

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



25 June 1963

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

UN/SA COLLECTION

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 25 June 1963, at 3 p.m.

President:

MR. BARNES

(Liberia)

1. Statement by the President
2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: report of the Administering Authority: report of the Drafting Committee [4b] (continued)
3. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea: report of the Administering Authority: report of the Drafting Committee [4c] (continued)
4. Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council [12]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1223 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce for the record that in connexion with the item on the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which we disposed of this morning, I am informed by the representative of UNESCO that a document prepared by his organization, entitled "Implementation of resolution 8.2 adopted by the General Conference at its eleventh session on the role of UNESCO in contributing to the attainment of independence by colonial countries and peoples" has been deposited with the Secretariat of the Council. This is available to any members who may wish to read it.

Inasmuch as the translation of the Russian text of the amendments submitted to the Drafting Committee's Report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is not yet available, I suggest that we now take up the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (c)

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA (T/L.1056) (continued)

Mr. de CAMARET (France) (interpretation from French): I am sorry that Mr. Corner, the representative of New Zealand, is not here, because he certainly would have presented the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of New Guinea much more completely and in a more detailed fashion than I can. In truth, there is very little to say about our work, since the report speaks for itself. As can be seen, it is very short, but I think it does include all the points mentioned in the discussions in the Council. In its preparation we benefited from the co-operation of the Secretariat in the past. I have had the

pleasure of working with Mr. Cottrell for seven or eight years, and I should like through you, Mr. President, to thank him, as well as his collaborators, for the co-operation they gave us. We also had to call upon the Special Representative many times, and he also helped us very much.

I do not think there are any special points to which I need draw the attention of the Council. Of course, I am at the disposal of my colleagues and I will give any information or clarifications which they may require on the report.

The PRESIDENT: As is customary, we will first turn to the annex and deal with the recommendations paragraph by paragraph. I invite the Council to turn to the annex on page 1 of document T/L.1066.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to refer to some points raised in connexion with the House of Assembly referred to in the first paragraph of document T/L.1066. In view of the fact that my delegation raised two points in this connexion which we feel are very significant, we would not be willing to accept the words "commends the Administering Authority". We agree that it is a step forward to establish a House of Assembly by 1964, but we expressed the opinion that the members to be elected to this body should be placed on one roll and that there should be no special reserved seats for any particular group of people. Therefore, we do not feel that we can say we commend the Administering Authority. We can take note of what has been done and look forward in the future to see what will result from this development.

Therefore, my delegation would like to propose that instead of saying "commends the Administering Authority for its decision to establish by April 1964 a House of Assembly elected by adult suffrage on a common roll", we should say "takes note of the decision of the Administering Authority".

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I am not sure that the representative of Liberia, in proposing such an amendment, appreciated that one roll, and one roll only, will be in operation. There is no question of two rolls. There is one roll for the whole of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea -- Papua being linked in

this matter -- and on that roll, entirely as individual names, will appear the names of all the eligible voters of the Territory. All of these voters will participate in the elections for the representatives of the new House of Assembly, in the elections for the forty-four indigenous members in the first place and in the elections for the ten reserved seats in the second place.

There is no question of two rolls. There will be one roll, and one roll only, one system of adult suffrage, and one system of adult suffrage only.

I would also point out in this connexion that the institution of the ten seats to which Australians would be elected on the basis of this one roll by the same voters who vote for the other forty-four seats was at the express wish of the people of the Territory and, indeed -- I quote from memory -- at the vehement wish of the people who were interviewed by the Select Committee.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I come back to my second point. If we eliminate the question of the single roll, the main question that was raised by my delegation was that of reserving seats for particular individuals. If seats are reserved for Australians, or even for specific New Guineans and Papuans. I feel that this would be wrong. I feel that all the candidates should be elected representatives of the population, and that no special seats should be reserved.

The representative of Australia has raised the point that this was the express wish of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory, and that raises my second point. I recall, if I am not mistaken, that the representative of the Administering Authority stated that after an informal poll it was found that some of these people would not be elected, and that therefore it was necessary to reserve these special seats. If that is the case, then this does not reflect the wishes of the entire population of the indigenous inhabitants, and therefore it would be necessary to say "reflect the wishes of some of the indigenous inhabitants".

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before making my comments on paragraph 1 of the draft conclusion and recommendations on the Trust Territory of New Guinea, I would like to make a

general statement in connexion with the fact that in the Soviet view the document submitted to us is really a cleverly compiled document, and when we read it we got the impression of the presence of the authorship of the very experienced representative of France and of the others who took part in its drafting.

My second point is to the effect that unfortunately we did not have sufficient time to go into a detailed consideration of the question. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation does not want in any way to prolong unduly the work of the Council.

I would like now to request that in paragraph 1 of the draft conclusions and recommendations the third and fifth sentences be voted upon separately, and that a roll-call vote be taken on these two sentences.

The first sentence on which the Soviet delegation would like a separate, roll-call vote reads:

"It notes that this House will have full powers of legislation for the Trust Territory."

The second sentence on which we request a separate, roll-call vote reads:

"It further expresses the hope that the constitutional power of disallowance will not be invoked against the wishes of the majority of the elected members of the House of Assembly."

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Before proceeding to speak briefly to what the representative of the Soviet Union has just said, I would like to speak briefly again to the previous statement of the representative of Liberia; and this is in relation to the reservation of those seats to which he referred. I quote now from the report of the Select Committee which was charged with the task of ascertaining the wishes of the people with regard to the constitution of the new house of assembly -- a document which has previously been quoted in this Council:

"Realization of this probability" -- that is, the probability that there would not be any, or many, Australians elected to this Council, in view of the numbers involved, which are disproportionate -- "produced a vehement reaction among the Papuans and New Guineans, and without one exception all agreed that elected Australian members must remain on the Council. The Committee went to some trouble to explain that there would be at least ten official members, but this was unacceptable to those interviewed because it was considered insufficient in relation to a possible council of over forty indigenes, and in any case did not include farmers and business men from private enterprise."

Those are not my words: those are the words of the Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Council, of which you will recall that Mr. To Baining, an indigenous colleague of mine on this delegation, was a member. This was directly in response to the wishes of the people themselves; so that, in so far as they can be ascertained -- and great steps were taken to ascertain them -- the wishes of the people of New Guinea are at variance with the wishes of the representative of Liberia.

With regard to the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union, it notes that this house will have full powers of legislation for the Trust Territory. It is quite true, as this Council knows, that there is vested, in certain minor matters, in the Administrator; in major matters, in the Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia, the power to disallow, or partially disallow, or take similar action with regard to ordinances of the territory. It is also true that, before a bill passing through the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia can become law, it must have the signature -- the assent--

(Mr. McCORMACK: Australia.)

of the Governor-General of Australia. You will recall that I have explained, in this Council, that there is no other way of introducing legislation in the Territory of New Guinea except through the Legislative Council. What this means-- in fact, what is the case -- is that neither the Administrator, the Minister for Territories, nor any other person -- nor any other person -- can get a law into force, as a law of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, except with the concurrence of the majority of the members of the Legislative Council; and this large majority, as this Council well knows, will be composed of indigenous representatives of their own people.

The PRESIDENT: The Council now has before it an amendment, proposed by the representative of Liberia, to substitute, in the second sentence of paragraph 1, the words: "...it takes note of the decisions of the Administering Authority" for the words which appear in the text: "...it therefore commends the Administering Authority for its decision".

We also have a request for a separate vote, on the part of the Soviet representative, on the third and last sentences of paragraph 1, relating to political advancement. We shall first take up the amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): There was a second amendment, that of including one small word -- "some" -- in the same paragraph, so that it would read: "...by noting the Administering Authority's statement that the composition of the present House of Assembly reflects the wishes of some of the indigenous inhabitants".

The PRESIDENT: There is also this second amendment which has been proposed by the representative of Liberia, in the fourth sentence of paragraph 1. I submit to the Council for its decision the amendment proposed by Liberia to substitute the words: "... it takes note of the decision of the Administering Authority".

