



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Thirty-first Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 23 June 1964,
 at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (concluded):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1963;</i>	
(ii) <i>Examination of petitions;</i>	
(iii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (concluded)</i>	107
<i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964</i>	113
<i>Arrangement for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea in 1965</i>	113
<i>Questions of procedure</i>	114

President: Mr. F. H. CORNER (New Zealand).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, China, France, Liberia, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (concluded):

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1963 (T/1624, T/L.1073 and Add.1);
- (ii) Examination of petitions (T/PET.10/L.5, T/PET.10/L.6, T/PET.10/L.7 and Add.1);
- (iii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964 (T/1620)

[Agenda items 4 (b), 5 and 6]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1077, T/L.1080 AND CORR.1, T/L.1083) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1077) and to the USSR amendments (T/L.1083) to the draft conclusions and recommendations in the annex to that report. He suggested that the Council should consider the draft

conclusions and recommendations paragraph by paragraph, together with the relevant Soviet amendments.

Paragraph 1 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with one abstention.

2. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in its existing unbalanced form paragraph 2 reflected the point of view of only one party to the dispute—the Administering Authority. The Council was aware of the dissatisfaction amongst the Micronesians at the refusal of the United States to satisfy their claims. His delegation had therefore submitted an amendment (T/L.1083, para. 1) to paragraph 2 in order to express the point of view of the other, most important, party—the Micronesians—and their dissatisfaction with the Administering Authority's refusal to recognize their claims.

3. Mr. YATES (United States of America) thought that paragraph 2 as drafted was a true reflection of the actual situation. It did recognize the existence of some disagreement and did recommend that the United States Government should draw to the attention of the Micronesians its belief that the claims had no validity.

The USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 1) was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The second USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 2), which concerned paragraph 3 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 3 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

4. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) introduced his delegation's amendment (T/L.1083, para. 3) calling for the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 3 of the draft conclusions and recommendations. The Mariana Islands District Legislature had adopted a resolution (T/1620, annex I (i)) requesting a United Nations investigation into radioactive pollution of the atmosphere in the Trust Territory. The Council could not ignore that request and it should not accept the statements of the Administering Authority to the effect that radio-active pollution had been eliminated and that the situation was satisfactory in that regard. In his delegation's view the opinion of the population of the Trust Territory and of its elected bodies was of prime importance in this serious matter. The United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964, had found that radio-active pollution had adversely affected the health and food supplies of the population of the Marshall Islands, the district adjacent to the Mariana Islands.

5. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that research into the question by the United States Government had been going on for some time. The Council had taken note of that fact and received reports from

the research teams. His delegation therefore thought that the Council should reject the USSR amendment.

6. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that there was a complete divergence of views on that subject between the Administering Authority and the population of one part of the Trust Territory. The Mariana Islands District Legislature considered that research into the question was needed. The welfare of the population of the Trust Territory should be the first consideration and their view should carry the most weight.

7. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that the presumptions of the Soviet Union representative had no basis in fact. The adoption of the resolution did not imply that discord existed. The resolution asked that appropriate United Nations bodies should carry out research; that was being done. The report of the Visiting Mission (T/1620) gave no indication of any conflict.

8. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's conclusions had a very sound basis—the resolution adopted by the Mariana Islands District Legislature. He could only express regret if that resolution did not have the same significance for the United States representative as it did for the Soviet Union delegation.

9. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation would support the Soviet Union amendment, since the Mariana Islands District Legislature had adopted a resolution requesting that the United Nations should conduct research into radio-active pollution.

10. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 3).

The third USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 3) was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The fourth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 4), which concerned paragraph 4 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

Paragraph 4 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

11. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would withdraw its fifth amendment (T/L.1083, para. 5), if it could be satisfactorily explained why the words "so far as possible" had been included in paragraph 5 of the draft conclusions and recommendations.

12. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) explained that the Visiting Mission had stressed the need for Micronesians to control their own affairs. However, it had realized that Micronesians could not hold every position because they did not yet have the necessary qualifications.

13. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, in the general debate (1234th meeting), his delegation had stressed the need to appoint indigenous inhabitants to legislative and executive posts, and had referred to some ways out of the present unsatisfactory situations. Those posts should be held entirely by Micronesians. His delegation therefore maintained its amendment.

The fifth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 5) was rejected by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the sixth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 6), pro-

posing the insertion of a new paragraph after the heading "The congress of Micronesia".

The sixth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 6) was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

15. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's seventh amendment (T/L.1083, para. 7) calling for the addition of the words "by the Micronesians" at the end of paragraph 6 (i) of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was necessary in order to avoid any confusion with regard to the question of whose interests should be considered first. In his view, it was the Micronesians themselves and they alone who were primarily interested in the proposed congress of Micronesia.

16. Mr. YATES (United States of America) thought that the USSR amendment was too restrictive. Although primary consideration should be given to the hopes of the people of Micronesia, the hopes of the Administering Authority and, indeed, of all concerned were placed in the congress of Micronesia.

17. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) suggested that the Soviet Union amendment should be amended to read "in particular by the Micronesians". Although all wanted the congress to have the necessary capacities, it was right to make a specific reference to the Micronesians, whose interests were deeply involved.

18. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not accept the Liberian sub-amendment because, in its view, the only, and the most important, party to the question was the population of the Trust Territory, whereas the amendment presupposed another party allegedly as important as the Micronesians themselves.

19. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) suggested that the difficulty might be resolved by adding the words "by all concerned", so that the phrase in question would read "by all concerned and in particular by the Micronesians".

20. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) supported the Liberian sub-amendment and also the suggestion by the United Kingdom representative, which had the same purpose.

21. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United Kingdom representative's suggestion to include the words "by all concerned".

That suggestion was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR amendment, as amended by the Liberian and United Kingdom representatives to read: "by all concerned and in particular by the Micronesians".

The seventh USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 7), as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

23. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although paragraph 6 of the draft conclusions and recommendations contained many statements which were fully acceptable to his delegation, he would be unable to support the paragraph because certain parts of it were too vague, and, in particular, it contained no satisfactory definition of what powers the congress would have. The congress of Micronesia would be an effective body only if it had full legislative authority and if the laws it enacted were final and did not require approval by the Administering Authority.

24. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) shared some of the Soviet Union representative's doubts about the phrase "real powers". He suggested that it might be better to say "more defined powers".

25. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) pointed out that, in its report, the Visiting Mission had used the words "real powers" (T/1620, para. 276). In that connexion, the Visiting Mission had laid stress on financial and budgetary matters; paragraph 6 should be read in conjunction with the Mission's report. Her delegation could not accept the Australian representative's suggestion.

26. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) agreed with the Liberian representative about the importance of financial responsibility. In the light of the explanation given by that representative, he would withdraw his suggestion.

Paragraph 6 (T/L.1077, annex), as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

27. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the aim of his delegation's eighth amendment (T/L.1083, para. 8), which concerned paragraph 7 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, was to ensure that the conclusions and recommendations of the Council reflected the true situation. It had been confirmed by the representatives of the Administering Authority at the current session of the Council that all key posts in the Territorial administration, including fourteen posts of senior advisers to the High Commissioner, continued to be held by United States citizens.

28. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that there were more than fourteen important posts in the Territorial administration and that, as the special representative had told the Council, an increasing number of Micronesians were being appointed to those posts. The USSR amendment reflected only half the true situation and should be rejected.

29. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's amendment referred to "key posts" and not to "important posts", the term used by the United States representative. The High Commissioner, his fourteen senior advisers, all six district administrators and all but one of the assistant district administrators were United States citizens. Those posts could all be described as key posts.

30. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked the Soviet Union representative whether he regarded the post of assistant district administrator as a key post.

31. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the post of assistant district administrator was important and his delegation had welcomed the appointment of Mr. Santos to it. However, that was quite inadequate.

32. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that he did not understand the distinction drawn by the Soviet Union representative between key posts and important posts. In any case, an increasing number of Micronesians were being placed in positions of responsibility in the Territory. It was therefore misleading to say that "all" key posts in the Territorial administration continued to be held by United States citizens. The Council should retain the existing wording of paragraph 7.

33. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that the USSR amendment was far too sweeping. It would be surprising if the 108 senior positions held by Micronesians

at the beginning of 1964 and mentioned in the Visiting Mission's report (T/1620, para. 254) did not include some key posts, and some of those listed in annex V of the report certainly seemed to warrant that description. The report also made it clear that much training was now being carried out and that more Micronesians would accede to key posts in the near future.

34. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to paragraph 253 of the Visiting Mission's report, in the last sentence of which the Mission stated that a determined effort was necessary for the Micronesians to capture the "commanding heights" of the civil service. While he did not entirely agree with some parts of that paragraph, the sentence to which he had referred indicated that his delegations's amendment was justified. The fact that only two key posts in the Administration were held by Micronesians was the best evidence of the true situation in the Trust Territory.

35. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) recalled that, in the debate just held on paragraph 6 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, emphasis had been laid on the importance of powers over finance; according to annex V to the Visiting Mission's report, six district finance officers were Micronesians. Surely, those were key posts.

The eighth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 8) was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

36. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that the ninth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 9), which also concerned paragraph 7 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, might be misleading, in view of the fact that two Micronesians had already been appointed assistant district administrators. His Government had pointed out that it proposed to continue making such appointments, and he therefore saw no need for the amendment.

37. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) observed that the amendment suggested that the Visiting Mission had taken the view that the appointments in question should be made immediately. The Visiting Mission, however, had noted the need to train Micronesians for some of those posts. If the amendment was to be adopted, it should contain some reference to time, since otherwise it would not accurately represent the view of the Visiting Mission.

38. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would simply draw attention to the first two sentences of paragraph 255 and the first six sentences of paragraph 257 of the Visiting Mission's report (T/1620), which called for some sort of emergency or crash programme and for cutting across the usual processes of advancement, and were directly related to the question under discussion.

39. Mr. YATES (United States of America) remarked that paragraph 255 should be read in its entirety. His Government did not deny that it had made mistakes in the past, and it was grateful to the Visiting Mission for its constructive criticisms, which would be given most serious consideration.

The ninth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 9) was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

40. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise that certain members of the Visiting Mission had voted against their own conclusions, as contained in the Mission's report.

41. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that his delegation had abstained because the amendment did not faithfully reflect the views of the Visiting Mission and was taken out of the context of the opinions expressed by the Mission on the question of Micronesians in the civil service.

Paragraph 7 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none.

42. Mr. YATES (United States of America) pointed out that the tenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 10), which called for the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 7, did not refer to the judicial system as a whole; it gave the impression that there were no Micronesian judges, whereas in fact the local court judges were all Micronesians.

The tenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 10) was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

43. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate votes on the second sentence of paragraph 8 (T/L.1077, annex), beginning "It expresses the earnest hope . . ."; and on the part of the third sentence reading "the people of Micronesia should be associated with the planning process at every stage", which his delegation was prepared to support. He also asked what was meant by the word "associated" in the latter sentence.

44. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the Visiting Mission had felt that the High Commissioner could not be assumed to know everything about the vital needs of the Micronesian people, who should therefore be associated with economic planning at every stage and should be able to give their views on the situation in general and on particular projects.

45. The PRESIDENT speaking as a member of the Visiting Mission, pointed out that the sentence in question was taken from paragraph 193 of the Visiting Mission's report, which formed part of the conclusions in the section entitled "The need for Micronesian participation in economic planning".

46. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the representative of Liberia and the President for their explanations, and suggested that the words "participate in" should be substituted for the words "be associated with" in the sentence under discussion.

It was so agreed.

The sentence in paragraph 8 (T/L.1077, annex) reading: "It expresses the earnest hope . . . economic development" was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The clause reading in its revised form, "the people of Micronesia should participate in the planning process at every stage" was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

47. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of a partly inadequate translation into English, representatives should take into account, in considering the eleventh USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 11), the corresponding section of the report of the Visiting Mission (T/1620, paras. 229-230).

48. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thought there was a difference between the fiscal treatment afforded United States companies and private citizens in the Territory.

49. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) suggested that neither the USSR amendment nor the relevant section of the Visiting Mission's report was entirely accurate. He had understood from the discussions and the replies of the special representative that, whereas the United States civil servants in the Territory paid income tax into the United States Treasury, United States citizens working there as private individuals did not.

50. Mr. YATES (United States of America) pointed out that, there being no taxation system in the Territory, all income taxes imposed by the United States Government on its citizens there, whatever their capacity, were paid into the United States Treasury. The relevant passage in paragraph 229 of the Visiting Mission's report, inasmuch as it suggested possible alternatives, was not at all the same as the USSR amendment. If the USSR amendment were to read: "The Council shares the Visiting Mission's view that there should be a change in the Territory's taxing system, either by the levying of a Territorial income tax directly on these residents or by the Territory's receiving an equivalent rebate from the Federal Government", it would reflect the Visiting Mission's recommendation more accurately.

51. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) felt that the United States representative's suggestion would cover the matter.

52. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was gratified to note that the United States representative agreed that the present system of taxation needed to be changed. He felt that the original USSR text, being more specific, was to be preferred, for it referred not only to the United States citizens but also to the United States companies active in the area.

53. Mr. YATES (United States of America) pointed out that the text he had suggested was quite different from the USSR amendment, inasmuch as it repeated the precise words used in the Visiting Mission's report, whereas the USSR amendment, though purportedly based on that report, departed markedly from the statement contained therein. Although paragraph 229 of the report described the fact that United States residents did not pay income tax to the Territorial Government as anomalous, nowhere was it alleged that the present taxation system amounted to an improper practice. If those words, which represented the Soviet Union's view and not the Visiting Mission's, were to be retained, then the statement that "the Council shares the Visiting Mission's view" was itself improper and should be struck out.

54. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) explained that the Visiting Mission had wished to suggest that the future congress of Micronesia might consider appropriate legislation for levying a Territorial income tax on residents and on Micronesian enterprises.

55. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) endorsed the United States representative's arguments; the term "improper practice", applied to financial matters, involved far-reaching implications, and his delegation could never accept its application to any Government.

56. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the word "improper" appearing in the English translation of the USSR amendment might be replaced by "inappropriate" or "irregular", or alternatively that the expression "surprising anomaly" used by the Visiting Mission could be used in both the Russian and English texts, if those changes would make the amendment agreeable to the United States representative.

57. Mr. YATES (United States of America) still felt that the USSR amendment should either accurately reflect the Visiting Mission's views, or be presented as reflecting those of the Soviet Union. The use of any kind of qualifying phrase could be avoided by simply saying that income taxes should be paid into the Territorial Treasury rather than the United States Treasury. The representative of China had raised an interesting point in suggesting that the fiscal question should be tackled by the congress of Micronesia.

58. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) suggested that the words "is an improper practice which should be changed" might be replaced by the words "is a matter which might well be studied by the Congress of Micronesia with a view to the enactment of appropriate legislation"; she was formally moving that proposal, which was in line with the Visiting Mission's thinking as explained by the Chinese representative, as a sub-amendment to the USSR amendment.

59. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation naturally had no objection to such a study being made by the congress of Micronesia, although a recommendation to that effect was not the same as a statement that the existing system should be changed.

60. The PRESIDENT invited representatives to vote on the Liberian oral sub-amendment to the USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 11).

The Liberian sub-amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none.

The eleventh USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 11), as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

61. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the twelfth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 12) which concerned paragraph 9 of the draft conclusions and recommendations.

There were 2 votes in favour and 2 against.

62. The PRESIDENT said that another vote would be taken on the amendment at a later stage.

Paragraph 10 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

In successive votes, paragraphs 11 and 12 were adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

In successive votes, paragraphs 14 and 15 were adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The thirteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 13), which concerned paragraph 16 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1077, annex), was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The fourteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 14), which concerned the same paragraph, was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

63. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the words "The Council commends the Administration for its bold educational programme", in the second sentence of paragraph 16 (T/L.1077, annex).

