

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1192  
5 July 1962

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 5 July 1962, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BINGHAM

(United States of America)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru (continued)
  - (a) Annual report of the Administering Authority [3c]
  - (b) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Nauru, 1962 [5a]
2. Examination of petitions in connexion with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [4]
3. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: report of the Drafting Committee [3b]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1192 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.

## AGENDA ITEMS 3c AND 5a

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1589, 1599, 1600: T/L.1039)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU, 1962 (T/1595 and Add.1)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative for Nauru under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The question of petitions in connexion with this Trust Territory has been raised. I have been advised that eight petitions were transmitted to the Secretary-General by the Visiting Mission; they are set out in documents T/PET.9/21-28. These petitions were not listed in the annex to the agenda because they had not been received by the Administering Authority two months before the opening of the session in accordance with rule 86, paragraph 1.

What is the Administering Authority's position on the application of that rule and the disposition of these petitions?

Mr. HOOD (Australia): My delegation is anxious to be of assistance to the Council in respect of these petitions. Obviously, however -- and this is quite apart from the two-month rule -- there has not been time to receive the specific comments of the Administering Authority on the petitions. The Special Representative has a certain amount of information in this respect in New York. I understand that he proposes, when time is available, to see whether the information he has is sufficient to enable him to submit useful comments on the petitions at the present session of the Council.

Perhaps the President would wish to ask the Special Representative to explain the position more in detail.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the Special Representative, I might say this. As I understand it, the question is whether the Administering Authority would be willing to waive the two-month rule. That decision would not necessarily have to be made today. The matter could be left on the agenda until a later point in the session.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): From my point of view that suggestion is most helpful. My delegation and I must now prepare our final statement on the basis of the very important and interesting debate that has been held here. This is a very important statement which we must prepare in a very short time. Until that matter is out of the way, I would ask the indulgence of the Council to follow the suggestion just made by the President.

The PRESIDENT: Am I correct then in understanding that the Administering Authority is requesting that the decision on this matter be delayed until a later time, at which time the matter will be brought up again and the Administering Authority will advise the Council as to whether or not it will waive the rule with regard to these petitions?

Mr. MCCARTHY (Special Representative): Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no comments or objections concerning that procedure, I will consider the matter so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I would now like to raise the question with the Council about the procedure to be followed in the preparation of the Council's report on Nauru. It has previously been suggested that the drafting committee be dispensed with in this case, and I think it would be appropriate to have comments as to how the Council might proceed.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France): It will be recalled that the question of drafting committees was left pending. With regard to the Pacific Islands, we had decided to set up a drafting committee since the Trusteeship Council was going to interrupt its work while meetings of the resumed General Assembly session were taking place. During this interval, it was judged useful that a limited group might be able to continue working, thereby saving us time.

However, I wonder whether this same procedure is indeed necessary in the case of Nauru. For my part, I should like to make a simple suggestion, at the same time, of course, leaving the question open; the Council will proceed as it sees fit. On the basis of the discussion on Nauru, I have been able to perceive that there is a rather widespread feeling in the Council that the conclusions in the report of the Visiting Mission could be adopted. However, in the statements of various representatives there were certain nuances of opinion that differed from what was generally accepted. Therefore, I wonder whether the best procedure, the quickest one and the one most in keeping with the feeling in the Council, might not be to request the Secretariat to prepare a document which would include, on the one hand, the recommendations of the Visiting Mission and, on the other, a sort of

summary of the views expressed by various members of the Council. And of course, this document would likewise include the comments that will be made tomorrow by the Administering Authority. We could go directly into the examination of this document and, as the case may be, adopt it or amend it if any delegation should find that the document is not completely satisfactory and that it should be modified in any way.

I think that this procedure would save time and that it would fairly well meet the wishes expressed by the Council.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Perhaps we ought not to look at this matter as a question of principle. I think that is possibly the wrong view to take of it. It simply is one of practice and of practicality. Perhaps there is little real reason why the existing practice of the Council should be varied in this case, even though admittedly the issues are comparatively simple and not very many in number.

(Mr. Hood, Australia)

None the less, there is a stage between saying simply that the Council might proceed to adopt the recommendations of the Visiting Mission, plus the inclusion very briefly of any variants of views expressed, and actually having it done -- and this is precisely drafting. I think that on balance there would be distinct practical advantages in retaining the drafting procedure of this quite small drafting committee thereby avoiding over-burdening the Secretariat and enabling I think a more efficient presentation to the Council of the draft of the final report. Otherwise, I think we simply transfer the business of drafting from a group into the Council where discussion is not naturally so intimate as would be in the drafting group; points, I think, can be lost in that procedure which would not be lost in the usual drafting method we have followed in the past.

Briefly, the preference of my delegation would be to retain the drafting procedure in this case again, in the belief that it would not involve any loss of time but would enable the presentation more adequately of the views that have been expressed around this table plus, of course, those of the Visiting Mission itself, which would naturally form the basis of our report.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with interest to the views of the representative of Australia. In this case precedents might serve if it were possible to arrive at a clear and simple resolution. But the fact is that the situation is as follows. First of all, we do not know what the position of the Administering Authority is in the light of the proposal made by the representative of the Nauruan Council in the evolution that has occurred in the last few months; this is a new event. In other words, I believe, that if we were to follow the initiative suggested by the representative of France, it would be the Fourth Committee that would take the final decision on this problem. Seen in this way there is perhaps some merit in the suggestion made by the representative of France. Clearly, such an initiative would break the precedent of the Council.

But I put myself in a very realistic position. Let us assume that the Council had to draft the resolution, or let us assume that we were to appoint two or three or four members to draft such a resolution. I wonder what they will say in the recommendation? First of all, there is a question that is still pending,

(Mr. Salaranca, Bolivia)

namely, the final decision which must be reached both by the Administering Authority and the Nauruan Council on the alternatives submitted by the Visiting Mission, and secondly, the Administering Authority must decide what its position will be vis-à-vis the unexpected original stand submitted by the representative of the population of Nauru. It does not seem to me that the Council has taken a decision one way or another, since the Council can take no final decision.

