

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1320
20 July 1967

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 June 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mrs. ANDERSON (United States)
(Vice-President)

1. Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967 (T/1658 and Corr.1 and Add.1; T/L.1126) (continued)
2. Examination of conditions in Nauru: report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1120 and Add.1-2, L.1128)
3. General Assembly resolutions on the question of the Trust Territory of Nauru (resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI))

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE
PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1967 (T/1658 and Corr.1 and Add.1; T/L.1126) (continued)

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): It is my privilege and pleasure to introduce the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1126, concerning the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission which visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on our behalf early this year.

It is a matter of particular gratification to my delegation to see that the gracious representative of Liberia has made a timely appearance in the Council, in the Liberian seat on this occasion, for this draft resolution is intended to be a tribute to the work which Miss Brooks and her able team carried out on our behalf in Micronesia. I use that word "work" advisedly, because these Visiting Missions are no tourist trips. They are carried out sometimes under extremely difficult conditions of transport and accommodation, and so on. Visiting Missions tend to work much longer hours than we are accustomed to work here; on occasion they are on duty twenty-four hours a day. Even when the trip itself is over, there are weeks and weeks of difficult drafting, and reconciling often differing viewpoints. It seemed therefore to my delegation highly appropriate to place on record the Council's approval of the work carried out by the Visiting Mission.

This report which the Mission has produced takes its place as one of a very erudite line of reports on Micronesia, and this draft resolution itself is submitted in an inadequate endeavour to thank the Visiting Mission, and particularly its leader, for the time and effort which they put into producing the report, and to place on record the fact that the Council has taken note of, and has absorbed, the collective information and wisdom contained therein.

I trust that the draft resolution will receive what it deserves, which is the unanimous support of the Council.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): I should like merely to underline this tribute to the Visiting Mission and to express for the United States, to the Chairman of the Visiting Mission and to its other members, our very deep and sincere appreciation for a very hard-working, conscientious and intelligent job.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

Their observations were extremely helpful. Their commentary was constructive. These observations have been taken into careful account already by my Government and will continue to be deserving of our very careful study.

Once again, I would like to express directly our thanks to those who have played such an important role in the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: As no other delegation has any comments to make, we shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution in document T/L.1126, which has been introduced by the representative of New Zealand.

Draft resolution T/L.1126 was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain the reasons for our vote. My delegation voted against adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of New Zealand concerning the report of the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and contained in document T/L.1126. In so doing we based ourselves on the following considerations.

Although the report of the Visiting Mission does contain certain recommendations calling on the Administering Authority to introduce certain individual reforms in the field of constitutional development in the Territory, and although it does contain certain recommendations for improving the systems of public-health services and of education in the Territory and for improvement of communications among the various islands, the report of the Visiting Mission as a whole, however, reflects the viewpoint of the Administering Authority on the situation in the Territory and the prospects for the Territory's development.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

As a matter of fact, the Visiting Mission has supported the colonial thesis of the Administering Authority concerning the lack of preparation of the population for self-determination and self-independence. It has approved the so-called plan for the economic development of Micronesia which was prepared by the Nathan firm, a plan which not only does not provide for development of industry in the Territory, thereby making possible the development of independent economic activities for the indigenous population, but which, on the contrary, leads to a still greater dependency of the Territory's economy on American monopolies. It also leads to the transformation of the Territory into an organ that would serve as a supply of raw material for the metropolitan country, and serves as a basis for providing a number of products for American military bases in the Pacific Ocean, including the naval and air base in Guam. The report not only does not reject the American plans for annexation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but actually sanctions these plans by the statements concerning the applicability of resolution 1514 (XV) to this Territory.

This opens the door to the absorption of this Territory under the guise of association or integration.

The draft resolution submitted by New Zealand, particularly paragraphs 4 and 5 thereof, proposes that the Administering Authority should consider the recommendations and conclusions of the Visiting Mission with respect to this Trust Territory, which amounts to an encouragement of the annexationist tendencies of the Administering Authority, all of which is in contradiction with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I was wondering whether I really understood what the representative of the Soviet Union had to say. I was the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, and I worked with my colleagues in drafting this report. I am not certain if it is the same report that he is referring to, because the Visiting Mission endeavoured to be extremely objective and to present the case exactly as we found it in the Trust Territory. I do not believe that

the representative of the Soviet Union really wants to say that the Visiting Mission approved entirely the Nathan report. Objectively, we saw some good points in the report; and I must say to the representative of the Soviet Union that, if he read the report very carefully, he would see that there were criticisms of the Administering Authority in the report.

We looked at those aspects which we thought were objective, and at the same time there were certain elements which we did not think were advisable. These elements had already been discussed with the Administering Authority, and I think the Administering Authority brought up some of the same points in the Trusteeship Council. Also, I believe the representative of the people of the Territory mentioned those points here.

Therefore, I do not think that the representative of the Soviet Union really intended to say that the Visiting Mission had not been objective and that its report reflected what was untrue. I would say to the representative of the Soviet Union that I do not believe the report reflects the fact that we totally approved the points or suggestions made in the Nathan report. But I think he would appreciate the Mission being objective and taking into consideration those points which even the people in the Territory felt were in their interest.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I did not wish to take the floor again, but the suggestion that paragraphs 4 and 5 of this resolution just passed by an overwhelming majority in the Council amounts to an encouragement to annexation of the Territory must be taken up.

Supporting this thesis, the representative of the Soviet Union suggested that resolution 1541 (XV) provided a vehicle for annexation. On my reading of resolution 1541 (XV), and on the reading of the Assembly majority which approved that resolution, it provides, in fact, for a number of alternative terminations to the colonial experience, including, of course, sovereign independence. Indeed, this resolution sets out very onerous procedures for the exercise of the right of self-determination and provides for the United Nations itself to check on the carrying out of these procedures.

As I said before, it reflects the view of the Assembly majority, and one cannot suggest that the Assembly majority would approve a resolution which amounts to a vehicle for annexation.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN NAURU: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1120 and Add. 1-2, L.1128)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI))

The PRESIDENT: The report of the Drafting Committee on Nauru is contained in document T/L.1128. The representative of France, a member of the Drafting Committee, will introduce the report at this time.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France)(interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegations of the United States and France, it is my pleasure to present to the Council the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of Nauru. We have done our best. As we do not lay any claim to perfection, we shall neither be surprised nor offended if certain members of the Council criticize the report or have any modifications to suggest.

Speaking as the representative of France, I should like to express my regret that the French text of this report has not yet been distributed. I know of the conditions of haste with which the Secretariat has had to act. However, I feel that I should make this comment so that it will be included in the records of this session.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to speak to the report as a whole. I shall commence by saying to the representative of the Soviet Union that Liberia is second to none in advocating the cause of a people who express their desire for independence.

