



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Thirty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 22 June 1965,
 at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Agenda items 4 and 6:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis-</i> <i>tering Authorities on the administration of</i> <i>Trust Territories for the year ended 30</i> <i>June 1964:</i>	
(b) Nauru (continued)	
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission</i> <i>to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New</i> <i>Guinea, 1965:</i>	
(a) Nauru (continued)	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	135
<i>Agenda items 4 and 5:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis-</i> <i>tering Authorities on the administration of</i> <i>Trust Territories for the year ended 30</i> <i>June 1964:</i>	
(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)	
<i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex</i> <i>to the agenda (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on the</i> <i>Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands . . .</i>	136
<i>Agenda items 4 and 6:</i>	
<i>Examination of annual reports of the Adminis-</i> <i>tering Authorities on the administration of</i> <i>Trust Territories for the year ended 30</i> <i>June 1964:</i>	
(b) Nauru (continued)	
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission</i> <i>to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New</i> <i>Guinea, 1965:</i>	
(a) Nauru (continued)	
<i>Request concerning the special representa-</i> <i>tive's opening statement</i>	142

President: Mr. André NAUDY (France).

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: International Labour Organisation; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:
 (b) Nauru (T/1631, T/1641, T/L.1091 and Add.1) (continued)

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:
 (a) Nauru (T/1636 and Corr.1) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Marsh, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, and Mr. De Roburt, and Mr. Detudamo, advisers to the special representative, took places at the Council table.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) expressed regret that it had not been possible for the two sides to reach agreement on the question of Nauruan resettlement. Having visited Nauru and thus being fully aware of the population problem there, he could only suggest that both sides should keep the question open for further discussion. He noted with satisfaction the special representative's statement that his Government would be willing to engage in future talks on resettlement, with due consideration for the matter of Nauruan identity. He hoped that despite Mr. De Roburt's statement that the Nauruans had no new thoughts on resettlement, they would not completely abandon that possibility, especially if the Administering Authority was now prepared to make some changes in its original position.

2. His delegation looked forward to the results of the work of the expert committee on the rehabilitation of the island; that possibility should not be discarded, for even if many of the younger Nauruans should decide to seek new homes elsewhere there would always be some Nauruans remaining on the island. He felt strongly that it was the duty of the British Phosphate Commissioners, in consideration of the enormous benefits they had derived from the exploitation of the phosphate deposits, to do as much as they could to restore the island to its original state.

3. He was glad to note the results of the Canberra talks with regard to royalties on the phosphates mined. For too long a time the people of Nauru had not been receiving an equitable return on their only natural resource. He urged further consideration of the proposal that the people of Nauru should operate the phosphate industry jointly with the British Phosphate Commissioners. He also noted the agreement reached concerning the rate of extraction of the phosphates; his delegation was inclined to feel that any prolongation of the life of the deposits would serve the interests of the Nauruan people.

4. On the matter of the Nauruan request for independence, there would seem to be no grounds for debate. The Nauruan people had the right to make such a request and the Council should inform the Australian Government that it expected their wish to be complied with. The special representative had said that after the legislative council was established his Government would consider the Nauruan request. Knowing how

jealously the Australian people guarded their own freedom, the Liberian delegation hoped that they would be willing to accord the same privilege to the Nauruan people.

5. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that for his delegation a highlight of the current session had been the extremely frank and forthright opening statement made by the special representative at the Council's 1256th meeting. That statement was a model for discussion of conditions in Trust Territories in that it presented fully and fairly the views of two sides, namely, the Administering Authority and the representatives of the inhabitants of the Territory. He was glad that Mr. De Roburt had once more been included in the Australian delegation, for he had been able to elaborate on the views of the Nauruan representatives and had done so without fear or favour.

6. Little had been said by members of the Council about social conditions in Nauru. That was simply because they were excellent; he himself, as a recent visitor to the island, could attest to that. The current well-being of the people was a fact. They had full educational opportunities and excellent health services and their level of living was unquestionably one of the highest in the world. Attention had therefore rightly been focused on the future of the Nauruan people and of the phosphate industry, which was the key to their future well-being.