For these reasons the views expressed in this Council in the light of this new proposal might, as I see it, simply lead to the kind of recommendation suggested by Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet of France. I am inclined to believe that this would be a realistic attitude. In this way, within three or four months, we feel certain that the Administering Authority will have a clearer picture on what should be done and the population of Nauru, too, will have had time to speak and discuss the alternatives that may be brought before it for consideration.

Clearly, this kaleidoscopic island presents a problem that is in inverse proportion to its size. It is likewise interesting to note that the international community pays heed even to so small an island and gives it its complete and concentrated attention. Therefore, I believe that principles and facts must ultimately be co-ordinated in a practical manner and it is high time that we reach a practical solution to the problem.

For all these reasons I am inclined to believe that the suggestion put forward by the representative of France is practical.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I merely wish to say that of the two suggestions put forward I think there may be some advantage in the first. It is quite true that these matters must be considered again in the Fourth Committee in due course. It is also true that developments by then may have taken place which affect the conclusion to be reached. Therefore, I should have thought that we were doing our duty if we were to refer the report of the Visiting Mission to the General Assembly -- to the Fourth Committee -- and at the same time to make sure that the views expressed in this Council, including particularly the views of the Head Chief of Nauru, are faithfully recorded for the information of the Fourth Committee so that it has the full position before it. Although it has been the practice to have a drafting committee in the past, I would doubt if a drafting committee could do more in present circumstances.

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

Therefore it seems to me that since the debate has not been long it would not be difficult to summarize the views which have been put forward. I should think it would be possible for the Secretariat, within a few days or even, possibly by tomorrow, to have prepared a short summary of the statements which have been made; that, together with the Visiting Mission's report would go forward for consideration by the Fourth Committee.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We do not object to transferring the whole question to the Fourth Committee for consideration, and we hope that in that case the Committee will see not only the Visiting Mission's report but also the Nauruan people's proposals of 19 June 1962, which are to be found in document T/1600, as well as the statements made in the Trusteeship Council -- perhaps in a condensed form prepared by the Secretariat. At the same time I think it is understood that the Trusteeship Council would recommend that the Fourth Committee should consider this question not generally, as one among other questions, but as a particular question since no decision is being taken now. We think that in this form the suggestion made by the representative of France is worthy of our consideration, and naturally the Fourth Committee is better able than the Trusteeship Council to take a decision on Nauru.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I should like to state my thinking a little more clearly. I agree entirely with what has been said by our colleagues of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, but there is something more of course. There is a report which has been to be submitted by the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly in the shape of the Fourth Committee but, above and beyond that, I must say that my delegation was prepared to adopt and to submit as its own the Visiting Mission's conclusions, and that is something more than mere transmittal.

The PRESIDENT: It occurs to me that the position would be clarified somewhat if the representative of France would make clear what he had in mind in terms of procedure. Did he have in mind that the draft which is to be prepared -- including the summary of the debate and the remainder, which, as I understood it, was to be a statement of acceptance of the Visiting Mission's conclusions -- would be submitted to the Council during the course of the session, at which time it would be open for discussion and subject to amendment? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): Yes, Mr. President, that is what I had indicated. Obviously, the report that will be prepared must be submitted to the Trusteeship Council and, as I said at the outset, that document would include, as I see it, two parts essentially. The first part would comprise the Visiting Mission's recommendations, on which we have to pronounce ourselves and which we might adopt or not adopt as our own -- personally, I believe we should -- and then, in an annex of the kind which always appears in such a report, would be indicated the varying opinions of the different members of the Council.

Mr. ODEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We understand the French representative's suggestion to mean that the working paper drafted by the Secretariat would include not only the proposals contained in the Visiting Mission's report but also subsequent proposals which the Visiting Mission had no opportunity to consider -- in other words, the Nauruan people's proposals contained in document T/1600. If that is the understanding, then we do not think that there are any difficulties. The Secretariat can draft such a paper for the Council, and the Council will then be in a position to decide what action should be taken on it.

Mr. KIANG (China): I must confess that I am little confused by what has taken place in the Council. I thought that the issue was very clear because it was actually discussed in the Council at the very beginning of the session. The question before us was whether, in view of the reduction in the membership of the Council, we should dispense with a drafting committee and have any recommendation relating to a particular territory considered in the Council itself. What has taken place in fact goes, I think, beyond the decision that was taken to that effect. We are almost discussing in what form the Council's report is to be presented to the General Assembly. As we all know -- and rule 101 of the rules of procedure makes it very clear -- all we have to do is to submit the Council's recommendations in our report for consideration by the General Assembly. The question is whether we are going to dispense with a drafting committee and to have the recommendations drawn up by the Council itself.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

As I understand the suggestion of the representative of France -- and I am sure that he will correct me if I am wrong -- it is that we should not have a drafting committee but, instead, would just ask the Secretariat to prepare a sort of working paper, which would actually be very much the same procedure we have always followed when we have had a drafting committee, and circulate it to the members of the Council. Thus the working paper would be given to the members of the Council instead of to the members of a drafting committee. We would go over it carefully -- outside the Council in the first instance -- and then the Council would meet and we should get down to discussing specific recommendations. Naturally, such a working paper would include all the available information, just as is provided for in rule 101; it would certainly include any documents, and particularly document T/1600 to which I also attach great importance. If we were merely to transmit the Visiting Mission's report, or any other document for that matter, we should be abdicating our responsibility.

I think that at this stage we should confine our remarks to the issue under discussion, which is whether or not we should have a drafting committee, and, if not, in what way we are going to discuss the recommendations to be included in our annual report to the General Assembly. I am quite sure that any one of us here who reads over the contents of the report of the Trusteeship Council -- even very roughly -- will understand how we are going to do that.