The Liberian amendment was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall take up now the second amendment proposed by Liberia -- that the fourth sentence of paragraph 1 include the words "some of" after "... reflects the wishes of ...".

The Liberian amendment was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote, by roll call, on the third sentence of paragraph 1.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: China, Liberia, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, Australia,

Against: None.

Abstaining: France,

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

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a separate vote, by roll call, on the last sentence of paragraph 1, as requested by the representative of the Soviet Union.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, China, France, Liberia, New Zealand.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia.

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

• The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 1 as a whole, as amended.

Paragraph 1 as a whole was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 2?

Mr. POTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to include a small amendment to the text proposed to the Council. At the beginning of paragraph 2, after the words "Administrator's Council", we propose inclusion of the following text: "...which at the present time is still simply an advisory or consultative body..."

That is a free translation. The text continues in the original.

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to propose the following small amendment to paragraph 4: replace the words "local rating powers" by the words "the powers in all aspects of local government, including local rating". The last sentence of paragraph 4 would then read: "To strengthen these Councils further, it suggests to the Administering Authority that financial assistance from the Central Government and the powers in all aspects of local government, including local rating, might both be expanded".

The Soviet amendment was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We wish to propose the following amendment at the end of paragraph 5: replace the phrase "senior posts" by the phrase "key posts". The last part of the paragraph would then read: "to prepare New Guineans for key posts in the Public Service".

The Soviet amendment was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I should like to propose a further amendment to paragraph 5. It relates to the first part of the paragraph, which reads: "The Council is firmly of the opinion that administrative responsibilities should be devolved on the indigenous inhabitants ...". Administrative responsibilities are being devolved on the indigenous inhabitants of New Guinea at the present time at a rapidly accelerating rate. In recognition of that fact, I would suggest that the first part of paragraph 5 should be amended to read as follows: "The Council is firmly of the opinion that further administrative responsibilities should be devolved on the indigenous inhabitants ...".

The Australian amendment was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

Paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

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

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We come now to paragraph 8.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I see that the word "commends" has been used too many times. While I would not vote against the paragraph, my delegation saw from the report that one of the vital problems in the territory is that of the question of roads. While we, of course, take into consideration the whole programme in connexion with road-building, it is not reflected that there is any serious problem on this question. Perhaps the representative of China wants the floor.

The PRESIDENT: Is the representative of Liberia finished?

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I saw that one of the drafters of the report was raising his hand to give some explanation; therefore I yield to him.

Mr. KIANG (China): First of all, I am not on the Drafting Committee. All that I wish to say is that I would like to see the word "commends" retained for the simple reason that the New Guinean people themselves have taken a very great and active part on the building of the roads in New Guinea. It is for that reason that I should like to see the word "commends" retained.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Perhaps it could be stated in this manner: The Council while noting that one of the serious problems is that of road-building commends the road-building programme ...

Mr. HENSLEY (New Zealand): The Drafting Committee is well aware, of course, that in New Guinea, as in any under-developed country, communications is one of the major problems. We included this specific reference to two roads because this had been a special suggestion of the Visiting Mission and the Drafting Committee was pleased to note the progress which the Administering Authority has made towards carrying out this particular road-building programme that had been suggested in the Visiting Mission's report.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of Liberia read out her amendment.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): It reads as follows:

"The Council while noting that roads is one of the major problems in the Territory commends the road-building programme carried out by the Administering Authority ..."

This is because they refer only to two roads here in this particular paragraph.

The SECRETARY: Might I suggest that instead of saying "while noting that roads is one of the major problems" we say "noting that communications may be ...".

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): You have got other communications problems there.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretary will now read the amendment. The word "communications" is being used instead of "roads".

The SECRETARY: The amended paragraph reads as follows:

"The Council while noting that communications are one of the major problems in the Territory commends the road-building programme carried out by the Administering Authority...".

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the amendment submitted by the representative of Liberia.

The Liberian amendment was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with one abstention.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with one abstention.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with one abstention.

Mr. FORTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to propose that paragraphs 11 and 12 be voted on together.

The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection to the proposal submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union I shall put to the vote paragraphs 11 and 12 together under Educational Advancement.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 were adopted by 7 votes to none, with one abstention.

Mr. FORTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to make a small addition to paragraph 13 on the question of the development of higher education. The Soviet amendment is to add at the end of the paragraph the following sentence:

"The Council also considers that the Administering Authority should revise its position with regard to the United Nations Scholarship Programme."

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I believe, in the first place, that this is a question separate from the substantive questions involved in paragraph 13 as it stands at the present time.

In the second place, I should also explain again, as I have done before, the Administering Authority's attitude with regard to United Nations scholarships. The Administering Authority believes that at the present time, as a general principle, having regard to the stage of education reached in the Territory, having regard to the language problem, having regard to the close association of the people of the Territory of New Guinea with Australia, and having regard to the highly developed educational facilities in Australia at all levels and in practical fields of scholarship, the interests of the people of the Territory are best served at this stage, in general, by extending to them the facilities of Australia rather than seeking to complicate an already complicated educational position by asking the people to take advantage of scholarships abroad in the circumstances with which we are familiar. That, briefly, is the attitude of the Administering Authority.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I am not sure that the amendment as drafted reflects the views which my delegation has expressed on this particular point. In supporting the amendment, I would support it on this basis: the basis of upholding the principle of the United Nations in granting scholarships to students in the Trust Territories. This has gone on through the years and has been something of vital interest to the Members of the United Nations by way of making contributions to the development of these peoples in the Trust Territories. On this basis I would vote for the amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to clarify my point for the benefit of the representative of Australia. He said that the content of the Soviet amendment was quite distinct from the content of paragraph 13 as a whole. Would the representative of Australia be satisfied if the Soviet delegation were to put the amendment as a separate paragraph -- for instance, as a new paragraph 14?

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): I think that it would be more logical if the Soviet representative put his amendment as a new paragraph 14; but if he did put his amendment as a new paragraph 14, the substance of the latter part of my reply would still apply.

I think that the representative of Liberia has got closer to the core of the subject which is involved and which is contained in the Soviet amendment. There is a principle involved here that the United Nations, through offering the combined and separate facilities of the Members of the United Nations, should try to help the separate member countries -- perhaps in some cases the less fortunate member countries -- of the United Nations. We have no quarrel whatever with this principle.

What I do say is that, at the present stage of advancement in Papua and New Guinea, and having regard to the facilities available in Australia in relation to the present educational situation in the Trust Territory of New Guinea, the interests are best served in the way which has been indicated by the Administering Authority. I make no objection to the principle as such enunciated by the representative of Liberia, which seems to me to be completely different in intention and expression from that indicated by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: I think that if the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to put his amendment as a proposal for a separate paragraph, we should act first on paragraph 13 and then take up the new paragraph proposed by the Soviet Union.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Whether the amendment is at the end of paragraph 13 or forms a new paragraph 14, is not, in my view, really important. There is not much difference. The only point which caused my reaction to the statement by the representative of Australia is that if the amendment is put as a new paragraph, I wonder whether it might be supported by the representative of Australia. What I would prefer is to have the amendment placed at the end of paragraph 13 as a continuation of that paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it an amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union which would add a new sentence at the end of paragraph 13.

Mr. KIANG (China): The remarks made by the representative of Liberia have confirmed the view of my delegation that the amendment is so badly drafted that it does not convey any sense at all. In saying "revise its position", does that mean it is to be revised for better or for worse? For this reason we are unable to give our support to that kind of amendment.

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

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

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up part V, establishment of intermediate target dates and final time-limit for the attainment of self-government or independence. Does any representative wish to make any comments on paragraph 15?

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would propose an amendment to paragraph 16 to the effect that the words "The Council" be followed by the words "confirms the recommendations of the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions of the Council, and further -- or again -- urges the Administering Authority", and so on as in the text.

The PRESIDENT: I am advised by the Secretariat that a reference to the twenty-eighth session would not be appropriate because no recommendations were made at that session. Perhaps the representative of the Soviet Union means sessions twenty-seven and twenty-nine?

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I believe there has been a misunderstanding here. The twenty-seventh and the twenty-ninth sessions are what is meant.

