



CONTENTS

	Page
Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (<i>continued</i>):	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1244, T/1254);	
(ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255)	
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the special representative (<i>continued</i>).....	89
Examination of petitions (<i>continued</i>):	
Petitions concerning Somaliland under Italian administration (T/L.673, T/PET.11/679/Add.1, T/PET.11/687)	96

President: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

Present:

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

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

- (i) **Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1244, T/1254);**
- (ii) **Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255)**

[Agenda items 4 (*d*) and 7]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nucker, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took a place at the Council table.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE (*continued*)*Political advancement (concluded)*

1. Mr. CHACKO (India), referring to paragraph 291 of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255), asked the special representative to comment on the suggestion concerning the preparation of a book for use in the schools of the Territory.
2. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said in his opinion the suggestion was a good one and he intended to have work started on such a book.
3. Mr. CHACKO (India) recalled the special representative's statement at the 711th meeting concerning

the term of office of elected officials to district and other local bodies, and asked whether he did not consider that six months was too short a period to determine a person's ability.

4. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that he had been mistaken in saying that elections would be held every six months; in fact they would be held every two years.

5. Mr. CHACKO (India) said that when the Visiting Mission had been in the Territory it had understood that the possibility of establishing the capital of the Territory at Dublon, in the Truk district, had not been abandoned. He asked whether that was in fact the case.

6. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the idea of situating the headquarters at Dublon had not been given up. No final decision had however been taken.

7. Mr. CHACKO (India) said he had in mind the proposal to distribute some of the offices of the heads of departments in various districts. He wondered whether it would be worthwhile constructing permanent buildings before a decision had been taken regarding the site of the Headquarters.

8. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that that possibility was still being considered and when circumstances indicated that the Headquarters should be moved to the Trust Territory the advisability of situating various divisions of the Headquarters in different districts would be discussed.

9. Mr. CHACKO (India) asked what arrangements were being made to provide adequate housing for the Rongelap people who had been moved to Ejit when they returned to Rongelap late in the autumn.

10. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that housing would be provided for them.

11. Mr. CHACKO (India) asked whether any section of the population had been removed from their normal places of residence on account of the recent atomic experiments held in the Marshall Islands district.

12. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that no people had been moved before, during or since the tests.

13. Mr. CHACKO (India) pointed out that according to the Press a thermonuclear bomb dropped by a B-22 aircraft at Bikini had exploded less than 4 miles short of the planned position. He asked whether that error had resulted in any unexpected occurrences, particularly with regard to the extension of fall-out.

14. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the negative. The error had had no effect on any inhabited islands in the area.

15. Mr. CHACKO (India), in view of Press reports to the effect that radioactivity resulting from those test explosions had been felt as far away as 1,300 miles, asked whether any adverse effects had been reported by the people of the Trust Territory.

16. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that no such reports had been received; even though the

effects of radiation might have been felt a thousand miles away, the direction of the wind and the movement of the radiation had been away from the populated islands of the Trust Territory.

17. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) drew attention to the first paragraph of part V of the annual report¹ and asked whether he was right in interpreting it as meaning that the Administering Authority believed in the importance of natural evolution as the principal element of political development, and that the basic factor affecting the rate of development was the response of the indigenous people, and further whether he was correct in inferring that the rate and kind of response were unlikely to be either predictable or uniform.

18. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative. The Administering Authority recognized that it could not expect uniform development all over the Trust Territory. The people in the various districts must be encouraged to develop towards self-government in accordance with their desires.

19. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) observed that all the objectives referred to in the special representative's statements were short-term objectives; most of them were for 1960 and one for a nearer date. He assumed that it was the Administering Authority's view that that was about the longest period for which it could plan in the circumstances of the Territory.

20. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said he would hesitate to go beyond what he had said in his opening statement (709th meeting). When the targets to which he had referred had been attained, the Administering Authority would be in a better position to forecast other developments in the direction of political self-government.

21. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said he had understood the special representative in his opening statement to say that the date of 1960 for the organic act was a target date rather than a firm programme. Its achievement would, of course, depend on the results of the consultation with the people of the Territory which he understood was now being carried on.

22. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said the Administering Authority felt it was essential to consult the Micronesians with respect to the development of an organic act which it was hoped would, for a considerable time thereafter, be the framework of government within which both the Administering Authority and the Micronesians could work. For that reason it had been decided to make 1960 the target date instead of starting at once with the unilateral development of an organic act. The Micronesians had made great advances in the past six or eight years in understanding the democratic way of government. For that reason he considered that they could now contribute intelligently to the development of an organic act for Micronesia.

Economic advancement (continued)

23. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said he had understood the special representative to say, in reply to a question

¹ *Eighth Annual Report on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations*, Department of State Publication 6243, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956. (Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1244.)

asked by the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting, that road-building in the Territory would be almost the exclusive responsibility of the municipalities. As the municipalities already had heavy responsibilities, he wondered whether the result might not be to leave the Territory without good roads.

24. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that the main roads in the Territory were maintained and repaired by the Administration, and funds were set aside for the purpose. The roads for which the municipalities would be responsible were side roads and paths; they were not vehicular roads, since few of the municipalities in the Territory possessed vehicles.

25. Mr. RIFAI (Syria), referring to paragraph 316 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked the special representative to comment on the fact that, although the deficit was covered by the Administering Authority, the Territory's budget still did not provide sufficient funds for economic and social development.

26. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the budget of the Territory has increased in recent years. The United States Congress had provided funds amounting to \$1,600,000 during the first two years for a construction programme, annual expenditure on which was now between \$800,000 and \$900,000. In spite of its contribution to the construction programme, Congress had not reduced the administrative and official budget, and revenues from the Territory had increased slightly, so that the situation was in general satisfactory. The Administering Authority had adopted the position that it wished to assist the Micronesians to achieve self-government and self-sufficiency, but that did not mean that it should necessarily provide more funds than it was already doing. It was there to aid the Micronesians, not to act for them. Furthermore, advancement could not really be measured by the amount of dollars invested. Conditions in the Territory had improved from 1950 onwards and the attitude of the Micronesians towards the Administering Authority was exceptionally good. Progress in the fields of politics, education and health had been most satisfactory during the last three years. The appropriations made by the Administering Authority were not so small as to hold up the Territory in its advancement. The rate of advancement might be accelerated with the help of larger appropriations but, in the end, the positive results would be the same.

27. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked whether the Administering Authority had considered the appointment of a Micronesian member on the Copra Stabilization Board.

28. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority would have no objection to such a course, but that it had not been done before because of the amount of travel that would involve, either for the Micronesian member or for the rest of the Board. However, as the Administering Authority's attempts to spread a wider knowledge of the copra situation among copra producers had so far been unavailing, that possibility would have to be considered. In order to explain the complexities of the situation to the Micronesians, it might be necessary for the Board to hold meetings in various districts, and perhaps for district representatives to be present at Board meetings on Guam.

29. Mr. RIFAI (Syria), referring to paragraph 66 of the Secretariat working paper (T/L.685), noted that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure in

the municipality budgets. He asked whether the surplus was due to lack of projects and what use had been made of the funds.

30. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the surplus was retained by the municipalities. There was no shortage of projects in which to invest such funds, but the Micronesians were in general extremely cautious with regard to expenditure.

31. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) congratulated the Administering Authority on the success of its agricultural development programme. He asked what kind of breeding livestock had been introduced, and what kind of new agricultural products were being encouraged. He wondered whether cotton might not be a suitable crop for the Territory.

32. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, during the past year, several different breeds of cattle had been introduced and new strains of poultry. A new strain of pigs, from Honolulu, was now being introduced.

33. With regard to the new agricultural products, cocoa cultivation was being stressed and new kinds of vegetables for the Guam market had been introduced, as well as improved varieties of taro, banana, pandanus and breadfruit. In actual fact, those crops were not usually new; strains which had shown themselves to be successful in one district were extended to others. The possibility of growing cotton had not yet been considered. He thought that the soils of Micronesia were not favourable to cotton-growing, but he would look into the matter.

34. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), referring to paragraph 28 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked what action the Administering Authority had taken to stimulate a desire for a cash income among the Yapese, which was desirable, as lack of such income was undoubtedly one of the obstacles to general economic development.

35. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the Yapese were very independent and faithful to their own culture and customs. At the present time they saw no reason to transform their traditional economy, in which money played a very small role, into a modern money economy. The manager of the Yap Trading Company wished to stimulate their desire for goods in order to increase his business, but the Administering Authority was not taking any strong action to change the habits of the Yapese.

36. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) asked whether the Administering Authority had considered reviving the fishing and pineapple-canning industries in the Palaus, and, if so, with what results.

37. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that those two industries had been developed primarily for the benefit of the Japanese, who had heavily outnumbered the Palauans. Their presence had created an artificial demand which could not be matched by the present United States population of the islands. The Administering Authority had considered introducing a fishing programme, which would have been an expensive undertaking, but as it could have been put into effect only under the management of non-Micronesians, and would not, therefore, have been of much benefit to the Palauans, the effort had been abandoned. However, the Administering Authority still had plans for that industry. Pineapple-canning did

not, at first sight, hold out very favourable prospects but it would be considered.

38. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) recalled, in connexion with paragraphs 64 and 65 of the Visiting Mission's report, that there had been a proposal to send an expert to make an on-the-spot survey of the bauxite and manganese deposits in the Palau Islands. According to the report, the expert had not yet visited the Territory. He wondered whether, assuming that no United States undertaking was interested, other foreign companies might not be attracted by the mining possibilities of the islands.

39. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that a study of the bauxite deposits had been made by a group from the United States Geological Survey, on the basis of statistics and past experience, without an expert being sent to the islands. The group's conclusion had been that the bauxite of the Palaus could not be exploited except at enormous expense. The bauxite was of poor quality, and the Japanese mills which had processed it during the war now handled a different type of bauxite. Considerable expenditure would be required to fit them for the handling of the Palau type.

40. Permission had been granted to one individual who wished to review the bauxite deposits on the spot with a view to supplying Japanese requirements. The Administering Authority was following the question closely, but the question arose whether the bauxite deposits should be exploited immediately. It might be more in the interest of the Micronesians to retain such an asset until their cash economy had developed sufficiently to make the mining of the bauxite desirable. He felt very strongly that there should be no development of the deposits unless it was in the interest of the Micronesians themselves.

41. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), referring to paragraph 98 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked whether over-population was a serious problem in the Mortlock Islands and how the Administering Authority had persuaded some of the population to migrate to Ponape.

42. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that population pressure was not a serious problem in the Territory. There were several homesteading programmes, all of which were aimed at relieving overcrowding in specific areas. Population was increasing, but the pressure would probably be easily relieved as the Micronesians became increasingly accustomed to the homesteading programmes. The Mortlock Islands were slightly over-populated but the situation was not yet critical. Land was available in the Marianas, on Ponape, and in the Palaus, but there was very little available on Truk, where most of the publicland was not suitable for settlement.

43. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) referred to paragraph 199 of the Visiting Mission's report and asked whether the special representative's remarks applied also to the Marshall Islands.

44. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative. He emphasized that, in interpreting the figures for population pressure in the Territory, considerable caution must be exercised. The population density of an island might be two thousand per square mile, but that did not mean that one square mile of land supported two thousand people, as they obtained food from the surrounding islands. In the Marshalls, the need for more land could be met by homesteading

programmes. Furthermore, as 40 per cent of the Territory's copra crop came from the Marshalls, the population had a certain amount of money with which to buy other foodstuffs.

45. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), referring to paragraphs 270 and 271 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked what conclusions with regard to the shipping of fruit and vegetables from the Marianas had been reached by the board of naval officers which had been asked to survey commercial shipping in the Saipan and Rota districts.

46. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the board's report had not been available before he had left the Territory. The problem of the delivery of the produce of the Marianas could be solved only by establishing regular shipping schedules. The matter would be given special attention upon his return to the Territory.

47. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted from the Visiting Mission's report that there was no individual ownership of land in the Marshall Islands. There seemed no reason therefore why the land held by the Administration should not be returned to the indigenous inhabitants. It would be interesting to hear what the difficulties were.

48. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the problem of returning land was somewhat simpler in the Marshall Islands than in those districts where there was individual ownership. In the Marshalls, land was returned to families or clans, which meant that larger blocks of land could be returned to fewer owners, without complaints from the individuals within the family concerned. Inter-family disputes occasionally arose over boundary lines but they had all been solved by discussion. In one case, the Chief Justice had held hearings and taken statements from members of the various families involved; a satisfactory solution had been found and no further difficulties had arisen.

49. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked how the land still held by the Administration was being used.

50. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that some of the land was used by the Administering Authority for its establishments and facilities, some of it was used for such projects as the cacao and copra plantations and the Jaluit agricultural projects, i.e. experimental low-atoll agriculture, and some of it was held in order to provide water-shed areas, ensure the continuation of adequate forestation and have land available for homesteading. In the latter case the land would ultimately be returned to the Micronesians.

51. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the figures for the area held by the Administering Authority compared to that held by the indigenous inhabitants were the same in the annual report under discussion as in the preceding annual report². He would like to know whether they gave an accurate picture of the existing situation and, if not, how much land had been returned to the indigenous inhabitants.

² *Seventh Annual Report on the Administration of the Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations, Department of State Publication 5735, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955. (Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1173.)*

52. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the figures in the 1955 annual report should have been changed. During the year under review, thousands of acres had been returned to Micronesian ownership by means of homesteading. He had not the precise figures with him, but he would be glad to obtain them.

53. Much of the 434 square miles mentioned in the report as public land consisted of single islands and small inhabited areas used by the population for producing food, but not definitely set aside as Micronesian-owned property.

54. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would welcome up-to-date figures on the land situation.

55. According to paragraph 200 of the Visiting Mission report, the Mission had received a complaint from the inhabitants of Uliga Island that the Government of the Trust Territory had been using their land for six years without permission and that it had failed to compensate the owners. It would be interesting to know why the Administration had taken the land from the indigenous inhabitants and how it intended to settle the question. He understood that the Administration was about to settle the indigenous inhabitants' financial claims; he was primarily interested in what would be done about the land itself.

56. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that Uliga Island was the island on which the Marshall Islands district administration had its headquarters. The United States Government had acquired most of the land at the end of the war, when it had taken over land formerly under the Japanese Government. Additional land had been taken shortly afterwards for the building of an airstrip and other administrative purposes. Some land had already been returned to the Marshall Islanders. The rest, including the airfield, was being used by the Administration, which would pay the Marshallese for it.

57. In reply to a further question asked by Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) estimated that approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000 was involved in the settling of land claims on Uliga.

58. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether Kili Island, on which the population of Bikini Atoll had been resettled, had previously been uninhabited, public domain or land occupied by other indigenous inhabitants.

59. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the Bikinians were not occupying land which had previously been occupied by other Marshallese; Kili Island had been vacant land.

60. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted from the Visiting Mission's report that the Acting High Commissioner had stated that it might not be possible for the former inhabitants of Bikini Atoll to return there. He wondered whether that meant that the atoll had been lost to the Trust Territory forever as an inhabited area.

61. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that forever was a long time. He did not believe, however, that in the foreseeable future Bikini could successfully be inhabited by the Marshallese in the way in which they were accustomed to living. The Marshallese should understand that and devote their time to learning the way of life on Kili Island rather than living in hopes of returning to Bikini. To all intents and purposes the present Bikinians and their children should not contemplate returning to the atoll.

62. In reply to further questions by Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the same prognosis applied to Eniwetok Atoll but not to the islands of Utirik and Rongelap. The islanders had already returned to Utirik and the people of Rongelap would return there later in the year.

63. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that, although the Administration had at its disposal 434 square miles, in other words far more land than the indigenous inhabitants, difficulties had been experienced in resettling the people of Bikini, Eniwetok, Rongelap and Utirik. He was not familiar with conditions on the islands, but he would like to know why it was so difficult for the Administration to satisfy the wishes of those indigenous inhabitants who had sustained losses as the result of the nuclear tests.

64. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that many of the islands were not habitable on a permanent basis; a number of them had an absolute shortage of water, others were not arable and others were too remote. The people of Eniwetok had been moved to Ujelang, and they were satisfied with it from the point of view of food production and the use of the lagoon. The question of cultural affinities also constituted a problem in some instances; the islanders did not want to move into areas that were under the influence of a different culture, preferring to stay within the area of their own language, people and culture.

65. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium), referring to paragraph 317 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked whether the Administering Authority was intending to give any substantial financial support to the municipalities for the maintenance of local institutions such as schools and clinics; the municipalities appeared to be in need of it.

66. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, although it was slower for the municipalities to be left to provide schools and other local institutions, the effort required from them was in itself educative and the Administration should not, therefore, take the financing into its own hands. The municipalities were making an increasing effort in that direction and beginning to compete with each other. However, the Administration did not leave the municipalities entirely on their own; it had recently set up a small matching fund. Municipalities which were unable to finance the construction of a building, for instance, might apply for a grant from that fund. They would provide the labour and local material and the Administration would provide funds for other materials, equipment etc.

67. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) asked how the negotiations with the Japanese Government concerning compensation for the expropriation of Micronesian assets in Japanese currency were progressing, and why the question had not been settled up to the present.

68. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that all Micronesian claims for compensation for assets in Japanese currency which had been received had been settled, and funds were available for the settlement of additional claims, but none had been made within the last three or four months. Arrangements had also been made for the Administering Authority to compensate Micronesians for postal savings in yen. The full settlement of all claims should be in sight by the end of the year.

69. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) congratulated the Administering Authority on replacing the Island Trading Company by seven private companies in which the Micronesians participated. He asked whether all the functions of the Island Trading Company had been taken over by the new companies.

70. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, with regard to shipping, the seven local companies were discharging greater responsibilities than the Island Trading Company had done. Although they did not handle all the shipping, some local shipping was entirely in their hands. They extended credit to their customers, as had formerly been done by the Island Trading Company. The Administration had started a \$500,000 fund for making loans to the Micronesian companies which wished to improve their operation and facilities.

71. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) asked why, in view of the advanced state of development reached by the Micronesians who operated the local trading companies, no attempt had been made to use the boards of directors of those companies to explain to the Micronesians the reasons for the fluctuations in the price of copra.

72. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that attempts had been made in that direction, but the members of the boards of directors did not always understand the functioning of the Copra Stabilization Board, and if they did, they often did not explain it to other Micronesians. The copra producer, who brought his crop to the store to sell and then departed with any goods he had purchased, had very little contact with the board of directors in any case. The problem was very real, as the Micronesians evidently did not understand how the price of copra was regulated. The Administration intended to disseminate information on that subject by every possible means. However, questions about copra did not necessarily reflect ignorance; it was natural that the Micronesians should ask questions about one of their staple products.

73. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium), referring to paragraph 347 of the Visiting Mission's report, asked whether the Administering Authority was considering long-range planning for agricultural extension work, as recommended by the Visiting Mission.

74. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority had been recruiting new staff for the Agriculture Department, with a view to strengthening the agricultural programme. Time was needed to acquaint the new staff with local conditions and with the Administration's programme. Another aspect of agricultural planning was met by the yearly meetings of agriculturists, from which plans for the various districts emerged. They were reviewed by the staff agriculturists and submitted to the High Commissioner. Substantial improvement could be expected shortly.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.

75. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the Visiting Mission had not recommended all-out financial aid by the Administering Authority but the appropriation of somewhat larger sums so that progress might be accelerated. The meagreness of the Territory's resources had been emphasized on various occasions, although it was known to possess considerable marine resources. He asked whether the Administering Authority had any plan under consideration for the development of such resources.

76. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority was aware of the importance of marine resources for the development of income in the Territory. A fisheries biologist had been studying trochus shell fishing, on which he would shortly be submitting recommendations, and he would study other types of shell fishing later. A study of the possibilities of local fishing had been carried out by an expert of the South Pacific Commission, who had recommended that a fishing programme should be started in the Palau, for which the Administration would provide some small fishing boats. The proposal was now under consideration. One Micronesian was being sent to Fiji to attend the South Pacific Commission's fishing school, and it was hoped to send another Micronesian also.

77. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that, if the Administration's homesteading programme, which was of great importance for the improvement of agricultural production and trade, was to succeed, roads would be needed, but the cost of repairing the existing roads and building new ones could not be borne entirely by the local authorities. He asked whether the Administering Authority had any definite programme of road construction, and whether it intended to finance such construction.

78. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that he had discussed the need for new roads with the Director of Public Works. In view of the fact that the roads were commercially necessary and essential for the development of the islands, they would be financed by the Administering Authority.

79. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the Micronesians obviously had difficulty in understanding why they did not obtain a better price for their copra, which was due, to a certain extent, to their ignorance of the copra market. The Visiting Mission had felt that one of the factors which militated against their obtaining better prices was that much of the copra produced was only third grade. To improve the quality, it was necessary to improve the drying process. He asked how many hot-air dryers for copra there were in the Territory.

80. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that copra was graded in Micronesia, according to acid content and other factors, as grade one, grade two or grade three. There was a differential of ten dollars a ton between the different grades, the first grade selling for \$110 a ton. It was obvious therefore, that the production of first-grade rather than third-grade copra would result in an increase in cash income for the Micronesians. However, even third-grade Micronesian copra was better than most copra produced in other areas of the world. The methods of grading and sorting had been discussed so that a standard grading could be obtained from all trading companies. Furthermore, an effort was being made to explain the grading process to the Micronesians and to convince them of the necessity for care in processing their copra. Lack of care in drying resulted in the production of third-grade copra.

81. There was one brick and concrete hot-air dryer in Metalanim, and other smaller heat-drying facilities on several of the other islands. The Administration's copra expert was now considering whether it would be advisable for the Territory to initiate a programme of installing small heat-drying units throughout the various islands. However, the copra produced by that method was not so good as sun-dried copra and the general-

ization of such a process might result in a lowering of quality and a consequent loss of dollar earnings for the Territory. The Administering Authority was giving the subject its attention.

82. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the Metalanim installation belonged to a plantation not being developed specifically by Micronesians: he had had in mind specifically Micronesian installations.

83. He asked whether there was any possibility of reviving the pineapple and sugar industries, which had flourished in the Territory under the Japanese occupation.

84. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, before reviving the sugar industry, thought must be given to the situation on the world sugar market and the availability of sugar from other areas. During the war, the Japanese had provided a market for Micronesian sugar which now no longer existed. For those reasons, he did not think that sugar could be developed in Micronesia as a cash crop. The prospects of the canning industry were more encouraging, but it would take time to accumulate sufficient information to be sure that there would be an adequate supply of raw material and a sure market for the products.

85. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked whether the studies regarding the utilization of the balance in hand after the closure of the Angaur mines had been concluded, and whether the regulations governing the utilization of the funds were to be modified.

86. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, at the close of the Angaur mining operation, there had been a balance of about \$1,300,000, which had been placed in a trust fund for the benefit of the Angaurese. The trust fund agreement, which laid down the manner in which the fund was to be invested and the profits distributed, had the approval of the Angaurese and had been signed by their representatives. About 400 Angaurese participated in returns from the fund. When discussing the subject with the Visiting Mission, the Administering Authority had intended to indicate its anxiety concerning the continued administration of the trust fund under its present regulations. At the present time, the trust fund agreement provided that at the death of a participant, the principal should go to his heirs. Such a solution, however, entailed considerable practical difficulties, and a different solution was being sought. There was no question of speculating with the fund, but merely of finding an equitable method of distributing the principal.

87. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) asked whether the Administering Authority was satisfied with the situation at the close of the mining operations.

88. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that he was satisfied with the way in which the mining operations had been carried out and with the way in which the mining company had respected its contract obligations.

89. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) asked the special representative whether, in his view, there might be a greater potential of marine resources than of land resources in the Trust Territory. He would also like to have some information about the activities of the South Pacific Commission expert who had recently visited the Territory and of the fisheries biologist who was engaged in a study of the trochus shell.

90. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that Mr. van Pel, of the South Pacific Commission,

who had a wide knowledge of fishing in the Pacific areas, had visited each of the districts in the Trust Territory. He had submitted a report recommending that the Administering Authority should sponsor a programme of deep-sea fishing, which would require the purchase of ships and fishing gear and other activities by the Administration and the employment of Micronesians to operate the boats, process the fish and generally carry out the programme. Mr. van Pel's suggestions had been studied and action might be taken on them.