I must say frankly that when I read the report of the Drafting Committee on Nauru, I was somewhat disappointed. Far be it from me to say that the report is completely meaningless, but I must admit that it is much weaker than the report which we had last year. My delegation took part in the discussion of

last year's Drafting Committee, and knows what happened at these meetings. We compared last year's report with this year's report, and we saw, for instance, that this year's Drafting Committee based itself partly on last year's report. However, many conclusions and recommendations adopted last year were left out or weakened, and I believe that the circumstances are not such that they should be left out.

For instance, paragraphs 2 and 3 of this year's report of the Drafting Committee are almost identical with the first part of paragraph 318 of last year's report. But a very important sentence, for which we fought last year, was left out, namely: "The Council also reaffirms the right of the people of Nauru to self-government and/or independence."

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

I cannot conceive why that sentence was left out. I would therefore formally move that that sentence be included in the recommendations of the Council to be adopted at this session.

This year's report also leaves out the recommendations of the General Assembly contained in resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI). Although these recommendations are in some cases referred to by number, reference to the recommendations is nowhere included in the draft report. Last year, for instance, in the recommendations proposed by the Drafting Committee and then adopted by the Trusteeship Council, we included the wording of the resolution of the General Assembly that it requested the Administering Authority to fix the earliest possible date, but not later than 31 January 1968, for the independence of the Nauruan people in accordance with their wishes. Resolution 2226 (XXI) contains the same provision in even stronger language, because it "Recommends that the Administering Authority should fix the earliest possible date for the independence..." instead of requesting it. In this year's recommendation the Council only recalls the recommendations of resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI) but does not say what those recommendations are. Therefore, I propose that the last sentence of paragraph 3 of this year's recommendation be changed to read:

"The Council, noting General Assembly resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI), which recommend, inter alia, that the Administering Authority should fix the earliest possible date, but not later than 31 January 1968, for the independence of the Nauruan people in accordance with their freely expressed wishes, recommends that the Administering Authority give effect to this recommendation of the General Assembly."

Another anomaly of this report of the Drafting Committee is the omission of any reference to the wishes of the Nauruan people. In the last report, for instance, we had a sentence which read: "The Council recommends to the Administering Authority that it give consideration to the wishes of the Nauruan people, freely expressed through their elected representatives, to receive independence not later than 31 January 1968." This recommendation is also omitted from the present report, and none of the recommendations contained in resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI) are either noted or recalled.

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

Madam President, I intend to introduce two draft resolutions. If you think that it would save time for me to introduce the draft resolutions at this time, I should be willing to do so. If not, I am willing to wait. May I proceed?

The PRESIDENT: You may proceed.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I wish to introduce two draft resolutions. They are self-explanatory, since they are based on General Assembly resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI).

With regard to independence for Nauru, we see clearly from the discussion of the report in the Council that the Administering Authority gives only two choices to the Nauruan people: (1) that Nauru be an associated State but not an independent State, or (2) that it be an independent State on condition that a treaty of friendship be concluded in advance of independence giving Australia the right to conduct foreign affairs and defence. My delegation takes a contrary view to this position, since the representatives of the Nauruan people have clearly stated that they wish to be completely independent, and if a treaty of friendship should be concluded, it can be concluded only after independence has been granted. We take this position because it has been taken in times past with regard to other Trust Territories or other Non-Self-Governing Territories. I would give Somalia as an example. I recall very clearly that it was one of the cases in which the General Assembly decided to leave that decision to the people after their independence. Those are the express wishes of the Nauruan people, and the General Assembly has clearly stated that the wishes of the Nauruans must be taken into consideration.

With regard to the rehabilitation of worked-out phosphate land, the General Assembly clearly stated that the Administering Authority should take immediate steps irrespective of the cost involved, towards restoring the island of Nauru for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation. My delegation is of the opinion that the Administering Authority does not intend at this stage to rehabilitate the worked-out phosphate land. That is evident from the statement of the Administering Authority that financial arrangements agreed on with respect

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

to phosphates took into consideration all future needs of the Nauruan people, including possible rehabilitation of land already worked out.

We base the language of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of our draft resolution on the report of the Drafting Committee. In our draft resolution we propose that the Trusteeship Council recommend to the Administering Authority that it should take immediate steps towards restoring the island of Nauru for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation. We add that the Trusteeship Council "Considers that it is the responsibility of the Administering Authority to restore at its cost the worked-out land on the island until the time when the Nauruans receive the full economic benefit from the phosphates". The last sentence is based on the express wishes of the Nauruans.

I hope that the Council will adopt our draft resolution. We trust that the vote will be taken on each of the operative paragraphs by roll call, and that a full account of the discussion on this draft resolution and on the vote taken will be included in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly, as was done last year.

We would also submit a second draft resolution, which is self-explanatory, and which I hope will not present any difficulty to this Council.

We would ask that a separate item on the question of Nauru be inscribed on the provisional agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. Talks will be held between the Nauruans and the Administering Authority between now and September. The United Nations must be informed of the outcome of these talks, and during the twenty-second session, the General Assembly will have to make final arrangements with regard to the Trusteeship Agreement on Nauru. Therefore, we think that a separate item on this question should be included on the agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. I wish to remind the Council that a similar procedure was followed by the Trusteeship Council with regard to Western Samoa.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I listened with great interest to the comments made by the representative of Liberia, and I noticed particularly that she considered that we were less complete in the report of this Drafting Committee than we were last year; that we omitted certain of the phrases and certain of the principles which were previously contained in the report submitted to the Council last year. I think in fact that if it is true that to be concise we had to a certain extent to compress this text, we maintained all the essential parts of it in the spirit of the provisions which were contained in last year's report. Thus, regarding the rights of the people of Nauru to self-determination and independence, we did in fact delete the second sentence of the recommendations as they stood last year, but we retained mention of the provisions of Article 76 of the Charter which say that it is the duty of the administering Power to lead the people towards self-determination and independence. So there can be no doubt in the mind of the Drafting Committee that the Nauruan people is entitled to self-determination or to independence -- and I emphasize "or to independence". It is true that in our report we did not reproduce the complete definition of certain provisions of resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI), but it was simply to observe brevity that we referred to resolutions themselves, and such reference to resolutions is tantamount, of course, to any specific reference to the provisions of these resolutions.

Finally, as regards the desire of the Council that the Administering Authority should make a serious study of the wishes of the people of Nauru, I would take the liberty of pointing out to the representative of Liberia that we reproduced -- word for word, I believe -- at the end of paragraph 3 the wording which was used by the Drafting Committee last year at the end of paragraph 5 of that report which read as follows:

"The Council recommends that the Administering Authority give serious consideration to the freely expressed wishes of the Nauruan people". I think that we used the same wording at the end of paragraph 3 of this present report.