Mr. YATES (United States): I also wish to offer an amendment to paragraph 16. The amendment that I propose would be to change the paragraph so as to read as follows:

"The Council urges the Administering Authority to continue to implement, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic plans and programmes reflecting a proper sense of urgency" with the rest of the paragraph remaining as it is.

The purpose of this amendment is to encourage the Administering Authority in the actions it has already taken. We note that the Administering Authority has established a date for the election of the first legislative assembly of Papua and New Guinea. This is a very good move; this is something that the Trusteeship Council looks upon with favour, particularly in view of the fact that we have a somewhat unsophisticated political development in the Territory. It is obvious to my delegation that the new legislative assembly of the Territory should be given an opportunity to work for a while and should be given the opportunity to establish the dates that it thinks would reflect the target dates that are looked for in this paragraph.

For that reason my delegation submits these amendments. For that reason too my Delegation voices opposition to the amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I regret very sincerely that I cannot support the amendment proposed by our friend, the representative of the United States. As to this question of target dates, this is something that has been discussed in the Council many times and something that has been discussed by the General Assembly. We have not arrived at the place yet to define exactly these realistic target dates. In my statement I referred to target dates not only in

connexion with political advancement but also in educational development. Here the Drafting Committee has confined itself to the political aspects. Therefore I would have to vote against the amendments submitted by the representative of the United States. Personally, I would prefer the text as it is.

The PRESIDENT: The representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States have proposed certain amendments to paragraph 16 in part V. I shall ask the Secretary of the Council to read those amendments for the information of the Council.

The SECRETARY: The Soviet representative would insert after the words "The Council", the following words: "confirms the recommendations of the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth sessions of the Council, and again", with the rest of the paragraph remaining the same.

The United States amendment would have the paragraph read as follows:

"The Council urges the Administering Authority to continue to implement, in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, realistic plans and programmes reflecting a proper sense of urgency for the rapid and planned advancement of the Territory in all aspects of its political life".

The PRESIDENT: We shall first take up the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. YATES (United States): A question, Mr. President. Should not the amendment offered by the United States delegation be put to the vote first?

The PRESIDENT: The amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union concerns the first part of the paragraph. I shall have to put that to the vote first. The representative of the Soviet Union has proposed to add some words after the words "The Council". This is nearer the beginning of the text and I must therefore give it priority in the voting. Following that, we shall take up the amendments proposed by the United States delegation.

Mr. KING (United Kingdom): I propose to vote for the amendment submitted by the representative of the United States. Therefore I propose to vote against the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union because I do not think it is compatible with the United States amendment.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I did not refer to the amendment of the Soviet Union because I did not have it written down. But as it confirms previous recommendations of the Trusteeship Council, my delegation would vote in favour of it.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the statements just made by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, I would like to say that a vote against the Soviet amendment, which concerns the recommendation of the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth sessions of the Trusteeship Council, can be considered only as an attempt to revise previous decisions of the Trusteeship Council. In addition, I would point out that the text proposed by the representative of the United States amounts to a significant step backward, considering the progress which the Trusteeship Council had made -- however small that progress may have been -- when its membership more effectively reflected the membership of the General Assembly.

Mr. YATES (United States): I would reply briefly to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union by pointing out that there has been a change in position since the action that was taken by previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council. We have an implementation of the resolution of the Trusteeship Council by the Administering Authority's decision to establish a legislative council. That in itself is a movement toward the purposes of the previous resolutions of the Trusteeship Council, and I think that the legislative authority, as constituted, should be given the opportunity of initiating movements which were the purpose of the resolutions of previous Trusteeship Council sessions. For that reason, I suggest that there has been a change in circumstances which warrants a departure from previous resolutions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since there has been a difference in interpretation, I think, of paragraph 16, I should like to ask the members of the Drafting Committee what were the principles and the concepts which guided them when they proposed to the Council that it take a decision in the form set forth in this paragraph.

Mr. Chiping KIANG (China): It happens that my delegation always respects the recommendations of the Drafting Committee. However, in this matter, my delegation would also wish to know from the Drafting Committee its views when it submitted this recommendation to the Council.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): As the representative of the Administering Authority, I should like to speak in support of the remarks made by the representative of the United States when he referred, very correctly, to the advances which have been made and are continually being made in this Territory. To repeat, year after year, as the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to do, one or more resolutions or all the resolutions of previous sessions of this Council takes no cognizance whatever of these changes, is no compliment to the work of the Council, and does not in fact reflect the progress of this Council's work. These changes have taken place. As the representative of the United States has pointed out, a most significant date, indicative of this, has been placed before this Council for the development of an organ which will, as we have said, give a voice to the people of this Territory, based on the universal franchise and a common roll.

The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of New Zealand as a member of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): It seems to me that the wording of paragraph 16 is self-explanatory as it stands. It was an attempt to put together what we considered the various elements involved in this matter in a balanced form. It will be seen that it is essentially the same wording adopted by the Council last year. I think no further explanation of it is needed. For my part, I still believe that it is a balanced formulation of the various factors, and I shall not support any changes in it.

7/2/54 7/2/54 1954

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): There is one other point in connexion with this. It will be noted, from the wording of the draft as it stands, that the urging is to the Administering Authority to establish these target dates. We have consistently maintained in this Council that it is not for the United Nations, it is not for the Administering Authority, it is not for any other country, to take these ultimate steps. It is for the people themselves. Therefore, the wording of the United States amendment -- "in consultation with the people, to develop plans and programmes reflecting a proper sense of urgency" -- does in fact reflect the position which we consider should obtain: not the final and irrevocable setting of target dates but, in consultation with the people, the development of plans and programmes which will ultimately, at no very far distant date, enable them to set such target dates as they may wish to set.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed with the voting on the various amendments before the Council. The first amendment is that of the Soviet Union, and I now put to the vote the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union, to add to paragraph 16 the words which have been read out by the Secretary.

The amendment was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: There are several amendments which have been proposed by the representative of the United States. These can either be taken up severally or can be dealt with as a whole.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I would suggest that they be put to the vote as a whole because it seems to me that they go together.

The United States amendments were adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to state that the amendment put forward by the representative of the United States has defeated an effort that was made by the Council and by the Members of the United Nations over a period of years with respect to the Trust Territory. We do not see here an equal advancement in the three Territories that we have discussed, and I think that the whole Council will agree that, when a comparison is made, there is a lesser development here than in the other Territories which are now under trusteeship. That is why I have abstained on this particular paragraph.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to explain its vote on this paragraph. Before it does so, however, I should like to comment on the statement made by the representative of Australia that there is no sense in repeating all the recommendations made at previous sessions of the Council. I agree that there would be no point in repeating the recommendations of the Council if they had been implemented.

With regard to the question of establishing realistic target dates, the only possible way out of this situation in these circumstances would be again to propose to the Administering Authority that it do what it has not done in previous years. I should like to repeat that there would be no point in repetitions of this sort. However, because of circumstances which are beyond the control of the Soviet delegation, not only that delegation but others are forced to return to previous decisions of the Council.

In the Soviet view, the amendment submitted by the representative of the United States radically alters the content of paragraph 16. That is why my delegation was forced to vote against the paragraph as a whole in the form in which it appeared after adoption of the amendment submitted by the United States.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I find myself in disagreement with the statements that have been made previously. There is no intention on the part of the United States delegation in offering the amendment to delay in any wise the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life.

We have here a situation in which there is a definite, progressive and specific political advance. There has been established a legislature to which members will be elected. This is a very significant advance. In offering its amendment, the United States delegation intended that this legislature should be given an opportunity to reflect its views, to make its wishes known and to undertake the political activities which have traditionally been the desire of the Trusteeship Council to have such a legislature take. It was for that reason that the words "target date" were stricken. It was for that reason that the word "establish" was stricken because the word "establish" can only mean that there should be initiated in the first instance a political advance. We know that a political advance has been made. Therefore, the word "establish" should have been stricken and the Administering Authority encouraged to continue to implement its advance.

For these reasons my delegation suggests that there has not been a retrogression in this respect. On the contrary, it is intended that the progressive steps taken by the Administering Authority shall be continued, and we are confident that they will be continued under the term "Plans and programmes".