All I would say is that I am in sympathy with the suggestion made by the representative of France that, in this case, if the Administering Authority, represented here by the Australian delegation, has strong objections we still must have a drafting committee, no matter how small it is. My delegation, of course, is prepared to consider that view, but so far I think that the representative of Australia has expressed no very strong feelings on the matter. Accordingly, I feel that the Council can very easily adopt the suggestion put forward by the representative of France by requesting the Secretariat to prepare a working paper and to have it circulated to us as early as possible. We shall then decide when we are going to discuss the working paper, which will consist of two parts -- first, the observations of the individual members of the Council, and, second, the recommendations to be adopted by the Trusteeship Council for submission to the General Assembly.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Almost invisibly, we are actually beginning to draft the report already, and perhaps not to the best advantage. However, I have listened carefully to the clarifications given by the representative of France in particular and the further remarks of the representative of China which I consider to be entirely proper and completely in accordance with the functions and obligations of the Council.

If there is to be any question of changing the form of the report to the General Assembly, then objections would be in order. I do not intend to press any objections to what the Council as a whole wants, naturally, provided that it is absolutely understood that the form of the report is to be no different from what it has been in the past on any particular Territory. The form is well known and, I think, must be adhered to in this as in other cases.

The only difficulty I do see is that at some point in this drafting procedure, the recommendations, let us say, of the Visiting Mission have to be selected or even elicited from a careful reading and study of the report. They are not perhaps all enumerated separately; there are some which are implicit in the general tenor of the report and this is precisely the work of drafting to which I referred earlier. Since this is really drafting, is it altogether proper that that selection -- and there has to be a selection -- be left to the Secretariat? Admittedly, the Council would naturally review the working paper which is prepared and would finally, of course, make its own selection, if that were necessary. Certainly it would have to formulate its own specific endorsement of the recommendations; this is inevitable. Therefore, we will naturally fall in with the wishes of the Council on that condition -- if I may so put it -- that the format of the formal report will in no way differ from what it has been in the past.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I did intend to make some comment several minutes ago and I had imagined that other comments would replace mine; but it does seem to me, from all that has been said, that there is general agreement with what we wish to do. We wish to forward the report, in standard form, to the Fourth Committee. We wish to indicate which recommendations of

(Sir Hugh Foot, United Kingdom)

the Visiting Mission we support. And we wish to attach, certainly, the statements of the Head Chief on behalf of the Local Council -- everyone would agree with that because it is a very important document -- together with the main comments which have been made during our debate.

We are all agreed on the purpose; the question now is whether that should properly be done as a first draft by the Secretariat or whether it should be undertaken by a drafting committee. I do not know that that final question need present any great difficulty to us. Perhaps we may have some guidance in the matter from the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: After consultation with the representatives of the Secretariat, it appears that they are able to proceed with the preparation of a working paper which, hopefully, will be ready for the Council early next week. It appears to the Chair that, rather than to continue this discussion now, which would be bound to involve general questions that would be difficult to resolve in theory, matters will be advanced if the Secretariat will kindly proceed accordingly. Of course, whatever document is presented will then be subject to action by the Council in any way that it sees fit. If that procedure is acceptable, we can then go on to the next item.

It was so decided.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We wish to draw the attention of the Secretariat to the working paper concerning the situation in Nauru, document T/L.1039, and, through the President, to ask the Secretariat to enlarge paragraph 2 of section I, concerning the future of the Nauruans, in such a way as to include the point of view of the Nauruan people as it is explained in the memoranda which were presented to the Visiting Mission in that text.

We would also ask the Secretariat to reflect, as fully as possible, the subsequent proposals, particularly the proposals presented on 19 June of this year which are contained in document T/1600.

The PRESIDENT: Does anyone wish to reply to the comments made by the representative of the USSR with regard to the working paper?

Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): If there is no objection from the members of the Council, the Secretariat will revise this working paper which, of course, was prepared before these latest proposals were submitted to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Since there is nothing further to be taken up with regard to Nauru at this time, we thank the Special Representative very much.

Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative, withdrew.

## AGENDA ITEM 4

## EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS IN CONNEXION WITH THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1042; T/PET.10/34)

The PRESIDENT: It is the suggestion of the Chair, subject to correction by the Council, that the matter of petitions should be considered first rather than the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. As there is no objection, we will take up the question of the petition contained in document T/PET.10/34.

I call the attention of the Council to the fact that a draft resolution on this subject has been submitted by the Soviet delegation; this draft resolution is contained in document T/L.1042. I invite comments from the members of the Council with regard to this matter.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I was quite sure that the way in which we were originally going to proceed to discuss the problem of petitions was that we would take this subject up immediately after the Trusteeship Council had adopted the draft submitted by the Drafting Committee. I am now endeavouring to present some amendments to the proposal put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union. I would ask you, Mr. President, to be good enough to allow the Council a recess of five or ten minutes as I should like to consult with the representative of the Soviet Union on a compromise proposal which I wish to submit. If we could reach an agreement on this, debate would be facilitated and the five or ten minutes I now request would be time saved for this Council.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection to a recess of ten minutes to permit consultation on the subject before us, the Council will take a recess.

The meeting was suspended at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): Having been Chairman of the Visiting Mission of 1961, I had been under the impression that once we had submitted our report to the Council, my obligations in connexion with the Mission had ended. However, it sometimes happens that we are obliged to return to consideration of certain matters concerning the Territory which is at present under discussion.

I have before me a draft resolution proposed, after a rather intensive debate, by the delegation of the Soviet Union, and to this draft resolution I should like to propose an amendment. I have one reason for proposing my amendment.

The Administering Authority has told us that a procedure is pending before the United States Congress regarding the establishment of a jurisdiction to consider this difficult and complex problem. As regards this problem I am completely at one with the inhabitants of Kwajalein.

I have indicated the reason why, when the Visiting Mission went to the Ebeye area where the former owners of the Kwajalein atoll were living, we realized that this was an extremely difficult problem and concluded that the claims of the indigenous population were reasonable.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

As a lawyer, I am in favour of judicial solutions in cases such as this. In other words, if there is to be arbitration, I am in favour of arbitration totally devoid of anything political.