Those are the remarks that I wished to make following upon what was said by the representative of Liberia.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I am afraid that if the authors of the draft are not willing to accept the suggestions made by the delegation of Liberia, we will have no alternative but to abstain on the draft report.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I would be pleased if the representative of Liberia would re-read more slowly her proposed amendments, so that we could take them down.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): They are as follows:

"The Council also reaffirms the right of the people of Nauru to self-government and/or independence".

The PRESIDENT: Is my understanding correct that this amendment was to be a sentence added to paragraph 2?

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I think it should be a new paragraph 2.

The PRESIDENT: If it were to be a new paragraph, it would be paragraph 3.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Yes. It should come after present paragraph 2.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of Liberia be willing to have this sentence as the final sentence of paragraph 2?

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Yes. It does not matter.

As regards the next question, the wording of the General Assembly resolution as it was adopted last year requested the Administering Authority to fix the earliest possible date, but not later than 31 January 1968, for the independence of the Nauruan people in accordance with their wishes. I propose that the last sentence of paragraph 3 read as follows:

"The Council, noting General Assembly resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI), which recommend, inter alia, that the Administering Authority should fix the earliest possible date, but not later than 31 January 1968, for the independence of the Nauruan people in accordance with their freely expressed wishes, recommends that the Administering Authority give effect to this recommendation of the General Assembly."

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): Obviously, I have been unable to consult my colleague on the Drafting Committee, and I do not know whether he has a different opinion.

As regards the addition just suggested by the representative of Liberia, I think that we could accept it. That principle was accepted by the Council last year, and I do not think that there is any objection to it. In any case, we supported it, practically speaking, in another form.

As to the second suggestion, I must say that I should like to ask Mr. Johnson how he feels about it.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): It is the view of my delegation, without having given the suggestions the very careful study which they certainly deserve, that the proposal to add the sentence reaffirming the right of the people of Nauru to self-government and independence is by no means objectionable. It was indeed contained in the report last year, and certainly the concept is embraced in the present wording of the report. We would not object to this reaffirmation of that right.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

With respect to the second amendment relating to paragraph 3, my delegation would have some difficulty with those changes because we believe that they are repetitive of what is already in paragraph 3 and that they in some sense change the substance of the paragraph, particularly the wording "recommends that the Administering Authority give effect to this recommendation of the General Assembly". It is our view that the present wording is closer to the views of the majority as expressed during the meetings of the Trusteeship Council this year, and we would therefore prefer the present wording.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I am really taken aback by the reply of the representative of the United States. I think his delegation, as well as all other delegations around this table, concedes that it was the agreed opinion between the Administering Authority and the peoples of Nauru that they would get independence at that time. I cannot see why there should be any hesitation now in view of the fact that last year's report contained the same thing, and it was adopted by this body at that time. I do not understand why he does not wish to support that view at this particular time, when Nauru is on the brink of independence. That independence is not something that is so far away. In the circumstances, I would ask that the amendment be put to the vote. I would request a roll-call vote in order to see who would be willing to vote against a paragraph of that kind at this particular time when Nauru is on the brink of its independence, as conceded by the members of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): As our colleague from the United States has just pointed out, it is difficult to speak at length and in substance to amendments put in this fashion.

With regard to the first amendment, as I understand it as it has been read out by the representative of Liberia, my delegation believes that the situation is fully covered in the original wording as explained by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee. What the representative of Liberia is seeking to have inserted is explicitly or implicitly already in the text. The text of the amendment is therefore redundant.

With regard to her second amendment concerning General Assembly resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI), I believe again that the mere reference to those resolutions, as has been explained by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, is already sufficiently explicit to carry the points that have been made. It will be recalled, of course, that my delegation, for reasons which it explained at length at the last session of the General Assembly, opposed General Assembly resolutions 2111 (XX) and 2226 (XXI). We shall therefore be obliged to oppose this amendment submitted by the representative of Liberia, while, at the same time, respecting her motives in presenting it.

I should like to make the following general observation, to which I shall return later in the debate. I must confess that the tremendous advance that has been made over the last twelve months in relation to Nauru, both politically and in connexion with the control and working of the phosphate industry, does not seem to have changed the approach of certain delegations, in this case the Liberian delegation, to the question of Nauru. Those advances have been tremendous advances. I shall be speaking at greater length on that point later.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before considering the amendments that have just been submitted by the delegation of Liberia, I should like to say a few words concerning the remarks made by the representative of Liberia when we were considering the draft resolution on the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory. I should like to assure her that my delegation has no doubt whatsoever that her delegation had worked in the Mission in order to give support to the demands of the peoples of the Trust Territory. She said that the report of the Visiting Mission contained criticisms of the Nathan plan. However, I was not referring to that plan. But in any case the Visiting Mission seemed to support the Nathan report and even supported the recommendations that were submitted to this Council. Thus the Visiting Mission, in so doing, factually speaking, supported the conclusions of the Nathan report and apparently shares the views of that report. The Soviet delegation cannot agree with that. I do not want to go into the substance of the matter since the Soviet delegation has already stated its position on that point.

My delegation fully supports the amendments presented by the delegation of Liberia, and we are prepared to vote in favour of them.

My delegation would also like to express its views on some of the recommendations contained in the report. If we are going to vote on the report, I should like to request a separate vote on certain paragraphs.

First, the Soviet delegation would like to draw attention to paragraph 2, which refers to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV). Without going into the substance of the matter, since my delegation has already expressed its views on that resolution, I would request a separate vote on the following phrase in paragraph 2 "and General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV)". My delegation will naturally vote against the inclusion of that phrase in the report.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

Further, in paragraph 6 of this draft report, where mention is made of negotiations in Canberra, in the third sentence it is stated.

"The Council is confident that these discussions will take place in the same spirit of co-operation and expresses earnest hope that agreement will be reached to the satisfaction of both parties". (T/L.1128. p.2)

My delegation considers that this sentence should be changed and the last words "to the satisfaction of both parties" should be replaced by the words "to the satisfaction of the Nauruan people". I consider that it is the task of this Council to defend the interests of the Nauruan people, and not the interests of the colonial Power.

My last comment refers to paragraph 12 of the draft which is now before the Trusteeship Council. This paragraph states:

"The Council, regretting that differences continue to exist on the question of rehabilitation, expresses earnest hope that it will be possible to find a solution to the satisfaction of both parties". (Ibid., p.4)

The Soviet delegation suggests that the last word of this paragraph should be changed so that instead of saying "to the satisfaction of both parties" we say "to the satisfaction of the Nauruan people".