Miss EROOKS (Liberia): I should only like to draw the attention of the representative of the United States to the fact that these things are proposals; they have not yet come into effect.

The PRESIDENT: Are we having a dialogue around the table here or can we proceed with our work?

Mr. YATES (United States of America): It is always a pleasure to have a dialogue with the representative of Liberia. I want only to say that perhaps the events of the year will show which of us is right; I am sure that both of us want the same conclusion. I am sure that we will be delighted to see the advances politically and otherwise that will be shown by the Administering Authority in the course of time.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since in the text adopted by the Council a few moments ago mention is made of the Trusteeship Agreement, and my interest is mainly centred on resolution 1514 (XV) in this particular context, I should like to draw the attention of the United States representative to the fact that if we were unable to recognize that there was any political advancement in the Territory, it was in the light of resolution 1514 (XV) especially.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to the recommendations contained in paragraph 4 of the report.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would ask you, Mr. President, to put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the report as a whole as amended.

The report as a whole as amended was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: It has not been possible to circulate the text of the individual observations on New Guinea. May it be taken that the Council adopts these observations as approved by each delegation and communicated to the Secretariat? These observations will be inserted in the report under the "development" headings. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the chapter of conditions in New Guinea is approved as a whole.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 1 (b)

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1059, L.1062)
(continued)

The PRESIDENT: The report of the Drafting Committee on this item is contained in document T/L.1062; the proposed amendments submitted by the Soviet Union delegation are contained in document T/L.1068. In accordance with the usual procedure I will consider the report paragraph by paragraph. I invite the Council to turn to the Annex and we shall consider paragraph 1.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Apart from the draft recommendations and conclusions worked out by the Drafting Committee and submitted to us in document T/L.1062, there is also a text of the amendments to this document submitted by the Soviet delegation and contained in document T/L.1068. There are also a number of other documents to which the Soviet delegation would like to refer.

I should like to take this opportunity officially to submit one document in particular which we will discuss in one way or another in the course of our work on the draft recommendations and conclusions. First of all, I have in mind document T/L.1059, which contains the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation on the question associated with previous decisions of the Trusteeship Council with regard to petitions of the inhabitants of the Pacific Islands. I submit this document officially to the Council, and I hope that members of the Council will find it possible to support the draft resolution when we reach the stage where we are dealing with it.

I should also like to take this opportunity to make one further comment. At this morning's meeting the Soviet delegation referred to a statement of the representative of the United States at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly with regard to the question of the United States position in regard to the consideration of the situation in the Pacific Islands in any body of the United Nations.

(Mr. Potin, USSR)

I used the time between the two meetings to find the documents and I would now like to refer to the actual text of the statement made at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, on 9 October 1961, by the representative of the United States, Mr. Bingham. This took place during the discussion of the report of the Trusteeship Council and the information can be found in the Press release of the United States delegation, No. 3788 or No. 3789, and in the Fourth Committee document A/C.4/SR.1162, page 16. In that statement the United States representative, among other things, said the following in replying to the Soviet representative:

(continued in English)

"He" -- that is the representative of the Soviet Union -- "implied that the United States had been opposed and had objected to discussion of the conditions in the Pacific Trust Territory in the Security Council. That is not so. We have never objected to discussion of the matters of that Territory in the Security Council and we would not object today. We are prepared to discuss those matters in the Security Council at any time."

(continued in Russian)

I considered it desirable to offer this quotation at the present time since in the next part of our proceedings we will discuss the Soviet draft resolution (T/L.1069) which I had the privilege to submit to the Council this morning.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will dispose of the Soviet draft resolution when we reach that stage in our work. We are now concerned with the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee on the Pacific Islands. I have invited members of the Council to turn their attention to the annex of the report. A number of amendments have been submitted in the name of the Soviet Union (T/L.1069). The first amendment is to paragraph 1 and I invite the Soviet representative to explain his amendment.

31

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the draft conclusions and recommendations compiled by the Drafting Committee we find quite contradictory statements. In paragraph 1, under the heading "General considerations", we find a reference to the fact that "certain ... recommendations of the Council have not yet been fully implemented". Then the text would continue. In the text of the draft conclusions and recommendations itself, it is difficult to find any provisions which confirm that statement. The Soviet delegation would like to point out that it supports the statement of the Drafting Committee and we really consider that not only several but many recommendations of the Council were not implemented by the Administering Authority. In this connexion we propose to have an enumeration of recommendations of previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council which in our opinion have not been implemented by the Administering Authority. This would include the recommendation for the establishment of realistic target dates, and so on.

I will not list them all. The members of the Council can read the things I am referring to in the document we have submitted. The second amendment to paragraph 1 is to delete the word "fully". We also consider that many recommendations of the Council were not only not fully implemented, but not implemented at all. This explains the Soviet position with regard to that part of paragraph 1 and on paragraph 1 as a whole.

Mr. KIANG (China): I think, on behalf of the members of the Drafting Committee, we owe an explanation to the Council. When we formulated this conclusion in paragraph 1 as it now stands, we did have certain recommendations in mind which were not yet implemented. We had in mind particularly the recommendations with regard to war damage claims and the land claims. As to the establishment of realistic target dates, we had this in mind too, and that is the reason why we put in a new paragraph in part VI, namely paragraph 33, which we thought took care of that point.

As to whether other recommendations should be mentioned or enumerated, it is for the Council to decide; it is not for the Drafting Committee to enumerate them in the report. I hope that this explanation is satisfactory to the members of the Council.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): Looking at the first amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union reminds me that during the debate on this matter, I had occasion to point out that the representative's comments were not related to the facts. We said at that time, as the Council may recall, that the representative had closed his eyes and his ears to the answers that were given not only to his questions but to the questions of other members of the Council, so that he would not be influenced by them. We think that the amendment he is offering shows that.

The record will sustain the fact that a Legislative Council has been initiated. The record will sustain the fact that there has been an increase in the transfer of Micronesians to positions of high administrative responsibility. I recall specifically the allusion of the representative of the Soviet Union to a certain page in the report saying that this showed that there had been no progress in this particular aspect of the report; whereas the answer of the Special Representative was to the effect that the page to which the Soviet representative was referring was only a part of the key positions in the administration of the Islands.

Thirdly, it was pointed out that the American Congress now has under consideration a bill which would provide for the granting of compensation. So that the record will not sustain as a matter of fact the amendment which is offered now by the representative of the Soviet Union.

For these reasons, we suggest that the amendment is not in order and that the recommendation of the Drafting Committee should be sustained.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): The second paragraph of the draft recommendations does not enumerate the points raised in the amendment of the Soviet representative, but it does cover it. And I would at this time agree with the representative of China. It says:

"The Council wishes to remind the Administering Authority, however, that certain other recommendations of the Council have not yet been fully implemented, and hopes that the Administering Authority will be able to report to the next session of the Council on action taken to meet these recommendations".

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

The only point would be to recommend to the Administering Authority that it make a report thereon, which would be a greater emphasis. I would not press for it, but I do not think it was expected that the Drafting Committee would enumerate in detail these other recommendations to which we referred.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not want to prolong the discussion on this point. I would just like to direct the attention of the representative of the United States to the fact that at the twenty-ninth session the following recommendation in particular was adopted:

(continued in English)

"that positions of high administrative responsibility, such as those of District and Assistant District Administrator should also be transferred to Micronesians after suitable on-the-job training if necessary."

(Continued in Russian)

I would like to observe that, as the Soviet representative pointed out in discussion on the Pacific Islands, unfortunately, this year, the United States Government could not boast, during its statement, of anything except that one assistant administrator was appointed to this post. The recommendation spoke of the posts of administrators and assistant administrators.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to a vote on paragraph 1 (a) of the amendments submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document T/L.1068.

Paragraph 1 (a) was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote paragraph 1 (b) of the amendments submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Paragraph 1 (b) was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not want to prolong the discussion again; but I would like to request a separate vote on the first sentence of paragraph 1 of document T/L.1062, Annex.

The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote the first sentence of paragraph 1 of the Annex of document T/L.1062.