Of course, I understand the Soviet delegation's motives in submitting this draft resolution. The basic purpose of my amendment is to make the text more flexible and to present an alternative. If the Administering Authority does not eventually open the United States courts for a solution of this problem, the alternative would be to have recourse to an arbitration procedure. I think that I already stated this as my position when we discussed the question before. I believe that these two possibilities would protect the rights of the inhabitants of Kwajalein.

I have drafted an amendment to operative paragraph 2 which would read as follows:

(continued in English)

"Recommends that, failing the agreement with the inhabitants of Kwajalein to the procedures now contemplated by the Administering Authority for the settlement of the question of compensation of the inhabitants of Kwajalein, the issue should be determined without delay by arbitration, as recommended by the 1961 Visiting Mission. The procedure for arbitration must be agreed between the parties."

(continued in Spanish)

Since my English is probably not as good as my Spanish, I would ask any member of the Council who has a greater mastery of the English language than I to feel free to suggest changes in the English text of my amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the representative of Bolivia whether he intends his amendment to replace paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, or only paragraph 2.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The amendment would replace operative paragraph 2, which now begins with the word "Decides". Under my amendment the paragraph would begin with the word "Recommends".

Once again I would stress that if arbitration has to be adopted by the parties my preference is for strictly judicial arbitration in which political factors would be excluded.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

I hope that my colleague of the Soviet Union, Mr. Oberenko, will not find this amendment incompatible with the point of view maintained by his delegation. In substance, the difference between my amendment and the way in which the draft resolution has been worded by the delegation of the Soviet Union is as follows. In the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union there is room for only one possibility, namely immediate arbitration; thus the possibility is denied for the United States Congress to open the jurisdiction of a United States court to the settlement of this difficult problem which has arisen in the case of Kwajalein. On the other hand, the amendment I am submitting would accept arbitration as an alternative in the event that access to that court was denied to the population of Kwajalein.

Mr. NOYES (United States of America): Perhaps it would help the members of the Council if I commented briefly on this amendment. As the Council will recall, I explained the position of my delegation on the substance of the Soviet draft resolution at our last meeting dealing with this matter. This draft resolution does present us with some real difficulties. I would be forced to vote against the Soviet draft resolution if it is not amended. The amendment just submitted by the representative of Bolivia is, from the point of view of my delegation, a very considerable improvement. As I told the Council before, we feel that the course which we are following at the present time is an entirely fair one and that there is hope of reaching a solution of this very difficult problem on the basis of that course. As I understand the proposal of the representative of Bolivia, the Trusteeship Council would be happy to see the Administering Authority proceed on this course for a period of time, and if this does lead to a solution the problem would obviously be brought to a satisfactory end, while if it does not lead to a solution the Council would make certain recommendations with respect to arbitration, as it has in the past. Therefore, as I stated earlier, from our point of view this is a substantial improvement and if this amendment is adopted I would, in order to protect the position of the United States in this matter, simply abstain. But I would be glad to see the amendment adopted.

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): This is not to comment on the substance of the amendment before us, though I well understand the arguments for it and, without a knowledge of this subject, these arguments seem to be very strong. I wonder nevertheless whether it would be wise to proceed to any conclusion in this matter without having before us the actual text. It is not for me to congratulate the representative of Bolivia on his English, which seems to me perfect, but it may be well to have the actual text before us before a decision is reached. Is it possible, Mr. President, that this matter might be dealt with at a subsequent meeting when we have the actual proposal before us in final form?

The PRESIDENT: It certainly is possible. The matter is in the hands of the Council. If it is the desire of the Council to defer action on this until a subsequent meeting at which time the amendment might be before us, it certainly is within the competence of the Council so to decide. If that is the desire of the Council, we could then proceed to consideration of the Drafting Committee's report.

I take that to be a proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom, that the matter be deferred until the amendment has been distributed.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I agree completely with this suggestion. This amendment could be distributed in writing as early as possible, perhaps tomorrow, so that we could pronounce ourselves on it.

Mr. RASGOIRA (India): The amendment, I take it, has been formally submitted and has been read out twice, and whereas I do not wish to press that it be adopted now, my own suggestion would be that we go ahead and act on it. There is no use in keeping this matter pending, this matter of the disposal of the Territory's affairs, for the sake of a simple amendment -- and I trust that it is a simply amendment. While we consider the report of the Drafting Committee, could this text not be circulated? It should not take very long to duplicate it, and then, after finishing with the report of the Drafting Committee, we could take a decision on this matter and thus conclude our business on it.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, the Secretariat will make every effort to have the document circulated before the conclusion of today's meeting, and we shall now pass on to the consideration of the Drafting Committee's report.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3b

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS:  
REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1040 AND Add.1 and 2, L.1043)

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it document T/L.1043, the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. There are certain corrections which have been made and to which I wish to call the Council's attention, typographical corrections.

In the second line of paragraph 1 of the annex, the word "any" should read "many".

In paragraph 23 of the annex, page 6, the word "planning" should read "planting".

In paragraph 26 of the annex, in the last line, the word "his" should read "this".

I invite comments on the report of the Drafting Committee.

I call on the representative of India since he is a member of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): There is another correction. In paragraph 25 the word should be "urges" and not "urges"; there is no such word, to my knowledge.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I wish only to make a general comment on this document, or to be more accurate on the French text which is before us. There are many faults in the French text; some expressions are incorrect. I do not wish to tire the Council with these details of language or style; I am certainly not a purist. I simply wish to say that nevertheless it is quite alarming to see a text which does not seem to be in accord with the spirit of the French language. I say once again that I do not wish to tire the Council with the details. Our delegation is available to the Secretariat for improvements in style -- simply on the question of style, not substance. For us it is just as alarming as a pianist who plays false. I would wish that the United Nations texts be drafted in as correct a form as possible. The haste with which the text was translated certainly explains some imperfections. But we wish to make this general comment. Once again, our delegation is prepared to assist the competent services of the Secretariat to improve this drafting.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for his comment. The Secretariat will be in touch with his delegation.