7. The results of the recent discussions at Canberra, which had proved to be the most encouraging and successful talks held by the two parties in recent years, had borne out the correctness of the decision of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, that it would not be appropriate for it to make detailed recommendations before those discussions had taken place. Much had been accomplished in the discussions; areas of disagreement had been identified, and specific provision made for further discussions to seek a resolution of the differences.

8. The Visiting Mission had reached the conclusion that the Nauruan leaders were capable of conducting their own internal affairs and had accordingly recommended the establishment of a legislative council. The Trusteeship Council should welcome the agreement reached at Canberra on that matter as a concrete forward step in the development of self-government, and should welcome also the agreement on the establishment of an executive council; it should moreover note that the composition and powers of those two bodies would be in accordance with the expressed wishes of the Nauruan representatives.

9. The Visiting Mission had also expressed the hope that agreement would be reached on increased royalties, and so it was with great pleasure that he had heard the special representative announce that the Governments concerned had agreed on new royalty rates for 1964-1965 and 1965-1966. Those rates represented a notable advance over the rates previously in effect and would no doubt be welcomed by the Council in its report. He would like to call attention to the Mission's opinion that the major part of any increases should be placed in the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund, where it would help to

provide for the future of the entire community. The advantage of such a division of the royalties was self-evident and should be endorsed by the Council.

10. The Council would presumably also note that there were definite plans for future consideration by the two parties concerned of unsettled questions, particularly the Nauruan request for independence in 1968. The special representative had explained that the Australian Government, taking a position neither for nor against the acceptance of that date, felt that the new forms of self-government, namely the legislative and executive councils, should be given a suitable opportunity to function, after which decisions should be taken on further steps in pursuance of the objectives of the Trusteeship System. That seemed to his delegation a sensible solution, which did not in any way prejudice future events or their timing. His delegation also noted that discussions would take place early in 1966 on future arrangements for the operation of the phosphate industry and that that date was agreeable to the representatives of the Nauruans. The Council should note that both parties had agreed to a technical survey of the feasibility of rehabilitating the worked-out phosphate lands.

11. In summary, his delegation thought that the Council should welcome the forward steps taken at Canberra with respect to the progressive development of self-government and to increased phosphate royalties, and should note the concrete plans for future discussions on unsettled matters, without attempting at the present time to prejudice their outcome.

Mr. Marsh, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru and Mr. De Roburt and Mr. Detudamo, advisers to the special representative, withdrew.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1633, T/1638, T/L.1089 and Add.1, T/L.1092) (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (T/PET.10/L.8, T/PET.10/L.9 and Corr.1) (continued)

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1096, T/L.1097)

12. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation (T/L.1092), the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1096) and the USSR delegation's amendments (T/L.1097) to the annex to that report.

13. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as his delegation's draft resolution was closely linked to its amendments to the recommendations set forth in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee, he would like to have an opportunity to introduce the amendments, after which the draft resolution could be discussed and put to the vote. The Council could then vote on amendments to the recommendations, both those submitted by his delegation and

any others that might be forthcoming, and finally proceed to vote on the recommendations themselves.

14. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the report had not yet been introduced to the Council. As it was self-explanatory, however, its authors would be willing, in the interest of saving time, to forgo a formal introduction and allow the Soviet Union representative to proceed with an explanation of his amendments.

15. The PRESIDENT thanked the Liberian representative and invited the Soviet representative to discuss his delegation's amendments.

16. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that he had stated during the general debate that the United States was refusing to carry out in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the practical measures which would give effect to the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and was actually trying to maintain indefinitely a régime of colonial oppression and exploitation in the Territory, thus failing to fulfil its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. If his delegation's position was correct, the only logical conclusion was that the matter should be referred urgently to the Security Council, in accordance with his delegation's draft resolution (T/L.1092). Since, however, it was the Trusteeship Council which was currently seized of the matter, he would, without prejudice to the disposition of the draft resolution, proceed to introduce his delegation's amendments (T/L.1097) to the recommendations in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1096). If those recommendations were adopted without the amendments in question, the situation would remain unchanged and at the next session the same shortcomings would have to be discussed all over again. While the adoption of his delegation's amendments would not fully solve the problem without its being referred to the Security Council, it would contribute substantially to the achievement of the aims set forth in the Charter with respect to the administration of Trust Territories. The amendments represented the minimum which could make the recommendations acceptable to his delegation and they would not affect the other considerations on which the draft resolution was based.