Those words were adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 16 (T/L.1077, annex) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

64. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) felt that in the fifteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 15), which concerned paragraph 18 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, the words "should be carried out unconditionally" were inconsistent with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV). She therefore requested the USSR representative to reconsider them.

65. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, despite his desire to accommodate the Liberian representative, he could not see his way to altering the amendment.

The fifteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 15) was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 18 (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The sixteenth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 16) was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

Paragraph 19 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

66. The PRESIDENT invited representatives to reconsider the twelfth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 12) on which the voting had previously been equally divided.

67. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he would vote against the amendment, which was not only superfluous but also implied, wrongly, that the Administering Authority was not aware of the relevant article of the Trusteeship Agreement.

68. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thought that the Administering Authority need not object to having its attention drawn to the Trusteeship Agreement which, like the Charter, closely concerned the Trust Territory.

69. Mr. YATES (United States of America) said that his delegation was very much aware of the Trusteeship Agreement and saw no need for the insertion of such a phrase.

The twelfth USSR amendment (T/L.1083, para. 12) was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 9 of the draft conclusions and recommendations (T/L.1077, annex) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

70. The PRESIDENT observing that consideration of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1077) had thus been completed, invited representatives to consider the recommendations contained in paragraph 5 of the report itself.

The recommendations in paragraph 5 (T/L.1077) were approved by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

71. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1080 and Corr.1), submitted by the Soviet Union.

72. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained the three reasons why his delegation had submitted its draft resolution addressing a recommendation to the Security Council to examine the

question of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands before the nineteenth session of the General Assembly.

73. First, the Security Council was the United Nations organ responsible for exercising supervisory functions in connexion with the Trusteeship System in so-called strategic areas. In the seventeen years which had elapsed since the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands had been approved by the Security Council, that Council had never considered conditions in the Territory. That situation was abnormal, all the more so since the other Trust Territories were as a rule considered yearly by the General Assembly. Reports were simply submitted to the Security Council by the Trusteeship Council but they were never considered by the Security Council.

74. Secondly, despite the great changes that had taken place in the world since the Trusteeship Agreement had been concluded, including the adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and despite the frequent statements of the Administering Authority that it was fulfilling its mission pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of the Declaration, the United States had as yet set no target date for the granting of independence to the Territory and did not appear at all eager to do so.

75. Thirdly, other evidence, and especially the fact that the current plans for the establishment of a congress of Micronesia did not provide for the transfer of full authority to that body, suggested that the Administering Authority was doing its utmost to prolong its domination over the Territory.

76. The Security Council should consider and take a position on the intentions of the Administering Authority with respect to the Territory. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples would be reporting to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session on the implementation of the Declaration in all dependent territories, including Trust Territories, and the Trusteeship Council should request the Security Council to consider the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands before that session was convened.

77. Mr. YATES (United States of America) thought the USSR representative's arguments were invalid. First, if the Security Council wished to assume jurisdiction over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it could do so at any time by adopting a resolution to that effect. Secondly, the Trusteeship Council's reports were transmitted to the Security Council and the latter could take such action as it wished on the basis of the information relating to the Territory which those reports contained. For those reasons he felt that the draft resolution should be rejected.

78. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while it was true that the Security Council itself could decide whether to consider the question of the Trust Territory, Article 83, paragraph 3, of the Charter imposed on the Trusteeship Council a moral obligation to draw the Security Council's attention to the abnormality of a situation in which the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for which the Security Council bore primary responsi-

bility, had not once been considered by it during the many years in which the Territory had been under United States administration, whereas the General Assembly had repeatedly considered the question of the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru, for which it was primarily responsible. The Security Council should be reminded of its responsibilities under that Article of the Charter and should be invited to consider the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands before the opening of the General Assembly's nineteenth session.

At the request of the Soviet representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

The USSR draft resolution (T/L.1080 and Corr.1) was rejected by 5 votes to 1.

79. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the previous session (1223rd meeting) also the United States had voted against a draft resolution calling on the Security Council to consider the question of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It was perfectly obvious that the reason why the United States had twice voted against such a draft resolution was that as the Security Council had a membership different from that of the Trusteeship Council, in which the United States felt relatively secure, the Security Council would bring the situation in the Territory to the attention of world public opinion and would shed light on what was going on there.

80. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it would be inappropriate for the Trusteeship Council to make a recommendation to the Security Council implying that the latter was not doing its work. As the Security Council was well informed on conditions in the Trust Territory by the Trusteeship Council's reports, it was in a position to judge whether there was any need for a discussion of the subject in the Security Council itself. The fact that the Security Council had not asked for such a discussion might well indicate that it was satisfied with the work done on its behalf by the Trusteeship Council. In any case, the simplest and most normal procedure for instituting a debate in the Security Council was the submission of a request to that effect by a member of the Security Council itself, which could then be considered by the other members.

81. Mr. YATES (United States of America) observed that although the Soviet representative had attributed to the United States the contention that the situation in the Territory could scarcely be improved, he had then cited articles appearing in United States newspapers and periodicals which were highly critical of the administration of the Territory. The fact was that the United States had been extremely critical of the way in which the Territory had been administered. It had acknowledged to the Trusteeship Council that in the past its administration had not been as progressive as it might have been but had pointed out that the situation had greatly improved and that the administration had been raised to a much higher level.

82. On behalf of other members of the Trusteeship Council, he took exception to the Soviet representative's statement that the United States felt itself relatively secure in that body, which implied that those other members were not conscientious in the performance of their duties.

83. He agreed with the New Zealand representative that the fact that the Security Council had not chosen to exercise its right to consider the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands would seem to indicate that it had confidence in the way the Trusteeship Council was dealing with the matter.

84. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the United States representative's remarks about the Trusteeship Council only confirmed the Soviet delegation's viewpoint, for the United States was one of the Administering Authorities.

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964 (T/L.1078)*

[Agenda item 6]

85. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Australian draft resolution in document T/L.1078.

86. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the draft resolution, which concerned the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964 (T/1620), followed the lines of previous resolutions on the reports of visiting missions and was self-explanatory.

87. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as far as his delegation was concerned the purport of the draft resolution was not clear and the matter should therefore be explained in more detail.

88. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) replied that he thought the draft resolution and its purport were satisfactory and that he had nothing to add in that connexion.

89. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) explained that as her delegation had been a member of the Visiting Mission she would not participate in the voting.

The Australian draft resolution (T/L.1078) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea in 1965 (T/L.1082)

[Agenda item 7]

90. The PRESIDENT observed that a draft resolution concerning the appointment of a 1965 visiting mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea had been prepared and would be introduced at the Council's next meeting. He was already in a position to inform the Council, however, that after consulting members he had found it to be the majority view that the following countries should be invited to name members of the mission: France, Liberia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. He hoped that those delegations would be able to name their representatives on the mission within the next day or so in order that the necessary further arrangements could be made.

91. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the dispatch of visiting missions to Trust Territories was one of the most important functions of the Trusteeship Council and such missions were called upon to play an important role in verifying how the Administering Authorities were carrying out their tasks in the Trust Territories. An examination of the composition of visiting missions in the past showed that the principle of equal representation of all States Members of the United Nations was not applied when such missions were appointed. Indeed, there had not been a single case in which the non-colonialist Powers had been in a majority on a visiting mission. As a rule the composition of those missions had included representatives of the Administering Authorities, in other words, of the very countries which were least interested in an objective presentation of conditions in the Trust Territories. The current session of the Council had offered striking examples of the way in which one Administering Authority defended the interests of another, and yet the Administering Authorities were invited to visit each other and inspect each other. The records showed that the United States had been represented on at least eight visiting missions, the United Kingdom on six, Australia and New Zealand on four and the Soviet Union on none. The USSR delegation had frequently raised the question of the appointment of one of its representatives to a visiting mission but the colonialist Powers had used their preponderant position in the Trusteeship Council to block that proposal in every case. The Council was told that the inhabitants of the Trust Territories were grateful to the Administering Authorities for their benevolence and did not want them to leave; if that was true, it was difficult to understand why there was such reluctance to allow a USSR representative to serve on a visiting mission. The Administering Authority had drawn an iron curtain round New Guinea and Nauru by refusing to allow the USSR representative to visit those Territories and had even refused a USSR journalist permission to visit New Guinea during the elections held there.