The suggestion has been made to the Chair that if there is no desire on the part of any member for separate voting on the paragraphs of this report, it could be considered as a whole. That is simply a suggestion which has been made to the Chair. It is, of course, within the competence of the Council to proceed in any manner that it wishes.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We do not object to the proposal to consider the report as a whole. We should like to make certain comments concerning the report of the drafting committee with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The representative of France has said that the French text is not very good. I must say that the Russian text likewise is no good in our opinion though it seemingly corresponds fully to the English text. I do not blame the translators; when one has a good piano sometimes one can hear very bad playing.

The position of the Soviet delegation concerning the Pacific Islands has already been expressed in the statement of the Soviet delegation at the session of the Trusteeship Council on 6 June. As members of the Council may remember, the Soviet delegation stated then that the situation in the Trust Territory in the first place is characterized by the fact that after fifteen years of administration by the United States, the main task entrusted by the Charter to the Administering Authority, in other words, to grant self-determination and independence to the inhabitants of the Island, is still not fulfilled.

The Soviet delegation has pointed out that it is characteristic with respect to the situation in the Pacific Islands for the United States to try to delay the process of liberation of the Territory of the Pacific Islands. This tendency of United States policy concerning the Pacific Islands has been fully supported by the United States allies who represent the colonial Powers and are members of the Trusteeship Council. In fact, the Government of the United States is continuing to evade not only the exact date of independence for the Pacific Islands, but it is also trying to evade the fulfillment of many recommendations of the Trusteeship Council concerning the necessity to draft a plan for the transfer of power to the inhabitants of the Islands.

In so far as political developments are concerned, the past year has not brought us any considerable changes. The Council of Micronesia is just a new name for the former Consultative Council which had no mandate, just as the present-day Council of Micronesia has no rights.

The economy is stagnant. As it has been pointed out by the Soviet delegation and as it has been pointed out in many various documents, even those industries which existed under Japanese occupation have not been restored. The economic situation has been, I would say, severely criticized even in the United States Press. We remember the articles which have shown the real situation in the Territory; these articles even contained certain remarks concerning the Visiting

Mission, though the Visiting Mission has presented a much better report than previous one; yet, the American Press had certain misgivings about the Visiting Mission saying that it looked at the situation through rosy-coloured spectacles. The point is that in the course of the discussion in the Trusteeship Council it has become clear that the economic situation is not satisfactory. The Administering Authority is reducing the funds for the economic and social development of the Territory; this shows greediness. Unfortunately, the report of the drafting committee speaks about it, but there are no specific or sufficiently strong recommendations which could urge the American trustees to give more money for the population of these Pacific Islands.

In the course of the discussion in the Trusteeship Council there was also pointed out the unsatisfactory conditions existing in the fields of education and public health in the Territory.

It was also pointed out that, in violation of its obligations, the United States had adopted in relation to the Trust Territory the policy of polluting the atmosphere and the surrounding sea with radio-active substances -- the sea which is of vital importance for the population of these Pacific Islands.

These, in a few words, are the conditions which exist in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

The Soviet delegation pointed out in its statement that it considered that the time had long since come for radical changes, and that the Trusteeship Council could not remain idle but had to make concrete and specific decisions in order to change the situation without any further delay. In this connexion the Soviet delegation thinks that it is necessary for the Trusteeship Council to demand from the United States the full implementation of the Declaration of 14 December 1960 in which, as is known, the General Assembly requested the Administering Authorities to transfer power to the populations of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. We think that the Trusteeship Council must demand the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement on the Pacific Islands and the granting of immediate independence to those islands. Only by recommendations of that kind and by providing conditions for their speediest implementation can the Trusteeship Council justify its existence and fulfil its task.

If the Trusteeship Council does not act thus it will once again prove that it is helpless and will show that it is not a body which is helping to secure the liberation of the Trust Territories but, on the contrary, a body which is putting a brake on the liberation of the independent peoples.

In this connexion the Soviet delegation cannot but express its negative attitude towards a number of the provisions contained in the Drafting Committee's report. Unfortunately that report does not, in fact, contain any specific or precise recommendations to the Administering Authority capable of advancing the cause of the liberation of the Trust Territory. The recommendations it contains merely register events in the Territory. The report really contains no recommendation concerning the basic question. It just expresses hopes and makes suggestions. No word is said in the report about the most important issue. There is no insistence on the need to provide immediate measures for granting independence to the Pacific Islands. Even the word "independence" itself is not to be found in the report, although there is a reference to the Declaration on the granting of independence.

Unfortunately, the report contains provisions that do not go any farther than the recommendations made by the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council -- recommendations which were not adhered to by the Administering Authority. Actually, this present session of the Trusteeship Council is invited to remain

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

where it was and not to make any advance as against the situation that existed last summer. If there are recommendations in the report they concern only questions of secondary importance and do not touch upon the substance of the matter, which is the question of the granting of independence to this Trust Territory. And even those recommendations are lost in a whole series of suggestions of help, factual statements, and so on.

In these conditions the Soviet delegation must state that it is not in agreement with many of the recommendations appearing in the Drafting Committee's report. It cannot, therefore, support that report and will abstain when it is put to the vote.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Having read the report (T/L.1043) submitted by the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands I have no difficulty in voting in favour of the draft resolution. However, some marginal comments are called for in connexion with some parts of the report. In its last paragraph it says:

"The Council reiterates its previous conclusions and recommendations on this subject, as adopted at the twenty-seventh session. It urges the Administering Authority to establish, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic target dates reflecting a proper sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life." (T/L.1043, para. 39)

This paragraph, it seems to me, has been very well drafted -- from a legal point of view, from a practical point of view and in the light of the living realities of the Territory.