The first sentence of paragraph 1 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote paragraph 1 as a whole.
Paragraph 1 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

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

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: With regard to paragraph 4, there are certain amendments which have been submitted to this paragraph by the representative of the Soviet Union, in document T/L.1066.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers it essential to submit two amendments to the text of paragraph 4, since, in our opinion, the efforts being made by the United States to solve the problem and question are not fully in keeping with the appropriate recommendations of the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council, nor with those of the twenty-ninth session. The recommendations of both sessions stressed the need for the most rapid solution of this question.

The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity, in its statement, to point out that, unfortunately, the question of satisfying the perfectly legal and just needs and claims of the inhabitants of the Islands was not being fully granted or implemented; for this reason, in the view of the Soviet delegation, the Council must, directly and unambiguously, state the actual situation, and not close its eyes to the real situation that obtains. The Soviet delegation realizes that certain measures are being adopted in this respect, and we hope that the Soviet delegation will be able to reflect its attitude during the voting on the Soviet amendments and on the paragraph as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further observations, we shall take a vote on the amendment, submitted by the Soviet representative, to paragraph 4. I put to the vote paragraph 2 (a) of the Soviet amendment.

Paragraph 2 (a) was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 4, as it appears in the document before the Council, Draft Conclusions and Recommendations of the Drafting Committee, document T/L.1062, Annex.

Paragraph 4 of document T/L.1062, Annex, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The next amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation is for the addition of a new paragraph 5.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the general discussion and the question-and-answer period, the Soviet delegation drew the attention of members of the Council to certain events, and these events are clearly reflected in the proposal contained in paragraph 3 of the Soviet amendments (T/L.1068). The Soviet delegation considers that the Council must take note of the Administering Authority's statement that the population of the Trust Territory has expressed concern with regard to all nuclear and thermonuclear tests. On the other hand, the Soviet delegation considers that the Council cannot ignore the indifference shown by the Administering Authority with regard to the plans of certain Powers to carry out such tests in the Pacific region.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): This proposed new paragraph is obviously totally unwarranted and without any foundation in fact. The Administering Authority has stated -- and not only during the course of the debate -- that the residents of the Territory are opposed to all nuclear tests. But I think that the paragraph is best answered by the statement made by the representative of New Zealand during the debate. I think that nothing more need be added at this time to the statements on the subject which were made during the debate.

As regards the supposed indifference of the Administering Authority to nuclear and thermonuclear tests, I would point out to the Soviet representative that the President of the United States, in a statement made a few days ago, said that my country was imposing a voluntary ban on nuclear tests and would continue this ban until it was broken by other Powers. I think that that is a sufficient answer to the proposal of the Soviet delegation. Such a statement has not been forthcoming from that delegation or from the Soviet Union. I believe that the Soviet representative should have thought twice before offering such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that it is necessary to have a discussion at this stage on the attitude of certain Powers regarding future nuclear tests. I hope that we can avoid introducing that aspect into our deliberations now.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not intend to provoke a discussion on this matter. I should simply like to ask the United States representative whether his comments are directed to the Soviet amendment as a whole or simply to the second part. In other words, does he mean that the first part of the Soviet amendment is of some worth and that there is some basis for it? What is his attitude towards the amendment?

Mr. YATES (United States of America): In reply to that question, I would say that the entire amendment should be rejected.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): As I recall it, what is said in the first part of the Soviet amendment was confirmed by the United States representative. With respect to the second part of the amendment, there was some controversy on this subject. I think that the President had to appeal to members of the Council not to stray from the subject under discussion. I therefore have no full knowledge of the position of the Administering Authority on this particular point. In view of the fact that these two matters are interrelated, I prefer not to participate in the vote.

The Soviet amendment to add a new paragraph 5 was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to paragraph 5 on page 2 of the annex to document T/L.1062.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to ask the members of the Drafting Committee if they would accept the substitution of the phrase "The Council takes note of" for the phrase "The Council applauds" at the beginning of the paragraph. It does not really appear to be fitting to use the word "applauds" in a recommendation of the Council.

Mr. HUNG (China): First, I would say that once a report is submitted to the Council the Drafting Committee no longer exists as such. However, as the representative of China I would say the following.

As early as 1956, the Trusteeship Council heard from its own Visiting Mission that the Administering Authority had succeeded in establishing relations of mutual and sympathetic understanding with all sections of the population. This fact has been further made known to the Council by all its subsequent Visiting Missions. Indeed, during the general debate at this session of the Council, I myself heard the representative of Liberia give due recognition to the "smooth" relations between the Administering Authority and the people of Micronesia. I therefore think that in drafting this paragraph the Drafting Committee merely reflected the sentiments of the Council, and particularly what was said to the Council by Mr. Santos.

As regards the suggestion made by the representative of Liberia, my delegation could accept the substitution of the phrase "The Council notes with satisfaction the good relationship". I am sure that the representative of Liberia would agree to the addition of the words "with satisfaction".

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I am raising no objections to the paragraph as such. As the representative of China has just said, I myself referred to the ability of the Administering Authority to create smooth relations with the population, and I said that that was why there should have been more progress on some other matters.

The point I was making was that I do not think that the word "applauds" is an appropriate word to be used in a report of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the amendment of the representative of Liberia, as further amended by the representative of China, which would substitute the words "The Council notes with satisfaction" for the words "The Council applauds" at the beginning of paragraph 5.

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

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

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet delegation has submitted an amendment to paragraph 6.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation has felt it necessary to submit an amendment to paragraph 6 because we do not agree with the interpretation of the principal task facing the Administering Authorities of Trust Territories. It seems to me that very clear decisions of the United Nations in this respect are to be found in documents of the Organization -- namely, the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and resolution 1514 (XV).

These mention very clearly the tasks the Administering Authorities must do in connexion with the administration by these Authorities of the Pacific Islands. Specifically, we felt that it was necessary to stress this fact in the proposed amendment.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I regret to have to quote the same words of the Charter on various occasions. But the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union purports to say that it follows from the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and resolution 1514 (XV) that the principal task of the Administering Authority is the immediate transfer. Article 76 of the Charter, which is one of the documents quoted, says that it shall be the purpose of the trusteeship system -- and hints that a principal task of the Administering Authority is:

"to promote the ... progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory ..."

There is a difference between the word "progressive" which is the method of the trusteeship system and the word "immediate" which is the word used by the Soviet Union, purporting to quote the Charter. Since it does not quote the Charter and is inaccurate, I cannot support it.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a vote on the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union to paragraph 6.

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1.

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

The PRESIDENT: We come now to paragraph 7. Liberia has proposed an amendment.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I have during the interim period looked up the document and I would like to give the amendment to reflect exactly what I referred to in the general debate. The amendment would read as follows:

"The Council refers to the observations of the 1961 Visiting Mission regarding the unofficial plebiscite held in Saipan and takes note of the acknowledgement of the Administering Authority that the questions as put by the inhabitants of Saipan do not fully reflect the basic objectives of Article 76 b of the Charter."

The Liberian amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.
Paragraph 7, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet Union has proposed an addition of a new paragraph 8 in section II of the report.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As you will remember, the delegation of the Soviet Union during the discussion in the Council of the Trusteeship Territories, in the general discussions as well as in the question and answer period, said that it was necessary to multiply the contacts of the population of the Territory with neighbouring Territories, and mentioned the need of increasing the number of open ports in order to achieve the objectives which, according to the Administering Authority, they were seeking, that is, to give to the population a better understanding of their internal problems as well as of world problems. We feel that one of the ways of achieving this purpose would be the adoption of measures which are mentioned in this amendment that we are proposing to the Council at this time.