Once again, in conclusion, I should like to say that my delegation fully supports the proposals that have been submitted by the Liberian delegation, particularly that concerning the recognition of the right of peoples to independence and self-government, and also the changes that have been suggested for paragraph 3 of the report that was prepared by the Drafting Committee.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): If I understand correctly, the authors of the draft report accepted the first proposal that I made. They have not accepted my second proposal, and in view of this fact and in order to determine the vote I will cast on the report under consideration, I should like to ask your indulgence, Madam President, so that the second proposal made by the Liberian delegation may be put to the vote. The result of this vote will determine our position in the vote on the report as a whole.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I will not dwell at length on the observations made in relation to resolution 1541 (XV) by the Soviet representative. I have already had occasion to point out in this Council that his zeal for the resolutions of the General Assembly is a very discriminating zeal.

With regard to the Soviet representative's second observation, that relating to paragraph 6 and his proposal that the words "of both parties" should be deleted and replaced by the words "of the Nauruan people", and his third suggestion in relation to paragraph 12, that again the words "of both parties" be deleted and replaced by the words "of the Nauruan people", I have no objection, as this Council well understands, to references to the Nauruan people. On the contrary. What I do object to is the implication that the Administering Authority, in circumstances such as this, is a faithless thing, worthy of no consideration of any kind, and having no responsibilities. The Administering Authority has a responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations and under the Trusteeship Agreement, in relation to which we have recalled many times that the Soviet Union was a partner in agreement. That responsibility the Administering Authority has endeavoured most earnestly to discharge.

In the relationship between the two groups of people concerned, that is the Nauruan people and the Australian people, it is essential for the future welfare of the Nauruan people, situated as they are and small in numbers as they are, that in the agreement which will be reached -- and I am confident that agreement will be reached between the two groups of people concerned -- the Australian Government be satisfied for its part in the discharge of its trust. It is not a cypher, it is not lacking in regard to responsibilities which have been conferred on it by the United Nations, and it has a point of view on every issue which it is bound to place before the Nauruan people. It is essential for the benefit of the Nauruan people themselves, I emphasize again, if they become independent in the way they wish to become independent in the near future, that the arrangements in relation to the phosphate industry be satisfactory to both peoples, as I am confident they will be.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, the first suggested change, to paragraph 2, was acceptable to all concerned, so it is not necessary to put that to a vote. Therefore, the amendment proposed by the Liberian representative to paragraph 3 will now be put to a vote.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize, Madam President, but as I understand it the amendment submitted by the Liberian delegation applies only to paragraph 3 of the report before us. I suggested that we delete from paragraph 2 the words "and General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV)". Therefore, I would suggest that perhaps we should first proceed to vote on paragraph 2, and thereafter on paragraph 3, or perhaps first you could put the Liberian amendment to the vote and then come back to the amendment suggested by the Soviet delegation.

The PRESIDENT: It is the intention of the Chair to proceed with the vote on the entire annex, paragraph by paragraph. The representative of Liberia submitted her amendment first, and therefore it is proper that we should now consider that amendment. We now have before us the amendment proposed to paragraph 3 by the representative of Liberia.

The Liberian amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 3, with no abstentions.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the vote cast by the French delegation. It is quite obvious that the French delegation is not opposed to fixing 31 January 1968 or earlier as the date for the independence of Nauru. The French Government has always been in favour of granting self-determination or independence to non-self-governing Territories at the earliest moment. However, we feel this date should be set by agreement of the parties concerned; it is not for us to establish it ourselves. Therefore, we feel that the Council can make a recommendation on this subject, but cannot set a definite date.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My delegation would also like to express itself on the vote which it has just cast on the draft amendment presented by the representative of Liberia. We do not, of course, question the motives or regret in any way that the representative of Liberia felt it necessary to submit this amendment, although we would have thought that the subject was adequately covered by the existing report.

The vote of the New Zealand delegation is not to be interpreted as a vote against substance. We have expressed ourselves on the whole principle by at least acquiescing to the incorporation of the first Liberian amendment in the text; and, of course, earlier, in 1960, by voting for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. There should be no doubt on where New Zealand stands with respect to the principle of the Charter.

However, this whole issue of the future is before the people of Nauru; it is before the leaders of Nauru at this stage. We have been told here that while the preliminary reaction of the Nauran leaders is that they prefer independence first, they have said that they will be returning to Nauru to discuss these questions, including the proposals put by the Administering Authority, with their Council and with their people. The final word may have been said; it may not have been said. But, because the matter is under negotiation, and because these delicate issues are still being discussed in

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

a friendly and hopeful manner, we do not regard it as helpful to put specific issues before us here to be decided by a specific vote. The people of Nauru and the people of Australia would have to live with these decisions for many years, and we do not wish to create any risk whatsoever of disrupting the negotiations about to take place.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): In explanation of the United Kingdom delegation vote on the amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia, I should wish to make clear that our position on this matter is in accordance with that taken at the General Assembly when resolution 2226 (XXI) was adopted. And, secondly, we consider it in accord with our view, which is that, at a time when negotiations on these whole questions are still in a very exploratory stage, we are certainly aware of, and have certainly asserted our sympathy for, the wishes of the Nauruan people regarding the timing of accession to self-determination; but we consider that at this particular juncture it is untimely and inappropriate that a reference should be inserted in these conclusions and recommendations in the form proposed by the representative of Liberia.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): Briefly, to explain the vote of the United States, we, of course, fully support the concept of early self-determination for the people of Nauru. We are very pleased at the progress which has been reported in this direction by the Administering Authority. We were unable to vote for the General Assembly resolutions referenced in this paragraph, and we had to oppose the recent amendment, simply because we believe that the question of exact timing is a matter to be determined by the parties concerned. We hope this will be determined shortly in resumed talks, and are pleased at the prospects of further discussions.

Mr. LIN (China): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of the Liberian amendment because we believe it is the intention of both the Nauruan people and the Administering Authority to have Nauru become an independent State or self-governing entity.

Today, we were given a statement by the Minister for Territories, the Honourable C.E. Barnes, which was distributed this morning. In paragraph 3 of that document it is stated that the Governments agreed that it was appropriate that basic changes should be made in the Government of Nauru and that the aim should be for those changes to come into effect upon 31 January 1968. So we believe that is exactly what the Administering Authority and the Nauruan Government intend to do.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1128, annex) section by section.