17. His delegation's first two amendments related to political advancement. The third amendment, which also concerned political advancement, had been put forward because his delegation felt that paragraphs 12 and 13 of the recommendations in the annex to the Drafting Committee's report gave a greatly exaggerated picture of the participation of the indigenous inhabitants in the public service. After the section on political advancement there should be a section on the judicial system, which was not dealt with in the recommendations as they stood; hence the fourth USSR amendment.

18. With regard to economic advancement, it should be noted that paragraph 15 of the recommendations conveyed the impression that the financing provided to meet the Territory's vital needs left nothing to be desired. His delegation had demonstrated that United States expenditure in the Trust Territory for economic development and for other services was inadequate

and was, moreover, insignificant in comparison with its military expenditure in that same part of the world. That paragraph should accordingly be replaced by the paragraph proposed in the fifth USSR amendment.

19. Similarly, the section on social advancement failed to show that appropriations for public health were completely inadequate; paragraph 18 of the recommendations should therefore be changed as indicated in the sixth amendment. The seventh amendment provided for an additional paragraph on social advancement which would correct the impression conveyed by the text as it stood that the situation in respect of qualified indigenous medical and health personnel was satisfactory.

20. The reason for his delegation's eighth amendment was that the recommendations in the section on educational advancement appeared to be based on the premise that there was actually no need for the establishment of an institution of higher education in the Territory, since Micronesians could obtain higher education elsewhere. The fact was that the only place where they could do so was the United States. Hence the political bias of such a recommendation was obvious. It was unacceptable to his delegation because it would deny to the Micronesian population one of its fundamental rights, namely, the opportunity to obtain a higher education in an institution in the Territory itself.

21. Lastly, he wished to draw special attention to the highly unsatisfactory recommendations in the section on political advancement and to his delegation's ninth amendment, the adoption of which would bring the situation in the Territory into line with the aspirations of the Micronesian people and the historic decisions of the General Assembly proclaiming the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

22. His delegation would ask for separate votes on other recommendations to which he had made no specific reference. Some of those recommendations were wholly unacceptable to his delegation, including all those which gave the impression that the Administering Authority had made significant progress in matters affecting the vital interests of the inhabitants of Micronesia.

23. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled that when he had referred to the USSR draft resolution at the 1256th meeting he had pointed out that it was not the first time that the USSR delegation had introduced proposals the purpose of which was to transfer the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Security Council, with the implication that there was something so seriously wrong with the administration of the Trust Territory that the Trusteeship Council was no longer capable of dealing with it. The USSR was itself a member of the Security Council and could propose any matter it wished for that Council to take up. He was confident that once again the Trusteeship Council would reject the proposal and would refuse to do the USSR's work for it.

24. At the present meeting the USSR representative had made it even clearer that his delegation's purpose was to take the question of the Trust Territory entirely out of the hands of the Trusteeship Council—the very body which the Security Council, in its resolution 70

(1949) of 7 March 1949, had asked to handle the problem for it. He had said that if the Security Council took up the problem, the Trusteeship Council would not deal with it again unless the Security Council asked it to do so. As the USSR had a veto in the Security Council, it obviously hoped that it would be able to prevent that ever happening.

25. Turning to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1096), he said he considered it on the whole a balanced report, which accurately reflected the views of the majority of the members of the Council, but that his Government obviously had reservations about some of the conclusions and recommendations it contained.