Mr. YATES (United States): My delegation does not have too strong an objection to the amendment offered by the Soviet Union if part of the proposed amendment is stricken. I refer to the words "the creation of open ports and other similar measures". I think it is not known at this time whether there should be open ports in the islands and I do not know what is meant by "other similar measures". That is a broad phrase which is not identified with anything except "open ports" and there is nothing that comes to mind that that would refer to. For that reason, I would urge that that part of the amendment be stricken and that the vote occur on the remainder of the amendment of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very happy to notice that on the whole the Soviet amendment gives rise to no special objections by the United States. But it seems that the objection of the representative of the United States as to the creation of open ports and other similar measures is perhaps provoked by the rather unclear language that we used in this amendment. In proposing the creation of open ports in the Trusteeship Territory, my delegation feels that these measures will contribute to an increase of contacts of the population of the Territory with the population of neighbouring Territories and that it would also improve the economic situation of the Territory by increasing possibilities of cultural contacts and other types of contacts as well with peoples and countries of the Pacific Ocean Basin.

It is no secret to anyone that trade is one of the means of development of friendly relations among States and peoples, and in this case the delegation of the Soviet Union feels that measures of this kind inevitably would lead to an increase of contacts between the people of this Territory and the people of other territories and that this would play a positive role in development.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I would suggest that this matter of open ports is one that should appropriately be left to the consideration of the new Legislative Council. There is concerned here a question of revenues, and in the past the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council, and the Trusteeship Council itself, has had occasion to remark on the necessity of the revenues being raised by the local inhabitants themselves. That is why I think that this properly is something that they might consider. However, the Administering Authority will be very happy to make known the views of the Soviet Union to the Legislative Council.

Mr. POEIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In order to give a better example with regard to our proposal, I would like to refer to the statements made in the thirtieth session of the Trusteeship Council by the representative of the Administering Authority. In his report and in statements as well, he said that the first measures had been taken for the development of tourism and, therefore, for contacts between the people of the Trust Territory and neighbouring areas. It is only natural, therefore, in my opinion at least, that the development of tourism presupposes the creation of certain new conditions, notably the creation of ports by which the tourists may enter the Territory. By this means there would be islands in the Territory which would be entirely open to tourists and through which delegations could come from the Pacific basin or from other countries. I hope that this will explain the sense that the Soviet delegation gives to this amendment.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I still insist that this is a matter which should have the consideration of the Legislative Council. There are some countries which employ the use of open ports for the purpose of attracting tourists; there are others who think that people will come in spite of the fact that the ports are not open ports. That is why I think that we should let the Legislative Council consider this question for themselves and come to a conclusion about it.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I listened to the replies given by the United States representative and I understood from them that the Administering Authority has no basic opposition to the Soviet proposal. Therefore, my delegation will vote in favour of it.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has requested the deletion from the amendment proposed for a new paragraph 8, submitted by the Soviet delegation, of the following words "the creation of open ports and other similar measures".

The United States amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Soviet amendment, as amended, was adopted by 2 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet Union has proposed the addition of a new paragraph before paragraph 8 in document T/L.1062.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Council has just adopted an amendment proposed by the Soviet Union to insert a new paragraph 8 in the document now before the Council. The amendment now proposed by the Soviet Union is the insertion of a new paragraph before paragraph 9. At the present stage, in the opinion of the Soviet Union the situation with regard to the development of the Council of Micronesia into a body which has all powers and to which the Administering Authority may soon transmit all powers of government has not changed. The Council of Micronesia continues to be a purely advisory body with no real authority on matters concerning the Territory. Therefore, we have proposed this amendment.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): Again I must insist that the statement of the Soviet representative is unrelated to the facts. A legislative body has been created with legislative powers, and the amendment that he has offered is not in keeping with the facts as presented to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote the Soviet proposal to add a new paragraph before the present paragraph 8 in the document before the Council.

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I want to explain my vote on the Soviet amendment. I think it is true to a certain extent that the Micronesian Council has some elements of an advisory nature, but my delegation did not think that we should say that the Council is "compelled to". Since we move along so rapidly, I had to abstain.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): Would it be in order to suggest a recess for fifteen minutes so that we might stretch our legs and smoke a cigarette?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure whether the Council is accustomed to this procedure of stretching legs and smoking cigarettes. However, at one time when the Council met at 2.30 p.m. it did adjourn for tea, and since we met today at 2.30, we might invoke that procedure and recess for fifteen minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 5.25 p.m.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 13, as amended. The word "establishment" has been substituted for the word "transfer", and the word "in" for the word "to"; in the first sentence.

Paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: An amendment has been submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union, calling for the insertion of a new paragraph 15.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation proposes, in the section headed "Public service", that a new paragraph be inserted, referring to the failure of the Administering Authority to carry out the recommendation of the twenty-ninth session on the appointment of Micronesians to positions of "high administrative responsibility". Since discussion has already taken place on this, I shall not take up any more of the Council's time. I simply submit this amendment on behalf of the Soviet delegation for the consideration of the Council.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I shall also not speak at length. I simply want to say that the amendment offered by the Soviet representative is not borne out by the facts as stated in the Council and should be rejected.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union.

The amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I would have preferred that the word "fully" be included in the Soviet amendment after the words "has not carried out". However, since the amendment has been rejected, it no longer makes much difference.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 15 as it appears in the report of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to have a separate vote on the words "with satisfaction", and also on the words "continued significant progress".

The words "with satisfaction" were adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The words "continued significant progress" were adopted by 7 votes to 1.

Paragraph 15 as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the members of the Council have no objection, I should like to propose that paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 be voted on jointly.

Paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 were adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We go on to Section III of the report, "Economic Advancement"; we shall take up paragraph 20.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to repeat my proposal. If the members of the Council do not object, I suggest that we put paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 to the vote jointly at the same time.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection I will put paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 to the vote jointly.

Paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 were adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Miss BROCKS (Liberia): My delegation voted for all of these amendments taken together. While we do not raise any objection to the contents therein, we believe that the form in which they are drafted in some way does not really present this with real seriousness. It is true that you must give deference where deference is due, but if you continue over and over again to repeat this sort of expression, it makes the whole draft seem not serious. With this comment, I will go on to support the next amendment.

Paragraph 23 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to state here that I am very certain the Council is engaged in very serious work and that every member of the Council is endeavouring to give the best of his time and talent to the success of this session. Certainly, if there are any members of the Council who feel that any part of this report is not to their liking and they wish to see it amended, they have the opportunity to do so. The President is in no way endeavouring to stifle that opportunity for members to introduce amendments so as to make the text conform to the view of all delegations.

Miss BROCKS (Liberia): This has no allusion whatever to the procedure adopted in the Council and in adopting the text. I think that the representative

of China and I have worked together and we know the sort of opposition we have faced in connexion with trusteeship matters; he looked at me and smiled; he knew exactly what I was talking about. I was not referring to you at all.

The PRESIDENT: I am very certain that when I made my reference I was not referring to myself either; I was only pointing out that when the question of the seriousness of the Council was raised, certainly I think that every member of the Council has the right to introduce any amendments that would give meat to the text that is before us. What is most unfortunate is that the smile between the representative of China and the representative of Liberia cannot be interpreted by anybody else but them.

Before we take up paragraph 24, I should like to observe that the representative of the Soviet Union has introduced a new amendment, to add a new paragraph between paragraphs 23 and 24.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to make a small correction to the text of the amendment. In the second line of paragraph 7 of document T/L.1068, we should eliminate the word "extremely". This is simply an error which occurred as a result of the wrong wording of the text. I would delete this word because, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the words following the word "extremely", "high rate of interest" reflect the existing situation sufficiently. My delegation considers it necessary to introduce this amendment to the text of the conclusion and recommendations on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, considering that the 4 per cent charged the representatives of the indigenous people who have taken loans from the Development Fund, is too high a rate. In this case I expect that the United States representative will say that in some other Trust Territories, particularly in New Guinea, the rate of interest is higher, 4.5 per cent or 5 per cent. Nevertheless, such a reference, if it were made by the representative of the United States would not justify the situation which exists in the Trust Territory. The introduction of this amendment was necessary in order to reflect the point of view of the Soviet delegation on this question. On behalf of my delegation, I would like to express my hope that the opinion of other members of the Trusteeship Council will also coincide with the Soviet view.