I want to point out that if any delegation requests a separate vote on a particular paragraph, we shall proceed to vote separately on that and on any other paragraphs requested, as we have already done with respect to paragraphs 2, 6 and 12, at the request of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If I have understood the situation correctly, the Australian delegation agreed to accept the Soviet amendments to paragraphs 6 and 12. If that be the case, I shall not insist on having a vote on those paragraphs. I would simply request that a vote be taken on paragraph 2.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): There is some misunderstanding between myself and my colleague from the Soviet Union. The purport of my remarks was that the Administering Authority had a responsibility -- and indeed a very great responsibility -- in this matter, which was conferred upon it by the General Assembly, by the Charter, and by the Trusteeship Agreement. The Administering Authority has always been -- hence the many months of patient negotiation -- at pains to learn the wishes of the Nauruan people, to find what they want, and to meet the wishes of the Nauruan people. The implication in my remarks -- indeed, the very direct purport of my remarks -- was that the wording as it stands takes care of the interests of the Nauruan people, the importance of which I recognize, while at the same time recognizing the responsibility which has been conferred upon the Administering Authority by the United Nations.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In that case, I should like to request separate votes on paragraphs 2, 6 and 12 of these recommendations.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on paragraphs 2 and 6 of the first section. Does any other representative wish a separate vote to be taken on any other paragraph in this section?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I am not quite sure whether the representative of the Soviet Union is asking for a separate vote on the whole paragraph or only on the words "and General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV)" in that paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a separate vote only on those words "and General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV)". Therefore, we shall now vote on the Soviet amendment to delete that phrase.

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote. My delegation voted in favour of resolution 1541 (XV) when it was submitted to the General Assembly and we still support the principles contained in that resolution. But we voted for the Soviet amendment to delete reference to it because we feel that resolution 1541 (XV) is not applicable to the Trust Territory of Nauru for the simple reason that the people of Nauru have stated categorically that they prefer independence to annexation.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the Soviet amendment to paragraph 6. The proposal is to amend the beginning of line seven to read: "the satisfaction of the Nauruan people".

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 1.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France)(interpretation from French): I should like it to be clearly understood that although my delegation voted against the amendment of the Soviet Union, it was not because we were against taking into consideration the wishes of the Nauruan people; on the contrary. But we do not think that the responsibilities incumbent on the Administering Authority should be overlooked.

I note further than in paragraph 3 of our report we request the Administering Authority to give serious consideration to the wishes of the Nauruan people, and I think that this sentence, which relates precisely to the question of independence, applies to the interests, as a whole, of the Nauruan people.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): With regard to the vote which has just been taken on paragraph 6, my delegation abstained as a matter of principle as the representative of the Administering Authority. At the same time I should like to have it placed on record that the notation regarding the undertaking to study the various proposals and to resume discussions at an early date is a statement of fact and I am pleased to see this recorded in that paragraph of the Council's report.

Also, as the representative of the Administering Authority I have noted with pleasure the observation that the Council is confident that these discussions will take place in the same spirit of co-operation and expresses earnest hope that agreement will be reached to the satisfaction of both parties. There has been -- and this has been pointed out not only by me and by the Special Representative, but also by the Head Chief himself -- a very earnest spirit of co-operation and friendliness in these discussions; and that spirit of co-operation and friendliness will, I have not the slightest doubt, continue to exist as the discussions proceed.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): In brief explanation of the vote of the United Kingdom delegation against the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like to say that my delegation also shares the view that the Administering Authority has its responsibilities in relation to these discussions designed to lead to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. Secondly, as my delegation has stated earlier in this debate on Nauru, we believe that the principle of interdependence, which is stated in the relevant section of the Charter, also has a particular relevance to the circumstances of Nauru.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I have some few brief observations to make on paragraph 7. There seems to me to be possibly implicit in this paragraph a contradiction, a built-in contradiction. The paragraph says that it "notes the statement of the Head Chief Hammer De Roburt that the Nauruans have abandoned the idea of resettlement and intend to remain on the Island". It goes on to say that "The Council notes, however, the statement of the Administering Authority that it remains ready to consider any Nauruan proposal concerning future resettlement"..

I have expressed myself at length on this subject of resettlement, not only during this session of the Council but at many previous sessions. Accusations have been made against my Government -- totally unwarranted accusations -- regarding its object in relation to resettlement and regarding the very genuine efforts which it has made in relation to resettlement. In view of everything that has passed in this Council on the question of resettlement, and in view of the categorical statement which has been made by the Head Chief and which is noted here, I doubt the value or the wisdom of including the last sentence in the paragraph before us, and I should like to hear the views of the Drafting Committee on this matter before we proceed to a vote.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): As far as I know, the last sentence is in accord with the view held by the Administering Authority, which is ready to consider, if necessary, any proposal that may be made by the Nauruans with regard to their resettlement. I know that as of the present moment the Nauruans have said that they have abandoned any idea of resettlement. I think, however, that it still holds true that if at any time the Nauruans change their mind, the Australian Government, as Administering Authority, is quite prepared to consider any proposal they may make regarding resettlement elsewhere. That is the reason why we added this sentence. We included both of these sentences quite aware of the contradiction existing under the present circumstances. That is why in fact we added the word "however" -- "The Council notes, however, the statement", etc.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): It is my recollection that this sentence was added because it seemed to be an accurate reflection of the remarks that had been made in the course of the Council's meetings. And in fact, the possibility of future proposals in this direction was envisaged in the course of the debates. It was therefore felt pertinent to have this sentence included. Of course, as a member of the Drafting Committee, I should be pleased to hear any suggestions that any delegation might wish to make for amending this paragraph.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the representative of Australia whether he wishes to request a change in the paragraph, as drafted, in the form of a formal amendment. Or does he accept the remarks of the members of the Drafting Committee as an answer to his questions?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I do not wish to make a formal proposal for the deletion of this phrase from the Drafting Committee's report. I did feel it my duty, and I thought I was correct in doing so, to point out the paradox involved here against the whole background of the discussion of resettlement that we have had. However, if it is the wish of the Drafting Committee that this remain, then I will not oppose the wish of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I feel that adopting the suggestion made by the representative of France that the last sentence begin with "However" would help, in a sense, to explain the slightly paradoxical implication, and I would therefore also suggest that the draft be changed simply to begin the last sentence with the word "However". It is a minor change but it gives a slightly different nuance.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I notice that on this question of the last sentence in paragraph 7, the representative of Australia has not pressed the matter to a vote. I would just like to say that from the point of view of my delegation it seems to me to be symptomatic of the whole approach of the

United Nations organs that the Administering Authority has no rights in matters like this. In fact, the question of resettlement would be a very expensive and onerous obligation for the Australian Government to undertake, and I should like to support what the representative of Australia has said, while not objecting to having this sentence remain in the report itself.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I have a suggestion regarding a word in the last sentence of paragraph 5, namely, the word "foreclose". As I understand it, the intention here is "does not exclude the possibility of". I wonder whether this wording might perhaps remove any obscurity in the interpretation of the sentence, and I would suggest that as an amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Would that change be acceptable to the members of the Drafting Committee?

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): Yes, Madam President, if the sense is the same. I thought that "to foreclose" actually meant "not to exclude the possibility of", but of course I rely entirely on the wisdom of my English colleague in this regard.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): I would be entirely agreeable to that change, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, the change suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom will be made.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): May I ask our colleague from the United Kingdom to repeat the proposed change that he is offering?

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): The proposed amendment is to replace the word "foreclose" in the last sentence of paragraph 5 by the words "exclude the possibility of".