26. With regard to the USSR amendments (T/L.1097), he was sure that the Council would recognize them as a continuation of the efforts of the USSR to ignore completely any progress in the Territory and to give the world a false picture of United States administration of it, a picture of exploitation and domination. The first amendment completely contradicted the Order No. 2882 of the Secretary of the Interior, as also the statements that the special representative had made in the Council, and sought to reverse the views expressed by the Drafting Committee. With regard to the second, he was surprised that the generally more thorough research of the USSR delegation had not revealed that the proposal in the amendment was part of the normal reporting procedure of the United States, which included in its annual reports not only the charters of the district legislatures but information on the activities of those bodies and major legislative proposals placed before them. Charters of the various district legislatures were to be found on page 163 of the 1959 annual report^{1/} and pages 156, 165, 172 and 179 of the 1963 report.^{2/} The 1964 report^{3/} included the text of an amendment to the Charter of the Marshall Islands District Legislature. The Council could be assured that the United States would continue to include such information in its reports.

27. There was an obvious inconsistency in the third, fourth and seventh USSR amendments; whereas the seventh drew attention to the need for highly qualified personnel, the third and fourth called for the withdrawal of such highly qualified personnel even before the Administration's programme of replacing expatriates by qualified Micronesians had been completed. The United States had no intention of creating a vacuum. The Council could rest assured that efforts to replace American officials would continue as rapidly

as possible. The third USSR amendment sought to disregard all that had already been done in that direction, while the seventh sought to ignore the use that had already been made of United Nations fellowship programmes and the fact that more than 200 students from the Territory were receiving higher education abroad. With regard to the fourth amendment, conditions governing the appointment of the judiciary were set forth on page 36 of the 1964 annual report; the USSR delegation might disagree with those provisions but he doubted whether it would be successful in its efforts to induce the Council to imply that the 132 Micronesian community judges, the twenty Micronesian district judges and the district and assistant court clerks, all Micronesians, did not already hold "responsible posts in the judicial system".

28. The fifth USSR amendment sought to enlist the aid of the Trusteeship Council in the USSR campaign against the use of the Trust Territory for the defence of the free world against aggression. The USSR would apparently like the Council to forget the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement which had placed that obligation on the Administering Authority, provisions which had been approved by the Security Council and, necessarily, by the Soviet Union.

29. In the sixth amendment, the USSR, in its desire to accept as absolute fact certain allegations made in a petition and to disregard the frank discussion of that petition by the special representative, was asking the Council to reverse completely the conclusions of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964, which had commended the United States on its health programme in the Territory (T/1620, para. 68), and the conclusions of the Council itself at its last session (S/5783, para. 117). There were sufficient indications that the amendments of the Soviet delegation were not intended to help the Council to judge fairly conditions in the Territory but were simply further indications of the Soviet Union's attempt to use the Council for its own propaganda purposes.

30. The ninth amendment would delete paragraphs 22 and 23 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report, which followed closely paragraphs adopted by the Council in previous reports, and would thus reverse the view previously expressed by the Council. It would also refer to the recommendations of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. He had already made clear the legal position of his Government on the question of the consideration of the Trust Territory by that Committee. He repeated that his delegation had not objected to that consideration and had in fact participated in it. At the same time, he had pointed out where the principal functions of the United Nations with respect to the Territory lay. The Special Committee had not seen fit to refer to the recommendations of the Council in its own recommendations, although the Council was the principal organ actively discussing the Territory; yet the USSR wished the Council to refer to the recommendations of the Special Committee. There seemed to be some inconsistency in this. The Soviet amendment would delete the reference to General As-

^{1/} United States of America, 12th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959, Department of State Publication 6945 (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1513).

^{2/} United States of America, 16th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1962 to June 30, 1963, Department of State Publication 7676 (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1624).

^{3/} United States of America, 17th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964, Department of State Publication 7811 (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965). Transmitted to the members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1633).

sembly resolution 1541 (XV). The USSR argument in that respect was that resolution 1541 (XV) referred to Non-Self-Governing Territories, not to Trust Territories. Yet in the Special Committee the USSR delegation had opposed any reference to that resolution in the Committee's reports on Non-Self-Governing Territories. He looked forward to hearing the Soviet Union demand in the Special Committee next year that resolution 1541 (XV) be included in future reports of the Committee dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories. The fact was that resolution 1541 (XV) referred to self-government, and self-government was linked also with Trust Territories in Article 76 b of the Charter, as one of the objectives towards which Administering Authorities were to lead the people of those Territories. There could be no doubt that the definition of self-government in that resolution applied equally to any other territory which was non-self-governing but happened to fall into the category of a Trust Territory. The Council should retain the reference to resolution 1541 (XV), as a helpful additional guide to the peoples and to the Council.