The second part of this amendment concerns the supervision of the activities of certain American companies and private citizens in the Trust Territory; it deals in particular with the taxation system. My delegation has explained its stand on this particular point during the general discussion, and at this stage of our proceedings, in order not to unduly prolong the meeting, I will simply limit myself to introducing this draft amendment and drawing the attention of the members of the Council to it.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I remember well the discussion on the Development Fund loans and on the other industrial testimony that was given in the course of the debates. I am not going to compare the 4 per cent figure with those of other Trust Territories. I know that it is lower than the rates of interest in the United States. Unless I am in error, the 4 per cent interest that is gathered goes into the Development Fund and is used for the purpose of making other loans in the Territory and of augmenting the amount of money that is available for the purpose. Thus it may not be an unmixed burden. It is a blessing as well as a burden, to use the meaning of the Soviet Union representative.

With respect to the last point that was made by the Soviet representative, when I listened to the argument that was advanced by the Soviet delegation and reread the verbatim transcript, it seemed to me that there was a misconception by the representative of the Soviet Union as to how the system of taxation operates. Citizens of the United States, corporations which engage in activities in other countries of the world still have to pay income taxes to the United States Government. If a corporation were engaged in business in any European country, for example, or any country on the face of the earth, it would still have to pay its appropriate share of income taxes to the United States. The fact remains that there are taxes that the industries pay to the local governments as well. That was brought out in the course of the testimony and in other reports.

(25. Votes)

I think that the question of the representative of the Soviet Union, at the time of the debates, related to the new fishing industry which is being developed in the Trust Territory. That industry, if it makes money, will pay a tax on its income to the Government of the United States, but it will also pay taxes locally as well. So that I think that there is this fundamental misunderstanding as to how the tax system works. As the Legislative Council begins its consideration of an expansion of the system of taxation, I am sure that new industries coming in will make a greater distribution of tax monies to the Trust Territory. I suggest therefore that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further observations, I shall now put to the vote the amendment of the Soviet representative to include a new paragraph between paragraphs 23 and 24.

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I propose that we should vote on paragraphs 25 and 26 together.

Paragraphs 25 and 26 were adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 27 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 28 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 29 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 30 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 31 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 32 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: With regard to section IV, Social Advancement, an amendment has been submitted by the Soviet Union to insert a new paragraph under the sub-heading "Race relations".

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before turning to the next amendment to the draft conclusions and recommendations before us, I would like to ask you, Mr. President, at what stage of our work we will consider the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation (T/L.1069)?

The PRESIDENT: In reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, I propose to take up the draft resolutions after we have adopted the report of the Drafting Committee and its conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Thank you for your explanation, Mr. President. It satisfies me fully.

In the section on "Social Advancement", we propose the introduction of a new sub-heading entitled "Race relations". In addition, the Soviet delegation proposes to include in the text of the amendment a recommendation to the Administering Authority to submit to members of the Council, as soon as possible, information on the situation in the Trust Territory in this field.

I think that it should not be necessary to explain the reasons why the Soviet delegation has submitted this amendment. We have given our views on this both while the petitioner Mr. Hosmer was being heard and during the general discussion when the Soviet delegation pointed out the need for getting information from the Administering Authority with regard to the measures which, according to the statement of the Administering Authority, have been taken in the Trust Territory to put an end to racial discrimination. As we can see from Mr. Hosmer's petition, this has existed in the Trust Territory. I think that it is a very important question and the Trusteeship Council should be concerned with acquiring the information on it. That is why we have submitted this amendment and I am now formally submitting it for the consideration of the members.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union played on this theme when the petitioner was before the Trusteeship Council. The Council will note in this last explanation of the amendment by the Soviet representative that he referred to the petition of Mr. Hosmer. At the time that Mr. Hosmer appeared before the Trusteeship Council he was interrogated by the representative of the Soviet Union who asked him about the charge of discrimination. At that time Mr. Hosmer said that he was sure that while it existed when he filed his petition, that his Government had taken care of the matter.

As a matter of fact, subsequently it was represented to the Trusteeship Council, both by the High Commissioner and the representative to the Trusteeship Council, that the Government of the United States was not only resorting to words but was resorting to actions and had fully taken care of the discrimination that was complained of by Mr. Hosmer.

I think it will suffice to answer the representative of the Soviet Union by pointing out the finding already adopted by the Trusteeship Council, in paragraph 5, wherein it is stated: "The Council notes with satisfaction the good relationship which clearly exists between the Administering Authority and the inhabitants of the Territory".

I suggest that this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I remember perfectly well the discussion which was held in the Trusteeship Council during the appearance of the petitioner, and during the question and answer period. If I am not mistaken -- and I hope that the records of the work of the Council will bear me out -- the petitioner simply expressed a hope that, since the time he was in the Territory, the Administering Authority had taken appropriate steps to put an end to the situation existing at that time in the Territory, which, among other things, was characterized by racial discrimination and the existence of segregated clubs. That is the first thing.

Secondly, the representative of the Administering Authority has pointed out in the Council that the Administering Authority has taken steps to put an end to the situation that has existed in the past. The aim of our amendment -- and I hope that the text is perfectly lucid in this respect -- is to ask the Administering Authority to submit some sort of account of the particular specific steps and measures taken by them to put an end to the situation. In any case, I think the members of the Council will be very interested to have further information from the Administering Authority to the effect that there is no more racial discrimination in the Territory; and I am convinced that, if we have such assurances from the United States, the members of the Council will be only too overjoyed to accept them.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I have only one further comment with respect to the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union, and that is to say that it is my recollection that Mr. Hosmer expressed the conviction that the Government of the United States would have taken care of it.

(Mr. Yates, United States)

Secondly, Mr. Hosmer's remarks were addressed to one club, and the High Commissioner pointed out that this had been eliminated.

Thirdly, Visiting Missions that have gone to the Territory have not noted any kind of discrimination that existed, and this is certainly something that can be considered by the Visiting Mission which will go to the Trust Territory in a relatively short time.

I suggest that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not want to prolong the discussion to this point, but in reply to the representative of the United States, I would like simply to make the following three statements:

Firstly, Mr. Hosmer argued toward his conclusions from specific knowledge of facts at the time he was in the Territory. When he expressed the conviction or hope that the Administering Authority had taken steps to eliminate racial discrimination, he based his argument on an assumption -- on a sort of faith in the American Administration. I do not think the United States can deny this. The fact is that Mr. Hosmer spent only two months in the Trust Territory in 1960, and he spoke here in 1963. Even one segregated club, in one particular place in the Territory, is a fact, proving that the principle of racial discrimination exists there.

Have steps been taken by the Administering Authority? That is another question. This is the particular question mentioned in the Soviet amendment.

Thirdly, on behalf of my delegation, I welcome the proposal of the United States representative, that the Visiting Mission, which will go to the Trust Territory in 1964, should pay attention to this problem.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): With due respect, I would say that two things should be answered with regard to the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union. With respect to Mr. Hosmer having faith in his Government, his faith was justified, as a matter of fact. The High Commissioner indicated that he came there and found that discrimination existed, and corrected it immediately.

(Mr. Yates, United States) |

Secondly, I did not, in the course of my remarks, indicate that this was to be a special observation by the Visiting Mission. All I said was that this was something that Visiting Missions noted as they went through the Territory in the course of their duties; I did not intend to single it out as a part of the specific responsibilities of the next Visiting Mission. I am sure that the Visiting Mission will, in the course of its survey, consider this along with all its other responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT: I think we can now proceed to the vote on the amendment of the Soviet Union to include a new paragraph, under the sub-heading, "Race Relations".

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

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to paragraph 33, under section IV, Social Advancement.

Paragraph 33, section IV, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 34, section IV, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: A proposal has been submitted by the Soviet Union to add two new paragraphs before paragraph 35.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is not two paragraphs, but one, really, in essence, although there are two slightly different things combined in this same item. Thus, inasmuch as they deal with the same question, my delegation considers it appropriate to put them in one paragraph.

In the first part of the Soviet proposal, we should note the statement of the adviser to the United States delegation, an inhabitant of the Trust Territory, with regard to the interests of youth in the Trust Territory, in the acquisition of higher education.

In the second part, we propose to the Council to recommend to the Administering Authority that it reconsider its position with regard to scholarships provided under United Nations programmes. Hitherto, there had been

(Mr. Fotin, USSR)

an attitude of refusal to accept such scholarships. This briefly explains the content of my amendments, which I now formally propose.