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): I thank our colleague from the United Kingdom and offer no objection to his proposal.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on section I as a whole, as amended.

Section I as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section II, Political Advancement, which contains only one paragraph.

Section II was adopted by 6 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section III of the report, the section on economic advancement. The representative of the Soviet Union has proposed to amend paragraph 12 by the replacement of the words "both parties" by the words "the Nauruan people".

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Does any representative wish to request a separate vote on any other paragraph of section III?

As there is no such request, we shall proceed to vote on the section as a whole.

Section III as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: On page 1 of document T/L.1128, paragraph 4 reads as follows:

"The Committee considers that the Trusteeship Council may wish to adopt the revised working paper on Nauru (T/L.1120 and Add.1) as the basic text for the chapter on conditions in that Territory to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly."

I shall now put that recommendation to the vote.

The recommendation was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 5 of document T/L.1128

reads as follows:

"The Committee also considers that the Trusteeship Council may wish to adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex below and include them at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter."

I put that recommendation to the vote.

The recommendation was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I should just like to place on record that, in voting on paragraph 4, New Zealand regrets that it was necessary -- because of the first draft of the working paper prepared by the Secretariat, which cannot be regarded as a balanced paper -- for the addition to be made recorded in document T/L.1120/Add.2.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the two draft resolutions concerning Nauru which have been submitted by the representative of Liberia and which are contained in documents T/L.1131 and T/L.1132.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have not yet received the texts of these draft resolutions. Perhaps the President could put these draft resolutions to the vote this afternoon so that we have time to read them, because I have only heard them read out here. I think to do so would not create any difficulties, nor do I think the representative of Liberia would object if we voted on the draft resolutions this afternoon.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): In relation to the statement I have just made about addendum 2 to document T/L.1120, I notice that there is no reference to it in paragraph 4, and I assume that that addendum will in fact be incorporated in the chapter on conditions.

The PRESIDENT: The addendum was mentioned in my statement of paragraph 4 on which we voted and it will be in the final report.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I asked for the floor to speak to the draft resolutions now before us in documents T/L.1131 and T/L.1132. I must express my concern, while doubting in no way the sincerity of the sponsor of these texts, that such far-reaching draft resolutions should be placed before us on such short notice at this stage of our consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru. I would speak very briefly, if I may, first to the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1131, which recommends that "the question of the future of Nauru be inscribed as a separate item on the provisional agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly". The future of Nauru will, of course, be considered as an item on the agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly quite in the normal course of events when the Assembly considers the report of the Trusteeship Council. Therefore, I doubt the necessity for, and cannot quite see the point of, the recommendation contained in this draft resolution.

I turn now to the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1132. I must confess to some sense of bewilderment that, in view of the detailed explanations that have been placed before this Council concerning the recent, far-reaching,

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

and most important developments on Nauru, it should have been necessary, or should have been considered necessary by the delegation of Liberia, to draft such a resolution as this, which does not take into account the vital information which has been placed before the Council. I will refer first, if I may, to operative paragraphs 4 and 5, which read:

"4. Recommends that the Administering Authority should take immediate steps towards restoring the island of Nauru for habitation by the Nauruan people as a sovereign nation;

"5. Considers that it is the responsibility of the Administering Authority to restore at its cost the worked-out land on the island until the time when the Nauruans receive the full economic benefit from the phosphates."

The word "restore" is a paradoxical word to use in this connexion. It has been requested elsewhere that the land be restored to its original state, but I think it important to remind this Council of what the original state of this land was. The prosperity of Nauru, together with the problems of Nauru, arise from the fact that it consists almost completely of phosphate rock. By "phosphate rock" I mean just that: rock. It has been explained to the Council that the greater area of the island, which consists of this rock -- and it is rock -- although it was put to some practical use by the Nauruans, as has been explained by the Head Chief -- in that it did provide wood for certain purposes and leaves with which to thatch their huts -- was never cultivated by the Nauruans, was indeed incapable of cultivation through its very nature, was not a soil-covered area, and was not used by the Nauruans even for purposes of habitation. Therefore, I say that the use of the word "restore" and elsewhere of the words "restored to its original condition" is curiously paradoxical. As I have said, the original condition was a condition of rock -- the fact that it was phosphate rock does not make it any the less rock -- covered at best by an inch or two of generally non-productive soil. Therefore, the question is one, as I understand it here, not of restoring the land to what it was but of making from this worked-out phosphate land something which it never was.

What, then, do we mean when we talk about restoring that land? That is a problem which the Committee of Experts appointed in accordance with the resolutions of the Trusteeship Council went into very closely indeed. As is well known to the Drafting Committee, which studied the report of the Committee of Experts to which I just referred, the report of that Committee of Experts was rejected by the Nauruans. The reason for that rejection and the views of the Nauruans on many aspects of the report have been placed before this Council in documentary form, so that the Council is fully familiar with the thinking of the Nauruans on that subject.

Probably the core of present Nauruan feeling on this subject is that the area of land in question should be covered by four feet of soil -- four feet of soil -- at a cost of approximately one hundred million United States dollars. But this land never had four feet of soil on it; for all practical purposes, it had no soil on it. As I said, it was rock and at the most it had an inch or two of unproductive soil. The first question that comes to my mind is, Why four feet of soil? Why not two feet of soil? Why not three feet of soil? Why not six feet of soil? I wonder what the magic is in four feet of soil. And this is a genuine inquiry. It seems to me that the proposal further envisages that, irrespective of what is going to happen to it in the future, this worked-out phosphate land be covered with four feet of soil at this cost by somebody or other.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

If that proposal were proceeded with immediately, it might well have the effect that as the Nauruan planning proceeds -- and proceed it will -- for the development of their island, that four feet of soil could become an airfield and an airfield does not need four feet of fertile soil underneath it. In fact, the less fertile soft soil an airfield has underneath it, probably the better. That could happen, and it does not take great imagination to envisage that a similar situation could arise in relation to other installations which the Nauruans might decide to instal on their own island.

But having carted four feet of soil at colossal expense to cover the whole of this area, factories or buildings of some kind or installations necessary to their business enterprises might then be built on this four feet of soil, thus not only wasting soil but also making the task of building, as in the case of the aerodrome, a much more difficult one than it would otherwise be. I present these not as arguments but as the kind of practical problem that the Australian Government has considered in its own study of this admittedly very important matter. What I am trying to say can be summed up, I think, in the phrase that any expenditure proposed on Nauru -- for the treatment -- not the restoration -- of this land should as a matter of clear planning be balanced against the proposed use of that land area. I do not know what use that area of land might be put to in the future by the Nauruans, nor do the Nauruans themselves know.