31. For all those considerations, and for reasons which he would put forward, if necessary, when each of the amendments was considered, his delegation was opposed to all the USSR amendments appearing in document T/L.1097 and would vote against them all.

32. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation could not support the new paragraph proposed in the first USSR amendment. It might, however, be able to vote for the following text, if the USSR delegation would accept it:

"The Council notes that the Administering Authority continues to have extensive powers over the executive, which now also extends to the legislature, thereby reducing the possibility of the Micronesians becoming effectively seized of the problems confronting the Territory and finding solutions thereto."

33. She did not think that the USSR delegation would press for a vote on the second amendment now that the United States representative had shown it to be unnecessary.

34. With regard to the third amendment, she felt that the point the USSR delegation wished to make was already made in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report.

35. Her delegation could accept the fourth USSR amendment, since there appeared to be a feeling in the Territory that the time had come for the Micronesians to take over the judicial system.

36. It could not support the fifth amendment, for it felt that the question of budgetary appropriations had been adequately dealt with in paragraph 15 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report which the amendment sought to replace.

37. The sixth amendment would disqualify the objective account of health conditions given in the report of the 1964 Visiting Mission (T/1620). Consequently, her delegation could not support it.

38. Her delegation had no objection to the new paragraph proposed in the seventh amendment. It could accept the eighth amendment if the words that were

to be deleted were left in the paragraph in question and the new sentence added at the end.

39. With regard to the ninth, and most controversial, amendment, her delegation could support the new text proposed for paragraph 22, if it was placed before the existing paragraphs 22 and 23 and if those two paragraphs were retained.

40. Turning to the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1092), she asked for the first three preambular paragraphs to be put to the vote together and for separate votes to be taken on each of the remaining paragraphs. Her delegation would vote in favour of the first three preambular paragraphs. It could not, however, support the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs, which contradicted the objective report of the 1964 Visiting Mission. It could support the fifth preambular paragraph, which merely stated a fact. It would abstain on the operative paragraph, in view of the fact that the Trusteeship Council's report was submitted to the Security Council and that the USSR delegation, as a permanent member of the Security Council, was able to request that Council to take up the question.

41. Mr. SHU (China), referring to the USSR draft resolution, pointed out that Security Council resolution 70 (1949) of 7 March 1949 had defined the working relationship between the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council in dealing with strategic areas. In keeping with that resolution, the Trusteeship Council had faithfully performed, on behalf of the Security Council, the functions specified in Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter and year after year had submitted its reports on the Trust Territory. Thus the Security Council had been kept fully informed. It was true that since its approval of the Trusteeship Agreement in 1947 the Security Council had not once examined the situation in the Territory, but the reason was clear: the Security Council had obviously seen no need to repeat what the Trusteeship Council was already doing.

42. The reasons for which the Trusteeship Council was to ask the Security Council to examine the situation in the Trust Territory were to be found in the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution: the fourth expressed a judgement which any individual member of the Council might make for himself but which should not be imposed on the Council, while the sixth stated a conclusion which was not borne out by the actual conditions in the Territory. There were admittedly certain fields in which his delegation would like the Administering Authority to do more or to act more rapidly and his delegation had made its position in that respect perfectly clear during the general debate. It saw no justification, however, for the findings implied in those two paragraphs.

43. His delegation would therefore be unable to support the draft resolution.

44. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) said that, while he had not had time to study the USSR amendments and therefore reserved the right to submit further comments on them at a later date, a first reading had led him to object to each one of the amendments to the recommendations prepared by the Drafting Committee, which had been carefully considered and in whose drafting he had had a part.