As is very well known to the Council, the main problem in the Pacific Islands is to create political unity in an area that is separated by the sea. It is geographically cut off, and that is the immediate problem. If we were mechanically to apply the process of independence when this process of political unification was still in its formative stage, what would the result be? Principles, in my opinion, must be subject to living realities of a Territory, because if a principle

(Mr. Salamarca, Bolivia)

could, in general, solve the problem in all the territories then the situation would be that the General Assembly's resolutions would have a scope that in fact no legislation, either nationally or internationally, can ever have. Principles and realities must be in accord, and in this case I must congratulate the Drafting Committee, not only on the wording of paragraph 39 but also for its accuracy and precision and for having so correctly interpreted the views stated here in the Council when we were discussing the problem.

I must add further that as a rule I feel reassured, as the representative of a non-administering Power, when a drafting committee is present and Mr. Rasgotra is a member of it. We know his point of view and we know that he is a man of principles, but he is also a realistic person and, together with the representative of New Zealand, I believe that the Drafting Committee has submitted to the Council a document that is constructive.

To conclude these brief remarks I should like to say that I agree with the Soviet Union representative on one point. He has referred to some reports in The New York Times -- articles that are certainly not unknown to the Administering Authority since the views of the new political representative in the Territory are quoted. When the Visiting Mission submitted its report it submitted a constructive report but a critical one, and this was recognized by all the Council's members. The new authorities, who are mentioned by name and quoted in these articles, considered our report as comparatively weak in the light of the negative situation and the poverty of the administration of this vast Territory. I do not adopt a negative attitude towards such view points. If there is really a possibility of making progress in the critical field of the administration of the Territory, that is exactly what we wish for the inhabitants of the Territory.

Having said that I am prepared, Mr. President, to accept your suggestion -- which has not I think been objected to by the Council -- that we can vote in favour of the report as a whole submitted by the two members of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to come back to a point, but this is not only a point of style. I think that there is a difference in interpretation which it is necessary to clarify fully. I am referring to section 2 entitled "Political Advancement", paragraph 7. We read at the end of paragraph 7 as follows:

(continued in English)

"The Council is aware that while the Administering Authority envisages 1963 as the target for this purpose, it itself considers that the achievement of this goal could, perhaps, be expedited". (T/L.1043)

(continued in French)

What does "it itself" mean? When I read the English text, I realize that it means the Administering Authority. Is that correct? I am putting the question to those who drafted the report. In the French text "it itself" is translated by the word "il" which would mean the Council. It should read "elle" in the French text, meaning the Administering Authority. It should not read "il" which would mean the Council. However, I wish to be quite sure whether it is the Administering Authority that is meant by "it itself" in English.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The representative of France is quite right. The words "it itself" in the English text very clearly means the Administering Authority. I do hope that as English is the original text of this report, the translated text will be brought in line with it because this kind of mistranslation could give rise to a serious misreading of the report.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further comments on the report, I take it that the Council is ready to proceed to a vote on the report as a whole. We will now vote on the report of the drafting committee as a whole.

The report was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Before returning to the matter of the resolution on the petition, I should like as the President of the Council, on behalf of the Council, to express the appreciation of the Council to the Drafting Committee for their labours in this matter. It seems that their efforts have been acceptable to the great majority of the Council without change, and the Chair is aware that they laboured long and hard over this task and certainly deserve the thanks of the Council.

(The President)

It is suggested by the Council Secretary that paragraph 4 of the Drafting Committee's report be adopted as the basic text for the report to the Security Council. Is there any objection to that procedure?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As regards paragraph 4 of the Drafting Committee's report and as regards also the whole report, the Soviet delegation abstained because it did not consider that the working paper prepared by the Secretariat as a description of the situation in the Trust Territory objectively reflects the existing situation. That is why we did not support it and cannot support paragraph 4.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the delegation of the Soviet Union is not asking for a vote but that it simply wishes its position to be recorded. It will be so recorded.

I now call on the Council Secretary with regard to the matter of the preparation of the final report.

Mr. RAPOPORT (Council Secretary): As is customary after the adoption of the report of a drafting committee, the members of the Council will receive a working document with a summary of the observations made by the various delegations during the general debate. Would the delegations kindly indicate which part of these observations they want to maintain for the final report to the Security Council, indicating their individual observations? It is also customary to require delegations to delete as much as possible and to leave as little as possible in these individual observations and also to give us their final texts as quickly as possible. The draft will be distributed to them in a few minutes. If we could get it back corrected by Monday, it would be a great help.

The PRESIDENT: We now return to the question of the petition and the amendment submitted by the delegation of Bolivia, which has been circulated in provisional form in the English text. I invite comments on the amendment.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): In this amendment it appears to me that there are some errors due possibly to the labours of translation, which should be corrected in the English version. The major error is in the fourth line. It reads "the issue should be determined without delay". It has not been my understanding that there is an issue to be determined; there is an issue to be settled. The question of compensation is a question to be settled and since it is linked with what the Visiting Mission said, I do not recall that the Visiting Mission called for the determination of the issue. It called for the settlement of the issues by arbitration. If this is not correct, perhaps this change will be acceptable to Ambassador Salananza.

I think that the last part would read better if it were to say the following: "The procedure for arbitration being agreed or being agreed upon between the parties". It will then link up grammatically with the rest of the paragraph.

Similarly, in the first line, the amendment might read: Recommends that, failing agreement of the inhabitants of Kwajalein to the procedures now contemplated...".

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): At the time that I submitted my amendment, I said that I would welcome any correction by those representatives whose mastery of English is greater than mine. I simply submitted a translation from Spanish. It is true that the suggestions made by the representative of India improve the English text considerably and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. KIANG (China): As it stands, the amendment is agreeable to my delegation. With respect to the wording "the issue should be determined ... by arbitration", I would like to suggest, in keeping with the last sentence of the last preambular paragraph, that the word "question" replace the word "issue". If you say that an issue should be settled, I think that is quite different from saying that a question of compensation should be determined by arbitration. As a matter of fact, that was the exact recommendation of the Visiting Mission. If we adopt the wording which appears in the preambular paragraph, I think the amendment will be much clearer.