So the condition is summed up, I think, in the phrase: necessity to balance any expenditure in this connexion against the proposed use of the land. It was precisely that exercise in balance to which the Expert Committee addressed itself in producing the reports with which the Nauruan people have disagreed and which they have in fact rejected. As I understand it, the Nauruans wish the partner Governments now -- right now -- to spend approximately \$100 million on doing this thing which I have just described, without any regard to or any planning in relation to the future use of the land involved. The use of that land will be for them to decide.

Furthermore, the proposal to cover that area, as a great engineering enterprise, with four feet of soil would be a positive hindrance to and perhaps completely inhibit such proposals as the ones made by the Expert Committee that any activities undertaken in relation to this worked-out land should be so designed as to provide a substantial and permanent increase in the water supplies

(Mr. McCarthy. Australia)

of Nauru -- and we know perfectly well how vital water is to Nauru. I would suggest that if the Nauruans had \$100 million now they would not spend it immediately for this purpose for the reasons which I have just indicated, and for other reasons.

It is well known to this Council that the Administering Authority has addressed itself with great anxiety to this problem as part of its wish that the Nauruan people should enjoy the greatest measure of prosperity which it is possible for them to enjoy.

There have been placed before this Council, together with the other papers relevant to the whole subject of Nauru, papers entitled "Heads of Agreement in relation to the phosphate industry". This is in fact an agreement which has been reached between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people regarding the ownership of the phosphate deposits, their operation and the ownership of the phosphate industry. The simple effect of that agreement, as it was summed up here by the Special Representative, is that at the end of three years, under certain agreed conditions, the Nauruans themselves will be completely responsible not only as owners of the phosphates, but also for the phosphate operations themselves. As part of that agreement it was decided by all the parties concerned -- that is, the Nauruan negotiators and the partner Governments -- that the Nauruans would get \$A12 per ton as a continuing figure for the phosphate mine on the island, subject to the operation of the formula which has been described here.

In reaching their own conclusions regarding the sum of money which should be involved here, the partner Governments followed two basic principles. The first was that the Nauruans should have adequate money from the phosphate industry to provide not only for their present needs but also for their future needs -- and we all know the problem that that future presents. The second basic principle was that with regard to work on this presently unproductive land on the island, the Nauruans should decide what should be done in relation to this worked-out land, when it should be done and at what cost.

I come back now to this basic figure of \$A12 per ton which is rather more than \$13 per ton in United States money. The basis of calculation in relation to that figure was that about \$A8 per ton would remain after the costs of operating the industry and getting the phosphates mined and on board.

DR/rh

T/PV.1320
58-60

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

ship were met. About \$A8 per ton would remain net for the benefit of the Nauruans, representing a figure of \$A16 million per year. For every Australian dollar you can add 12 cents to change it to United States dollars, which are perhaps more comprehensible to most of us here.

On that basis, the figure suggests that this would provide an annual income of the order of \$A30,000 for each Nauruan family. Of course that is in relation to the present population figures of Nauru. The population of Nauru, as we know, will certainly grow, as it has grown in the past, and even more rapidly.

From that figure of \$A8, which we believe is a sound planning figure in relation to Nauruan needs, it is true to say that the Nauruans will have to meet expenses under a variety of headings, as anybody else has to meet expenses under a variety of headings, in the mere process of living, but also in relation to their own administration, their investment in a long-term fund to secure their future and for payment to individual landowners. On the basis of this calculation, we arrive at the following figures: of the \$A8 per ton remaining for the benefit of the Nauruans, \$1 would go to a fund for restoring the land, \$1 would go for administration, \$3 would go to a long-term investment fund to guarantee the Nauruan future, and \$3 would go for payment to the owners of the land in current use.

Those figures, as far as we can calculate at the present time, would result in the following type of situation. By the time the phosphates were exhausted, an investment fund of over \$US400 million would be built up, with an annual income to the people of Nauru in perpetuity, without reduction of the capital, of something of the order of \$US24 million. In working out that arrangement, the partner Governments had particular regard, as I have said, to the future, not only through this type of planning which would enable their future to be safeguarded through this sum of \$US400 million and the income from it, but also by deciding to ensure, for example, that 100 per cent benefit from the industry would accrue to the Nauruans. They also took other circumstances into consideration, for example, the capital value of the installations, machinery, buildings and so forth presently on the island, and reduced that capital value from a figure of the order of \$30 to \$40 million, which would be the commercial value, according to their estimate, of providing those installations at the present time, to a figure something of the order of \$20 million, which is approximately half of the original figure.

I believe that, in brief, it is very relevant to the last two paragraphs of the draft resolution now before us that previous consideration has been given to this problem, that it is for the Nauruans to decide how the worked-out land should be treated so that they can take action in that connexion, and that provision has been made to ensure that the sums of money that I have quoted will remain available in perpetuity to the Nauruans.

That brings me back to the curious paradox to which I referred earlier when we were discussing the report of the Drafting Committee, that is, the observation regarding resettlement. I said then that there had been much talk in the Council over the years regarding resettlement, that the Council had accepted the statement of the Head Chief that the idea of resettlement had been abandoned, and that the Council has noted the statement of the Administering Authority that it remains ready to consider any Nauruan proposal concerning future resettlement. Now suppose in the course of time the Nauruans decided that they wanted to settle elsewhere. I think it needs no very great imagination to see the relationship between any such decision, or the possibility of such a decision which the Council has recognized here, and the decisions which have to be taken with regard to the treatment of worked-out phosphate land.

I shall turn now very briefly to operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. I consider those paragraphs to be not only unnecessary at this time, but also possibly -- and I am fully aware of the fact that this is not the intent of the paragraphs -- harmful in the present circumstances. An atmosphere of friendliness has been created and a large degree of understanding has been reached between the Nauruan people and the Administering Authority regarding the people's future. In this connexion, the statement of the Australian Minister for Territories was read out to us only a short while ago by the representative of China. Therefore, I feel very strongly that at this critical stage when the negotiations are to be resumed when the Council concludes its work, the possible success of those talks, and they are close to success, should not be jeopardized by the adoption of such a draft resolution.

I should like to make just one more remark before I finish. While I was speaking about the political advancement of the Nauruans, I wanted to correct what I believe to be a basic misunderstanding or perhaps simply a slip of the tongue by the representative of Liberia earlier. The Liberian representative referred to the possibility of Australia's annexation of the island of Nauru. I should like it to be placed on record that nothing that has ever been said and nothing that has ever been indicated by the Administering Authority in this Council can justify the use of this word "annexation". There is not, there has never been and there will never be any question of the annexation of this island by Australia.

The PRESIDENT: Since the representative of the Soviet Union has indicated that he has now received the texts of the draft resolution and is prepared to vote at this time, we shall now proceed to the vote on the two draft resolutions contained in documents T/L.1131 and T/L.1132 respectively, and submitted by the Liberian delegation. We shall vote first on draft resolution T/L.1131.

