council.

I thank you, again Mr. President, and this distinguished Council for allowing me to make this statement, and I shall place myself and my colleagues at the disposal of this Council to answer any questions to the best of our ability which you and the members of the Council may wish to ask us.

The PRESIDENT: I would suggest that, in order that we may pass on to other business briefly, the Special Representative and the Head Chief and his Adviser should now withdraw, on the understanding that they may come back again for a further session of questions at a later date, as they have so kindly offered to do.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Could my delegation first request the Special Representative, if it is at all possible, kindly to make available to members of the Council copies of the Nauruan Act which he mentioned several times during his statement. I have in mind the Nauruan Act, from which the Legislative Council and Executive Council now derive their terms of reference.

Mr. LEYDIN (Special Representative): Yes, Mr. President, I have copies available, and would be glad to make them available to the representative of Liberia, and to the other representatives if they would like to have a copy.

Mr. R.S. Leydin, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Nauru under Australian Administration. Head Chief Hammer DeRoburt, and Mr. Joseph Detsimea withdrew.

AGENDA ITEMS 12 AND 13

OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1654 and Add.1-2)

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM IN TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1651)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will recall that it decided last Friday to take up this afternoon two reports of the Secretary-General: the first concerning offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories, and the second concerning dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories. Does any member of the Council have any objection to taking up those two items now? If I hear none, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this procedure.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall first take up the report of the Secretary-General (T/1654 and Add.1-2) on offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation cannot speak in detail on this important item because of the lateness of the hour. We should, however, like to express the following views.

Over the years we have asked the Australian Government to give an opportunity to people from Papua and New Guinea to travel abroad, get acquainted with the world around them and broaden their ideas. We have been told in statements made by the Australian delegation here that some New Guineans have been given an opportunity to go to Hawaii and to Fiji. No reference has been made, however, to these various offers contained in document T/1654. We know that the Australian Government makes it possible for people from the Territory to travel to Australia for study. But means are available in other countries and these people should be enabled to travel abroad. Australia, however, restricts this travel and

says that it has facilities in Australia. We know that more doctors, agriculturalists and so forth are needed in New Guinea. Nevertheless, Australia still restricts travel to those countries which it selects. Countries like Burma, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Philippines, Italy, Mexico and Pakistan have offered opportunities to these people, but the Australian Government does not allow them to take advantage of the opportunities. I think that they are being denied something basic to their development.

My delegation feels that in addition to sending these people to Australia, the Australian Government should send them to other countries that have offered opportunities for study.

My delegation again calls on Australia to give the people of the Territory an opportunity to broaden themselves by studying wherever facilities have been offered.

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to reserve the right to speak on this subject. We have a number of observations to make in this respect.

The PRESIDENT: In view of what have just been said by the representative of the Soviet Union, I do not think that we can dispose of this item at the present meeting. I shall therefore arrange with the Secretary for the item to be placed on the agenda of another meeting.

We turn now to the second of the Secretary-General's reports, that on the dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories (T/1651).

Mr. MAKAREVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We also have a number of observations to make on this item. In view of the lateness of the hour, we should like to be given an opportunity at another meeting to make our statement.

The PRESIDENT: In that case I have no choice but to defer consideration of this item, too, to another meeting. I shall arrange with the Secretary to have it included in the agenda on another occasion.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: We are falling behind in our schedule, and I therefore suggest that there should be two meetings tomorrow, that we should begin the morning meeting with the final statement of the representative of Australia on New Guinea and that we should then -- either in the morning or, if there is not sufficient time, in the afternoon -- take up the final items outstanding on the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): When will the Council undertake a discussion of the petitions concerning New Guinea?

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Secretary to reply to that question.

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): We are awaiting the observations on the petitions that must be submitted by the Administering Authority. As soon as they have been submitted, the item will be listed on the agenda. I am told that we shall most probably have the observations on one of the petitions tomorrow.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): The observations of the Administering Authority on both petitions will be in the hands of the Secretary tomorrow.

Because of the deferred statements of the representative of the Soviet Union -- and I mean no offence in saying that -- we are having some difficulty in preparing our final statement and other material. The representative of the Soviet Union made a very interesting and somewhat lengthy statement on New Guinea, this morning, and that statement deserves the closest study. He has now asked permission to speak later on two other subjects on the agenda. Since we are the target area in these matters, this naturally creates considerable difficulty for us. If -- and only if --

BC/dm

T/PV.1285
74-75

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

it would be convenient for the United States delegation, we should prefer a little extra time to prepare our closing statement on New Guinea; in other words, we should prefer to make it tomorrow afternoon. Would it be possible to reverse the order of business for tomorrow? As I have said, I do not wish to inconvenience the United States delegation.

Mr. ANDERSON (United States of America): I am not sure whether we will be able to accommodate the representative of Australia, much as we should like to. One member of our delegation would have to come from Washington, and because of the situation with the airlines, I am not sure whether he would be able to get here tomorrow morning. We will try, and if possible he will be here, but I cannot be sure about this at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I understand the point made by the United States representative. We know the difficulties involved and, if necessary, we will accommodate ourselves to your original proposal, Mr. President, about the closing statement. But I would suggest that the time of our meeting tomorrow be set for 11 a.m., instead of 10.30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the Council is very much obliged to the representative of Australia for accommodating our difficulties in that way. There is one further suggestion I would make, apart from the timing of the meeting, which might help, if the Council so pleases. That would be that tomorrow morning we first take up the two items we have still to dispose of, that is, the reports of the Secretary-General. If we took those items first, and met at 11 a.m., and then went straight on to the final statement by the representative of Australia on New Guinea, that should occupy us for the whole morning. In the afternoon, we could go on with the report stage of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

If no member has any comments to make on that point, we will so proceed.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.