45. The first sentence of the first amendment consisted of an inaccurate and untrue statement. Everyone who had read the annual reports and heard the special representative's statements was aware that more and more Micronesians were being appointed to positions in the Executive and that, where legislative authority was concerned, the new Congress of Micronesia had been granted real powers and would shortly hold its first session. As for the statement that the people of Micronesia were "kept away from the solution of the problems confronting the Territory", it was common knowledge that the Administering Authority was increasingly encouraging the people of Micronesia to take part in solving those problems. The second sentence of the first amendment was the expression of a particular point of view, namely that all colonial territories should be given independence forthwith. He had often expressed the opinion of the New Zealand Government that the movement towards self-government or independence should be pushed forward with the utmost speed, but he had also expressed his Government's disagreement with the notion of instant independence. His Government favoured the Trusteeship Council's method of constant pressure on the Administering Authorities to take the most urgent steps they could to advance the people under their administration in every field. The results of the Council's work were to be seen in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but the people of the Territory were still not ready to have instant independence thrust upon them.

46. It had already been pointed out that the second amendment was based on a failure to read the relevant documents.

47. The third amendment started with another untrue statement. Although the report of the 1964 Visiting Mission pointed out that almost all key posts had been in the hands of nationals of the Administering Authority at the beginning of 1964, the Council was aware that Micronesians had been moved into key posts at various levels since then. As for the recommendation that the Administering Authority should hand over all responsible posts to Micronesians, the Visiting Mission had made it quite clear that trained Micronesians capable of filling those posts simply did not exist and the Council had been told about the programmes under which Micronesians were being trained in all urgency to take over responsible positions.

48. With regard to the fourth amendment, he would need to study the statement that the United States representative had made on the subject. He would agree with the recommendation that the Administering Authority should take immediate measures to hand over responsible posts in the judicial system to Micronesians if there were Micronesians trained in law ready to occupy those posts. He was sure, moreover, that if such Micronesians did exist, they would already be holding those posts.

49. The fifth amendment referred to the "profits" which the United States had derived from the use of the Trust Territory. It seemed to him that that word had no meaning in the context of Micronesia.

50. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), intervening on a point of order, said that the word

"profits" in the English translation of the amendment should be replaced by "advantages".

51. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) agreed that the word "advantages" was more accurate, for the 1964 Visiting Mission had indeed pointed out that the United States had received certain advantages from the use of the Territory. He would reserve for further consideration the statement that "the appropriations made by the Administering Authority in the budget of the Territory do not cover even a small part of the advantages...".

52. The sixth amendment stated that appropriations for public health were "completely inadequate" and that medical care remained at an extremely low level. He did not wish to prejudge the report that would be submitted by the World Health Organization, but on the basis of what he himself had seen in Micronesia he could not accept the extreme statements made in that amendment. It was true that the 1964 Visiting Mission had reported certain deficiencies in the health facilities in some remote areas and had found inadequacies in several of the nine main hospitals, but it had also seen new hospitals with excellent equipment, and laboratories staffed by trained Micronesians.

53. He had no serious objection to the seventh amendment, with the sub-amendments which he hoped would be made. It should, however, take note of the fact that a number of fellowships and scholarships were already being taken up by Micronesians.

54. The eighth amendment, recommending the adoption of immediate measures to establish an institution of higher education in the Territory, also needed to be amended. He favoured the establishment of such an institution in the Territory, as had the other members of the 1964 Visiting Mission, but there were many factors—including the high cost and the number of students available in a population of 85,000—that must be taken into consideration. The responsible course for the Council to follow would be not to recommend the adoption of immediate measures but to recommend further consideration of the matter by the Administering Authority and to give some more positive indication of the Council's support for the establishment of a university.

55. He favoured the inclusion of a reference to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), as suggested in the ninth amendment, but he felt that the way the words "self-determination and independence" were used in that amendment was illogical; self-determination included the right to independence, and he would be willing to accept the wording "self-determination, which includes the right to independence". The second part of the amendment, suggesting a new paragraph 23, was unnecessary, since the wording in the report of the Drafting Committee covered the matter more satisfactorily.

56. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (T/L.1092), he agreed with the statements that the Trusteeship Council had considered the report of the Administering Authority, had heard statements and had taken into account certain decisions; nor could there be any objection to the statement that the Security Council had not examined the situation. In other respects, however, he disagreed completely with the draft resolution. It was palpably untrue that

the United States was refusing to take practical measures directly connected with the implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); in his delegation's view, the United States was taking precisely the kind of steps that would enable the people of Micronesia to exercise their right of self-determination. As to the statement in the last preambular paragraph that there had been violations of the principles of the Charter and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, he had already made his position clear. There was no reason why the Trusteeship Council, as a corporate body, should request the Security Council to examine the situation in Micronesia; it was perfectly possible for the Soviet Union, at any time, to raise the matter in the Security Council.

57. The PRESIDENT said it might be better for delegations to have more time to consider the amendments and sub-amendments submitted at the present meeting. If the Council agreed, a vote could be taken immediately on the draft resolution, and the votes on the amendments, the sub-amendments and the Drafting Committee's report itself could be postponed until the following day.

58. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the President's suggestion was acceptable to his delegation. He would like, however, to answer some of the remarks made by other representatives, in order to clear the way for the following day's vote.

59. His delegation was prepared to accept the Liberian representative's suggestion for the wording of the first sentence of the first amendment, on the understanding that the second sentence would remain unchanged. With regard to part (b) of the eighth amendment, his delegation was submitting the clause "and recommends the adoption of immediate measures to establish an institution of higher education in the Territory" as an addition to the existing text.

60. His delegation was willing to agree that the paragraph 22 proposed in the ninth amendment should be an addition to, and not a substitute for, the text in the Drafting Committee's report, but it would have to insist that the wording it had proposed for paragraph 23 should replace the corresponding text in the report.

61. With regard to the lengthy statements made by the United States representative concerning the amendments, it would appear that the United States representative had not examined them with sufficient attention. For example, he had stated that the Soviet Union was ignoring the Congress of Micronesia. The second sentence of the first amendment, however, referred to the Congress of Micronesia and recommended the Administering Authority to confer upon the Congress all powers necessary to the exercise of full legislative authority in the Territory. If the Council agreed, his delegation was prepared to improve the amendment by replacing the words "full legislative authority" by the words "full legislative and executive authority". He would have expected the United States delegation to state that, under the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the recommendations of the Special Committee on the Situation with

regard to the Implementation of that Declaration, his Government had an obligation to grant independence to the Micronesian people as early as possible and that at the first session of the Congress of Micronesia it would support a proposal to give that Congress full legislative and executive power. If the United States delegation would not say that, he hoped that at least it would not continue to distort the Soviet Union's position.

62. The United States representative's remarks had failed to refute the points made by the Soviet Union, and he would refrain from analysing them in detail. The vote on the Soviet Union draft resolution would show whether the Trusteeship Council could rise to its responsibilities under the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples or whether it would again fail to do so, on the pretext that the Soviet Union could itself raise the question in the Security Council. It was difficult to convince the United States Government, no doubt because it intended to annex the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and use it for military purposes. The Soviet Union delegation had hopes, however, of convincing the States which represented the anti-colonialistic forces in the United Nations that the decision of the Trusteeship Council and the votes of certain of its members, particularly those representing the African continent, were of great political significance. If a unanimous decision could not be reached in the Council, at least an appropriate climate of opinion could be created for transferring the question of the Trust Territory from the group of States now monopolizing the study of that question to the broader group of States represented in the Security Council. It would thus be possible to take important political decisions to break the vicious circle in which the conditions for preparing the local population for self-government were not being created and that lack of preparation was then being made the pretext for postponing the granting of independence.

63. His delegation was prepared to accept the Liberian representative's request for separate votes on parts of the draft resolution.

64. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that the Soviet Union delegation's charge of distortion was itself a serious distortion. The representative of the Soviet Union had distorted every humane effort on the part of the United States Government, every social, economic or political advancement, every achievement of the Administering Authority, every forward step noted or commended by visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council. He had asked questions of the type, "Have you stopped beating your wife?", and had then supplied his own answers. Perhaps the Soviet representative, in speaking as he did, realized that the amendments were poorly drafted and needed improvement and was merely seeking to gain time so that no vote would be taken on them at the present meeting.

65. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was grateful to the United States representative for at least refraining from a repetition of his assertion that the Soviet Union delegation had ignored the Congress of Micronesia.

66. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that the representative of the Soviet Union was indeed

ignoring the Congress of Micronesia. He ignored the fact that the Congress had been elected by universal suffrage, constituted a step forward in self-government and was an expression of the wishes of the people of the Territory; by distorting the facts, the representative of the Soviet Union was, in effect, ignoring the Congress of Micronesia and all it stood for.

67. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that it was a rule in court that when a lawyer did not know what answer he would receive to a question, he was better advised not to ask it. The Soviet representative had violated that rule because he had overestimated the United States representative's capacity for self-criticism. The United States representative apparently had instructions to ensure that the Soviet representative did not express approval of any of his statements. That was the only possible explanation of the statement he had just incautiously made, which, of course, essentially demonstrated nothing about the Soviet delegation's actual position concerning the Congress of Micronesia. The Soviet delegation, unlike the United States Government, proposed that the Congress should be endowed with full executive and legislative powers. Thus, the United States representative's repeated statement that the Soviet delegation sought to ignore the Congress of Micronesia was utterly meaningless.

68. He was prepared to let any further reply by the United States representative go unanswered, since there would be no point in continuing the discussion.

69. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) thanked the Soviet representative for offering him the last word. It was an historic occasion when a member of the Council, particularly the representative of an Administering Authority, had the last word in a discussion with the representative of the Soviet Union. The Soviet representative had speculated about the instructions of the United States delegation. He would be glad to tell the Soviet representative and the members of the Council what those instructions were and to speculate on what the Soviet representative's instructions were. His own instructions were to support the work of the Council to the best of his ability and to explain to the Council what the United States was doing in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. He speculated that the Soviet representative's instructions were to destroy the efficiency of the Council, to oppose every constructive step taken by an Administering Authority, to distort, delay and confuse; in short, they were to employ anti-colonialism for the cynical propaganda purposes of the Soviet Union.

70. The PRESIDENT put the USSR draft resolution (T/L.1092) to the vote, in the manner requested by the Liberian representative.

The first three preambular paragraphs were adopted by 3 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The fourth preambular paragraph was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The last preambular paragraph was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

The operative paragraph was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll call on the draft resolution as a whole.

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.

Abstaining: China, Liberia.

The draft resolution (T/L.1092) as a whole was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

71. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) asked when the sub-amendments to the Soviet Union's amendments would be available as Council documents.

72. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council) said that if the Liberian representative would submit the sub-amendments in written form, they would be reproduced by the following morning.

73. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that, if the Soviet Union representative accepted the changes she had proposed, there were no amendments for her to submit.

74. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that, since the changes were fairly extensive, it would be of great help to his delegation and probably to others if they could be available in written form.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(b) Nauru (T/1631, T/1641, T/L.1091 and Add.1) (continued)

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:

(a) Nauru (T/1636 and Corr.1) (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE'S OPENING STATEMENT

75. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the Trusteeship Council should circulate as an official document the first annex to the opening statement made by the special representative of the Administering Authority for Nauru at the 1256th meeting.

76. The PRESIDENT said that it might be advisable to hear what the special representative had to say on that subject at the following meeting.

77. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was willing to wait until the following meeting if the President so wished. He would point out, however, that the special representative could have no power to decide what was to be done

with a document which had already been submitted to the Trusteeship Council.^{4/}

78. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) endorsed the President's suggestion and said that if the annex in question was circulated it should be

^{4/} Circulated by the Australian delegation to members of the Council only.

identified as an official document of the Australian delegation submitted to the Trusteeship Council.

79. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said it would be of assistance to his delegation if the matter could be deferred until the following day.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.