Draft resolution T/L.1131 was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the second draft resolution, T/L.1132. A roll-call vote on this draft resolution has been requested by the Liberian delegation.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Liberia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

Abstaining: China.

Draft resolution T/L.1132 was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The hour is very late, and if there are representatives who wish to explain their vote at this time, I would appeal to them to be brief so that we can conclude this item. I call first upon the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): With regard to draft resolution T/L.1131, that is, the suggestion that a separate item on Nauru be inscribed on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly, my delegation's vote was based on the understanding that in fact this question would be on the agenda of the General Assembly, and that it would be superfluous to suggest that it be placed on it twice. I might add that my delegation would welcome at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly a very full and, we hope, informed and factual debate on Nauru.

Turning to the draft resolution contained in T/L.1132, my delegation's view on this draft resolution is similar to that which we set out in relation to the Liberian amendment to the draft report. The Liberian delegation has, in our view, absolutely impeccable credentials in this field of decolonization. My delegation, in particular, has had reason to know that that delegation, one of the two original African delegations represented in the United Nations, acts with considerable courage and honesty in pursuing the ideals of the Charter and of resolution 1514 (XV). But we do not feel, as we said earlier, that any useful or helpful purpose would be served at this stage by endeavouring to force parties to delicate negotiations to commit themselves in concrete fashion on paper on all sorts of issues which are as yet unresolved.

My delegation is very optimistic about the outcome of the forthcoming talks, and we hope that agreement will be reached between the Administering Authority and the Nauruan people.

I had hoped to speak before the vote on this draft resolution, and perhaps appeal to the representative of Liberia, given these considerations, not to press the matter to a vote, but since I did not have the floor, I would at this stage just reiterate that New Zealand's stand in principle on the questions contained in this draft resolution cannot be doubted.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution T/L.1132. To avoid any misunderstanding on the meaning of the vote cast by the French delegation, I should like to recall the comments I made a moment ago when we were considering the report of the Drafting Committee, particularly with respect to a target date for independence for Nauru, and also with respect to taking into account the interests of the Nauruan people, in view of all their problems, including that of the restoration of the surface soil.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): In explanation of the vote of the United Kingdom delegation on draft resolution T/L.1132, I should like to say that my delegation gave careful study to the draft resolution, but came to the conclusion that it was both inopportune and unacceptable in substance.

Operative paragraphs 1 to 3 deal with political matters which are crucial to the future of Nauru, and which are currently the subjects of negotiations between the three partner Governments, on the one hand, and a representative delegation of the Nauruan people, on the other hand. Those negotiations are still at a very early and very exploratory stage. My delegation felt unable to associate itself with provisions in the draft resolution which would clearly prejudice the outcome of those negotiations.

As regards the remaining two operative paragraphs, 4 and 5, which concern the rehabilitation of the worked-out mining areas, my delegation, as one of the partner Governments, fully associates itself with the position of the Administering Authority as presented to this Council by the representative of Australia.

A comprehensive settlement has been attained on this matter in free agreement between all the parties concerned for the future operation of the phosphate industry, including all financial arrangements pertaining thereto.

In the view of the United Kingdom delegation, this settlement is a generous and far-sighted arrangement, which has been freely accepted by the Nauruan delegation to those negotiations. It is a comprehensive settlement, and it is also, in the understanding of my delegation, a final settlement, which disposes of outstanding issues relating to the phosphate industry in Nauru, including the cost of any proposals for rehabilitating the mined lands which the Nauruan people may decide to assume.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): My delegation would not wish its vote on draft resolution T/L.1131 to be interpreted as any indication that we do not wish to see Nauru discussed in the General Assembly. Rather, as has been pointed out, we are aware that this item will come up, in any event, in the General Assembly as a report of the Trusteeship Council, and we therefore did not consider this draft resolution entirely necessary.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

As for draft resolution T/L.1132, we were obliged to vote against that resolution in the belief that operative paragraphs 1 to 3 concerning the future arrangements for Nauru, are covered in a preferable fashion in the report which we have just approved. We believe that while this matter is subject to discussion, and with every prospect of an early decision on a date for self-determination, there is no purpose in explicit references in a resolution of this sort.

As far as operative paragraph 3 is concerned, we could not go along with the suggestion that the Administering Authority has established pre-conditions to the granting of independence.

Finally, concerning operative paragraphs 4 and 5, on the question of the worked-out lands, my delegation prefers the wording on this subject which was included in the report on Nauru which we have just approved.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I want to make it perfectly clear, as I hope it was indeed clear, that my exposition of the reasoning in relation to the finances involved, in so far as they might relate to the worked-out phosphate land and its treatment, is not shared by the Nauruan people itself. I just want to make it perfectly clear that this agreement with regard to the phosphate industry does not include agreement along the lines of my explanation with regard to the treatment of the worked-out phosphate lands. The Nauruans have their point of view, which they have expressed and will continue to express.

I want to make only one other point clear: that we are deeply conscious of the fact that whatever form these basic constitutional changes take in relation to Nauru -- the phrase which was used by the Special Representative and by the Minister for Territories -- the Nauruans themselves will continue to face great problems. They will face those problems for a variety of reasons. They will face some problems in a particular form because of the particular circumstances of the island and the population, and they will face problems because of those particular circumstances which will be unique to themselves.

In the working out of those problems, I have not the slightest doubt that the help and advice they request from Australia will be forthcoming at all times, as it has been forthcoming in the past; because whatever form these constitutional changes take, there remains in Australia and in the Australian Government a sense of deep responsibility for, and abiding friendship for, the Nauruan people.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I do not want to explain my vote; I simply wanted to exercise my right of reply. I wanted to do so immediately after the representative of Australia had spoken, but because of the lateness of the hour I refrained from doing so.

However, I should simply like to reserve my delegation's right to exercise its right of reply; and since the people of Nauru cannot sit here and defend themselves, I should also like to answer the insinuation made by the representative of Australia when he said the request made by the Nauruans to restore their land was made -- to quote him -- "without any regard to the future use of the land". At our next meeting, I should like to have the opportunity to exercise my delegation's right of reply.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I am sorry to keep taking up this Council's time. Again, I believe there was some misunderstanding between myself and my colleague from Liberia. I made no insinuations about the Nauruan people. I do not know what his purpose is in making the suggestion that I made some insinuations about the Nauruan people. If my recollection and understanding are correct regarding the point in my statement -- of which I do not have a record -- his statement refers to some remarks I made about the planning for the use of that land. I made no insinuations against the Nauruans. I was simply endeavouring to explain, to the best of my ability, the magnitude and the nature of the problem raised in this particular resolution now before us.

The PRESIDENT: I have taken note that the representative of Liberia has reserved his right to reply at a later meeting.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Council, as usual, agrees to include a summary of the observations of individual members on this subject in the appropriate sections of the report to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.