92. He would like to ask in particular by what right a representative of the United Kingdom, which was one of the three Powers which constituted the joint Administering Authority for Nauru, was to be included in the visiting mission which would go that Territory, apparently for purposes of self-inspection. The Council would recall that during the debate criticism had been voiced of the fact that the Nauru Local Government Council had not been allowed to include a competent adviser in the delegation it had named to conduct negotiations with the British Phosphate Commissioners. It could scarcely be expected that a United Kingdom representative on the visiting mission to Nauru would defend the interests of the Nauruan people against the Commissioners, who were exploiting the island's natural resources.

93. There was nothing in rule 96 of the Trusteeship Council's rules of procedure to indicate that only members of the Trusteeship Council could be included in the membership of visiting missions. His delegation therefore felt that the 1965 visiting mission should consist not only of Trusteeship Council members—such as the representative of Liberia—but also of representatives chosen from among the members of such a body as the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That procedure would be all the more logical

*This item was considered earlier in connexion with agenda items 4 (b) and 5.

in that the Special Committee would shortly consider the question of the application of the Declaration to the Territories of Papua, New Guinea and Nauru. Such a joint mission would be able to carry out effective and efficient work and to submit concrete and rational proposals concerning the future of those three Territories.

94. With regard to the draft resolution which the United Kingdom representative would introduce at the following meeting but the text of which had already been circulated (T/L.1082), he wished to submit two amendments (T/L.1086). First, his delegation proposed that the words "and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV))" should be inserted in operative paragraph 1 after the words "Article 76 b of the Charter of the United Nations". Secondly, the end of operative paragraph 1, beginning with the words "in the life of the relevant sections of the Charter", should be deleted. Those amendments were based entirely on the provisions of the Declaration in question, which ruled out the annexation of any Trust Territory by the metropolitan country. The text of draft resolution T/L.1082, particularly the reference to resolution 1541 (XV), gave reason to believe that the colonial Powers were still unwilling to give up the idea of integrating Trust Territories into the metropolitan countries.

95. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) reserved the right to reply to the Soviet representative at a later meeting.

Questions of procedure

96. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there were two points to which he wished to draw attention at that stage. The first was that the Council's agenda included a separate item concerning petitions, which had not yet been taken up. The second was that as the session was now approaching its end he hoped the members of the Council would in the very near future receive texts intended for inclusion in the Trusteeship Council's reports reflecting the observations of the various members on the dissemination of information about the United Nations in the Trust Territories and the utilization of scholarships made available to indigenous inhabitants under United Nations auspices. The report of the Trusteeship Council should also cover the discussion begun at that

meeting on the dispatch of a visiting mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

97. The PRESIDENT observed that all the petitions on the agenda of the thirty-first session related to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and all raised general questions; they had, therefore, in accordance with past procedure, been listed in the agenda of each meeting at which conditions in that Territory had been under consideration. As no member had made specific comments on those petitions and as they had been covered by the report of the Visiting Mission, the Chair had assumed that the Council's final action with regard to them would be to acknowledge the petitions and refer the petitioners to the report of the Visiting Mission or to such comments as had been made during the course of the meetings. If, however, any delegation still wished to comment on those petitions they could again be placed on the agenda.

98. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, whether or not delegations had any specific comments to make on the petitions, the decision whether to consider them separately or simply to take note of them could be made only by the Trusteeship Council itself.

99. The PRESIDENT said that the Council could decide at its next meeting whether it wished to depart from precedent and examine the petitions as a separate item.

100. With reference to the second point raised by the Soviet representative, he suggested that the draft reports of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council and the General Assembly should cover the dissemination of information in Trust Territories and the question of scholarships and fellowships offered under United Nations auspices, with a summary of the observations made by members of the Council. Those reports would be open to discussion and members would be free to comment on the summary of their views. He asked if that explanation was satisfactory to the Soviet representative.

101. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied in the affirmative.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.