I do not know whether my good friend, Mr. Salamanca, agrees with me but I would suggest that it would be better to retain the word "question" and then leave the rest as it is.

I also agree that the last sentence should be changed to a phrase, for very simple grammatical reasons.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I am very grateful to the representative of China for his suggestion. I have no objection to replacing the word "issue" by the word "question". In this way, with the amendments made both by the representative of India and the representative of China, the draft would be in accord with the views that I wished to express and with the wording that I have in Spanish.

I translated my own text into English very quickly and, as I said, I agree entirely with the suggestion made by the representative of China because it is in full accord with the resolution we adopted on this subject last year.

The PRESIDENT: I might call the attention of the Council to the fact that the spelling of Mr. Bolkeim's name in the second preambular paragraph does not correspond with the spelling of his name on the petition. The petition itself contains the spelling as follows: Bolkeim; I think that is correct.

Mr. KIANG (China): If you are going to change the spelling of the last name, why not include the full name of the petitioner, Jalle Bolkeim?

The PRESIDENT: I take it that there would be no objection to the suggestion of the representative of China that the petitioner be referred to by his full name as it appears on the petition, Mr. Jalle Bolkeim.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have no objection to the proposal to include the full name of the petitioner.

With regard to the amendment submitted by the representative of Bolivia, it goes without saying that the Soviet delegation prefers the text of the draft resolution in document T/L.1042. Much time has elapsed since the Trusteeship Council adopted two resolutions on this question, yet the recommendations have not been adhered to. The time has now come to adopt certain recommendations to the Administering Authority in order to settle the just demands of the inhabitants of the Kwajalein islands concerning compensation for the land that was taken.

Of course, the drawback of the Bolivian amendment is the absence of any reference to any text. While it states that "the issue should be determined without delay", that refers only to the second part. A time limit should be set beyond which the Administering Authority would be compelled to take part in an arbitration procedure if no agreement is reached.

The Soviet delegation wishes to draw the attention of the representative of Bolivia to this point and insists on such a text in this paragraph.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the argument advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union is a valid one because the solution of this problem has, in fact, taken many years. I assume that the Administering Authority would have no difficulty in reporting to the Council, at its next session, with regard to what steps have been taken toward a legal solution of this problem.

I should like to inquire of the representative of the Soviet Union whether he is prepared to submit a brief amendment to any specific part of the draft resolution. I do not believe that the Administering Authority will have any

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

objection to reporting to us at our next session regarding the legal solution of the problem of these compensations which have been delayed for so many years. I believe the matter has been pending for more than ten years without the achievement of any solution. Therefore, I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union. I do not think that the Administering Authority would object to an inclusion in the resolution of a recommendation which would request it to report to the Council at our next session the steps which have been taken to implement this recommendation.

Mr. NOYES (United States of America): I certainly have no objection to this proposal. I am sure that this matter will be before the Council at its next session under any circumstances and, therefore, I see no reason why we should not say so, if that is what the Council wishes.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): If such is the general consensus of opinion, I think we could adopt a minor amendment to the text along the lines suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union. But, in any case, I would ask him to draft the amendment and specify the place in the draft resolution where he would wish to insert it.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Our draft resolution mentions a term of three months; therefore, I see no reason for this request. We have just drawn the attention of the representative of Bolivia to the fact that he has not mentioned any date. It goes without saying that we are not going to introduce any amendment which would tend to weaken our draft resolution. I repeat, we have mentioned a period of three months for arbitration.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I am in a difficult position. At one of the meetings of the Council when this draft resolution was submitted, there was some discussion as to whether we should specify a period of three months. There would really be no way of checking on the time factor of three months because the Council will meet next year and the subject of the Pacific Islands is discussed only in the Trusteeship Council. In order to meet the wishes of the Soviet Union representative, a paragraph might be added to my amendment stating that the Administering Authority must report to the Council on this problem at its next session. In any case, may I draw the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union to the point that if we set a period of three months as a minimum, it will be only next year that the Council will have the opportunity to take cognizance of the situation and to ascertain whether its resolution has been implemented. Therefore, I think that it would be more suitable to indicate, at some point in the draft resolution, that the Administering Authority must report to the next session of the Council on the steps which it has taken to implement the draft resolution.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I agree in substance with what has just been said by the representative of Bolivia. However, I do not think that an additional amendment is required because it seems to me, as stated by the representative of the Administering Authority, that it is customary to make a report. When we meet again next year, since the question is now pending, we shall be informed at that time as to how the matter has been settled. Therefore, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the

(Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, France)

representative of Bolivia is quite clear, and it has been made still clearer through our deliberations. The words "without delay" mean that we can expect, between now and the next Council session, that the question will have been settled. -- and this would certainly be the most desirable solution -- or else that the arbitration procedure envisaged will have started to function. This is how I interpret the meaning of "without delay". I do not think we need add that a report must be submitted, because that goes without saying; it is really a matter of routine.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the situation, the only amendment that has been proposed formally to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation is the one which has been distributed. That amendment, however, has been amended further, with the consent of the representative of Bolivia, in several respects. I shall read out the proposed amendment as amended:

"Recommends that, failing the agreement with the inhabitants of Kwajalein to the procedure now contemplated by the Administering Authority for the settlement of the question of compensation of the inhabitants of Kwajalein, the question should be settled without delay by arbitration, as recommended by the 1961 Visiting Mission, the procedure for arbitration being agreed upon between the parties."