91. The trochus industry was essentially a reef industry. Income from it had increased in each of the past four years and an additional increase was anticipated during the current year. The fisheries biologist was collecting information which would enable him to make recommendations to the Administering Authority on improving the harvest while at the same time conserving the trochus. He had been at work for about six months and by 1957 would probably have information which would be of great value to the Trust Territory.

92. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) referred to paragraphs 59 and 87 of the Secretariat working paper (T/L.685), which showed that the Administering Authority had been unable to establish a fishing industry for export which would benefit the people of the Trust Territory, but that those resources were being exploited by foreign interests. He asked whether the special representative could comment on the problem and in particular whether the Administration, having failed to negotiate successfully for the establishment of a fishing industry through private interests, had envisaged governmental action.

93. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the Administration had envisaged the development of a fishing industry based on Micronesian facilities. It was true that other nationals were fishing the waters of the area, but they were operating outside the three-mile zone. They sent boats to the area which engaged in long-line fishing, made a full catch and then returned to their point of origin for the disposal and processing of the fish.

94. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) asked whether the special representative could say whether there had been any attempt to make informal arrangements with regard to the regulation of fishing in the area outside the three-mile zone.

95. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) pointed out that there were over 3 million square miles of water in Micronesia. Existing international law permitted any country to fish in that area and in other areas of the open ocean. The Administration's conservation work with regard to trochus, sponges, shells and lagoon fish was limited to waters within the three-mile zone.

96. Mr. CHACKO (India) referred to a statement made by the special representative at the previous meeting that the copra of the Trust Territory received the benefit of a premium payment because of its higher quality as compared with world copra in general. That remark had apparently given the New Zealand representative the impression that the Visiting Mission's statement in paragraph 349 (d) of its report that copra drying was done mostly by primitive methods resulting in many cases in the production of inferior quality copra had been based on a misunderstanding of the situation in the Territory. At the present meeting the special representative had said that copra in the Trust Territory was graded into three categories, which

fetched \$110 per ton, \$100 per ton and \$90 per ton respectively. However, the Visiting Mission had found that nearly everywhere the people were receiving either the second or third grade price. It had advised the people that one way to obtain a better price was to improve their methods of drying.

97. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) confirmed that most of the copra in the Trust Territory was grade two or grade three rather than grade one, and that that fact was due in part to the methods of drying used by the Micronesians. The Administration was endeavouring to teach them better methods.

98. In reply to a question asked by Mr. CHACKO (India), Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that in the Administration's view the amount now appropriated, approximately \$6 million a year, was sufficient to enable progress to be made in the Trust Territory. A larger sum might produce faster changes, which might or might not be regarded as an advantage.

99. Mr. CHACKO (India) wondered whether, if the Administration should decide, for example, to start a fishing industry, money would be available for the purpose from the existing funds.

100. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that if the Administration decided to start a fishing programme for which additional funds would be required, it would ask the United States Congress for the money. Six million dollars was not enough to allow for economic development programmes, but the Administration could always apply to Congress for additional funds.

101. Mr. CHACKO (India) thought there had been some misunderstanding of the Visiting Mission's recommendation in paragraph 316 of its report that the Administering Authority should increase its appropriations. One of the immediate requirements of the Territory was the provision of adequate shipping, for which a considerable amount of financing would be required. As an illustration of that need he referred to paragraph 232 of the Visiting Mission's report, which stated that the island of Ujelang had frequently had to wait for six months or more before a field ship called to load copra and deliver trade goods. That one example showed that the expansion of shipping facilities was very necessary. Moreover, the Mission had had many requests for assistance in starting industries, such as fishing, canning and so forth. Furthermore, with regard to education, while the Administration's policy of letting the people rely mostly on local resources, particularly in regard to elementary education, was commendable in principle, progress with that system would obviously be extremely slow.

102. For those reasons the Visiting Mission had come to the conclusion that unless the existing appropriations were increased there was very little likelihood that the Territory would make adequate progress in any reasonable time. He had no intention of implying that no progress was being made, but no large-scale development could take place unless the existing appropriations were increased. He would not go into the question whether the Administering Authority should provide additional funds because of security considerations, or the use that the Administering Authority was making of the Territory; he had merely wished to explain the considerations which had led the Mission to make that recommendation.

Mr. Nucker, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, withdrew.