Mr. KIANG (China): If my understanding is correct, the representative of Bolivia accepted the suggestion to change the word "issue" to the word "question" without changing the word "determined". Thus the text would read: "... the question should be determined" instead of "... the question should be settled." I hope that I am correct in my understanding of the agreement of the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of China has placed me in a very awkward situation. I am caught between two fires, as they say in English. I accepted the proposal of India to use the word "settled"; I accepted the proposal of China to use the word "question". Therefore, instead of asking me for my views, since I agreed to both suggestions, I should like the representative of India to give his opinion on this point.

Mr. KIANG (China): I wish to settle on the word "settled".

The PRESIDENT: I take it that the text as I read it is the text of the amendment. As the representative of the Soviet Union has indicated that he does not accept the amendment, I shall put it to a vote.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I have a suspicion that this amendment will be adopted, and if that is going to be the case, I think that some provision should be made to meet the open concern with respect to the time element which has been voiced here. To provide that, I should myself like to move a small amendment. This would be the addition of a third paragraph in the operative part of the draft resolution which would read as follows:

"Expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will be able to report satisfactory settlement of this question at the Council's session in 1963."

My motivation in suggesting this amendment is that for many long years this has been an issue which has remained unresolved and, as the Visiting Mission pointed out last year, there are many political and other undertones and overtones to it. The Mission felt -- and I continue to feel -- that the sooner this question is finally settled to the satisfaction of all concerned, the better it will be for everybody in the Territory.

Many years have passed; many recommendations have been made. Some move forward is in evidence. It may not be the move which appears to us at this time to be the most suitable. However, one hopes that it will succeed. If it does not, this draft resolution purports to make an alternative suggestion. I hope that no one will suggest that, in the context of the settlement of this question, the Council's summer session of 1963 is too soon. That gives the Administering Authority more or less a year, and in that period it is my hope, at least, that the question will be finally settled.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I entirely agree with the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of India.

Actually I stated in one of my earlier interventions today -- and in this respect there is a minor divergence between my views and those of the representative of France -- that it is true that the Trusteeship Council has been discussing the problem for many years and that, as the representative of the Administering Authority has said, the problem will probably be discussed at the Council's next session; but by including this paragraph in which we would express the hope that the problem would be settled satisfactorily by next year we would be taking a step forward as regards the Council's attitude towards the question.

Basically I think that this would meet the concern expressed by the Soviet representative. Sometimes it is rather difficult to find common denominators. It seems, however, that we are now finding one, and I think that we shall now be able to adopt this draft resolution as a constructive solution to the problem.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I am afraid that I cannot agree with the representative of Bolivia that there is any divergence of views between us. Actually we are in agreement on substance. We have the same idea in mind. The only thing that divides us is the question whether or not it is desirable to add this paragraph. Since, however, I am in agreement with the substance, I shall vote in favour of the new paragraph. I would merely suggest that it might be more in conformity with Council practice -- and here I address myself to Mr. Rasgotra, who is an old hand in the Council -- to use the words "the thirtieth session" instead of "the session in 1963". I would not insist on this change, but I do think that it improves the text.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I agree to that change.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that the suggested additional paragraph is acceptable to the representative of Bolivia as an amendment to his amendment. Therefore, the amendment now provides for the substitution of two paragraphs for the original operative paragraph 2.

The Council will now proceed to the vote.

The Bolivian amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution as whole, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA

The PRESIDENT: Today's meeting will probably be the last to be attended by Mr. Rasgotra as representative of India. I know that I speak for the Council as a whole in saying that no member of the Trusteeship Council has performed greater service to the Council and the objectives of the Trusteeship System than Mr. Rasgotra, both as a member of the Council and as a member of last year's Visiting Mission to the Pacific Islands. I know that all the members of the Trusteeship Council share my feelings of appreciation to Mr. Rasgotra for his past services and of regret that he will be leaving us shortly.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am very deeply moved, Mr. President, by your kind words.

I consider it a very special privilege to have been associated so intimately with the work of the Trusteeship Council. The past three or four years of the Council's work since I came here, in 1953, have been particularly stimulating. During those years the Council's labours of the last decade or more have come to fruition with respect to several Trust Territories. It has been my privilege as one of the representatives of my country to witness the coming to fruition of those labours. This has been an extremely exciting and inspiring result of the Council's work.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

I shall particularly miss the many friendships and associations I have formed during this period of my work with members of all delegations to the Council, both permanent and non-permanent, and when I go away I shall carry with me very happy memories of their courtesy, consideration and friendship -- friendship irrespective of all contention and debate that has arisen between myself and other members from time to time. These memories will last me for a very long time and they are memories of a character which I shall cherish very dearly.

To you, Mr. President, I owe many thanks for your consideration and courtesy, and I also wish particularly to say a word of thanks to Dr. Protitch at whose merciful hands I have learned a great deal during my work in the Council. He has saved me from many a pitfall. He is a very indulgent man, a very kind gentleman who is always ready to offer advice when it is sought. I have had to go to him on many occasions and I have found him extremely kind, extremely helpful.

I should also like to take this opportunity to thank my many other colleagues in the Secretariat of the Trusteeship Council on whose energies and abilities I have placed many impositions in the course of my duties, either privately for consultation or in various drafting committees of this Council where I know I have been a perfect nuisance.

I wish also to thank the staff here in the chamber, as well as the interpreters and others, many of whom I have not met personally but to whom I am grateful nevertheless for all the excellence of training and knowledge which they have displayed in responding to the demands of language and other demands that I have made upon them.

I wish to thank you again, Sir, and my colleagues in the Council for this great time I have had with all of you here.

The PRESIDENT: The next meeting of the Council will be tomorrow, Friday, at 2.30 p.m. when we shall hear the closing statement of the Administering Authority on Nauru. We shall also at that time have the report of the Secretary-General on credentials, agenda item 2; we shall consider the annual report on Ruanda-Urundi, agenda item 3a; the dissemination of information on the United Nations, agenda item 9; offers by Member States of study and training, agenda item 10; and examination of petitions concerning Trust Territories in general, having reference to document T/PET/GEN/L.4.

If there is no comment at this time, the meeting is adjourned until tomorrow at 2.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.