Examination of petitions (continued)

[Agenda item 5]

PETITIONS CONCERNING SOMALILAND UNDER ITALIAN ADMINISTRATION (T/L.673, T/PET.11/679/Add.1, T/PET.11/687)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Holte Castello (Colombia), Mr. Salah (Egypt) and Mr. Baradi (Philippines), representatives of States members of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration, took places at the Council table.

103. Mr. JAIPAL (India) recalled that in the past the Council had recognized the handsome contributions made by the Governments of the United States America and Egypt to the development of Somaliland under Italian Administration. The Standing Committee on Petitions had taken note of certain statements made by the Egyptian representative on the United Nations Advisory Council for Somaliland, but as stated in its one hundred and fifty-eight report (T/L.673), it had considered that it was not competent, under the Trusteeship Council's rules of procedure, to put forward any recommendations.

104. In those circumstances he proposed that the Trusteeship Council should take note of the report in document T/L.673 and decide that no action was called for on the petitions dealt with in the report or set out in documents T/PET.11/679/Add.1 and T/PET.11/687.

105. U MYA SEIN (Burma) supported that proposal.

106. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that in the Standing Committee on Petitions the Egyptian representative on the Advisory Council had asked the Italian delegation for some information on the matter dealt with in the petition. In that connexion a preliminary question of principle should be taken into consideration. Petitions were normally addressed to the Council to lodge complaints against the Administering Authority, to call attention to conditions of a general nature in the Trust Territory, or to protest against the activities of local organs or persons falling within the jurisdiction of the Administering Authority, for whom the Administering Authority could therefore be held responsible. The case under consideration was quite different; it involved a petition against a person for whom the Administering Authority could not be held responsible inasmuch as that person did not fall within its jurisdiction, being a member of a United Nations organ. He therefore believed that the Administering Authority should refrain from intervening in the discussion of the petitions as far as the subject matter was concerned. On the other hand, if the Council wished his delegation to report on specific factual data, he would be glad to try to obtain the relevant information.

107. Mr. DE CAMARET (France), speaking as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, said that he had been asked to decide whether or not the Advisory Council should be asked to enlighten the Committee on the matters dealt with in the petitions. He had not deemed it desirable to take such a decision because the petitions in question were unique and they

were not covered by any rule of procedure requiring the observations of the special representative or the Committee's comments.

108. Speaking as representative of France, he drew attention to the difficulties which had arisen when the Committee had come to consider the adoption of a draft resolution. Those difficulties lay in the fact that the members of the Advisory Council were responsible to the General Assembly and not to the Trusteeship Council. It was important that that point should be borne in mind.

The Indian representative's proposal was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

109. Mr. KIANG (China) explained that he had abstained from voting because he was not certain whether the Council was competent to deal with the matter, since the Advisory Council had been established by the General Assembly.

110. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that the right of petition also included the petitioners' right to a reply. The case in point was the first occasion when the Council had sent the petitioners no reply. He had therefore abstained from voting.

111. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that, in keeping with his previous statement, he should have abstained from voting. The members of the Council would, however, have noted that his delegation, while expressing its appreciation of the favourable judgement passed by the Advisory Council as a whole on the Italian administration of Somaliland, had refrained from commenting on the statement made at an earlier meeting by a member of the Advisory Council about the relationship between that organ and the Administering Authority. He had voted in favour of the Indian proposal so as not to leave the slightest doubt about the regard in which the Italian Government held the Advisory Council as a whole.

112. Mr. SALAH (Egypt), member of the Advisory Council for Somaliland, observed that, as he had informed the Standing Committee on Petitions, the authors of the original petition (T/PET.11/668 and Add.1 and 2), namely the General Secretary, Central Committee and Executive Committee of the Partito Democratico Somalo had visited him the day before he had left the Trust Territory and expressed their regret at the petition. He had now been informed that a written letter from the Partito Democratico Somalo had been presented to the Headquarters of the United Nations Advisory Council on 26 May in which the Partito expressed its regret and withdrew the petition. He would like to know why that letter had not been circulated, while other petitions, including statements and accusations against the Egyptian representatives, had been circulated and attached to the document under consideration. He would be grateful if an inquiry could be made.

113. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) replied that no written text of the communication or petition had so far been received at United Nations Headquarters. He would make inquiries.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.