1

Mr. YATES (United States of America): If this amendment represents the conclusions drawn by the Soviet Union delegation from the testimony, I think that the Soviet Union delegation would do well to listen with greater attention. As a matter of fact, Mr. Santos, when he appeared before this Council, said exactly the opposite of what is said in the amendment.

The Soviet Union delegation is offering an amendment based upon two sentences of Mr. Santos' statement. I shall read out those two sentences -- but I shall also read out the third sentence of that statement. And I shall let the Council decide whether it should not reject the amendment out of hand. This is what Mr. Santos said:

"More and more young men and women all over the Trust Territory are interested in getting higher education. They are forever in search of ways of acquiring it" --

it was on the basis of those two sentences that the Soviet Union delegation drafted this amendment, which is a total distortion of Mr. Santos' position. For this is what Mr. Santos went on to say:

"The Government of the Trust Territory is aware of this particular matter and has increased the number of scholarships this year to meet the needs".

That is the full statement. I ask that the Soviet amendment be rejected.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is, of course, fully aware of the third sentence of Mr. Santos' statement. But, in our opinion, that sentence does not prove that the Administering Authority has given sufficient scholarships to satisfy what Mr. Santos calls the constant desire of the young people in the Trust Territory for education. Perhaps my knowledge of English is defective, but as I read Mr. Santos' statement it is quite clear that he does not at all think that everything is being done to satisfy the requirements of the young people of the Trust Territory, and he certainly does not think that a sufficient number of scholarships has been granted to those young people who wish to enter institutes of higher education.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I did not gather the impression from the discussion of this particular question that the United States delegation had refused to use the opportunities for higher education. I thought that it had been explained that scholarships had been offered, and I believe that it was stated that someone had gone to the Philippines to study. It did not seem to me that the United States had asserted positively that it would refuse to allow young people in the Territory to make use of scholarships granted for higher education. I think that it was the representative of Australia who placed some conditions on the acceptance of scholarships. I should therefore like some clarification of this point. If the United States delegation could make its position on the matter clear, I would know how to vote on this amendment.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I suggest to the representative of Liberia that the Soviet amendment is totally predicated on Mr. Santos' statement. Now, Mr. Santos has not indicated in any way that the United States has refused to make use of the higher education opportunities, which is the conclusion drawn by the Soviet Union delegation from Mr. Santos' statement. As I have already pointed out, the third sentence of Mr. Santos' statement reads as follows:

"The Government of the Trust Territory is aware of this particular matter and has increased the number of scholarships this year to meet the needs". That is a total refutation of the assertion of the Soviet Union delegation.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I am not sure that the United States representative has really answered my question. What I am seeking is the philosophy or general thesis of the United States delegation as regards the acceptance of scholarships offered by the United Nations.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): The United States is expanding the number of acceptances of scholarships made available by various nations. I hope that that answers the question of the representative of Liberia.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): What I am trying to find out is this: Does the United States, as an Administering Authority, agree with the general principle of the acceptance by inhabitants of the Trust Territory which it is administering of scholarships for higher education offered by Member States?

The PRESIDENT: I think that the question is quite clear.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): To the best of my knowledge, the answer to the question is "Yes". I do not know the full details with respect to the opportunities envisaged in the scholarships that have been made available. I therefore show some hesitation in answering the question unequivocally. However, as I have said, to the best of my knowledge the answer to the question is "Yes".

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): When I asked to speak, after the statement of the representative of Liberia, I simply wished to associate myself with her request to the United States delegation for a clear answer on the question of United Nations scholarships.

At the same time, I cannot fail to draw the attention of the United States representative to the fact that the President, in calling on the Soviet representative to submit its amendments to this section of the report, said that there were two amendments -- or at least two parts of one amendment. I mention this in order to stress something which has indeed been confirmed to some extent by the United States representative, who said that, although these two questions are different, they are interrelated; both concern opportunities for acquiring higher education.

I should therefore like to make it clear that the second part of the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union is not based on statements by Mr. Santos, that it is a conclusion drawn from the actual situation which exists and has existed during the entire period of the operation of the United Nations Scholarship programme, so far as the inhabitants of this Trust Territory are concerned.

68

The PRESIDENT: I shall now proceed to put to the vote the proposal of the Soviet Union to add the new paragraphs before paragraph 35.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): In view of the fact that the two paragraphs were put together, I abstained because I think the first paragraph was a quotation of the statement.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to propose to have a joint vote on paragraphs 35, 36 and 37 of the report of the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections, I shall put to the vote paragraphs 35, 36 and 37.

Paragraphs 35, 36 and 37 were adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We have a proposal from the Soviet Union to insert two new paragraphs before paragraph 38.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation proposes to introduce in the last section of the report two new paragraphs which, in our opinion, fully reflect the real situation existing with regard to the question of the establishment of immediate target dates and a final time-limit for the attainment of self-government and independence; we want to reflect the true situation existing in this regard in the Trust Territory.

The first amendment is confirmation of the statement of the representative of the Administering Authority made during the discussion in the Trusteeship Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the effect that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including paragraphs 2 and 5, fully extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(Mr. Fotin, USSR)

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the effect that unfortunately, and I understand that the Secretariat employees have worked at great length in order to present the text of the Soviet amendments in time, in our opinion, the text in English should be worded slightly differently. With your approval I will read out the text in the form which the Soviet delegation would like to see it in English:

(speaks in English)

"The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples including its paragraphs 2 and 5, is fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(continued in Russian)

In the English text we propose to eliminate the words "the effects of" and change the last part to include the words "is" and "applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

The second amendment is a reaffirmation of the recommendation passed at the twenty-ninth session of the Trusteeship Council with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands when the Council asked the Administering Authority to establish realistic target dates for rapid progress in the Territory in all aspects of its political life. My delegation proposes that at the thirtieth session of the Trusteeship Council that it should again propose to the Administering Authority that it establish such target dates in keeping with the provisions of the Charter, Trusteeship Agreement and resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly.

These are the two amendments which I now submit to you.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I must apologize to the Council. I should like to say that if paragraph 37 had been voted upon singularly, I would have abstained. I did not think that the Council was in a position to say that "it notes with satisfaction that scholarships ... provided by the Administering Authority will shortly be adequate ...". They could have taken note of the statement of the Administering Authority to this effect.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union is again quoting only part of a statement. I do not think it is open to question that the statement of the United States in response to the specific question of the representative of the Soviet Union as to whether my delegation supported paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was to the effect that my delegation does support paragraph 5, taken in conjunction with Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations; and that is still the position of my delegation. It seems to me that what this amendment seeks to do is to ascribe to my delegation an attitude which it did not represent to the Council. I have just explained what our full statement was and we do not agree with the viewpoint of the Soviet Union that the Articles of the Charter are not applicable to the administration of this Trusteeship by the Administering Authority.

Secondly, with respect to sub-paragraph (b) of the amendment offered by the Soviet Union, I suggest that in this situation too, there has been a change since the last amendment adopted by the Trusteeship Council in that there is being created a legislative council which should have the opportunity to fashion in its way, in measure, the date of self-determination, the period of self-determination that is envisaged by both resolution 1514 (XV) and the appropriate provisions of the Charter. Just as you have a new situation that was present in respect of the Trusteeship of New Guinea, so, too, do you have a similar situation present here; and the consideration of the necessity for target dates, we suggest, is not applicable.

For these reasons, I suggest the amendments offered by the Soviet Union be rejected.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I should like, if I may, to address a question to the representative of the Soviet Union. He has said that his amendment, paragraph 10 (b), is a reaffirmation of a previous conclusion of the Council. I notice that it leaves out one of the factors in last year's recommendation, that is, there was a phrase last year which read, "in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory". Could the representative of the Soviet Union indicate why this particular phrase has been left out of what purports to be a reaffirmation of last year's conclusion?

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In reply to the New Zealand representative, I would like to say that this part of the recommendation adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the Trusteeship Council was omitted by accident. This is simply a mistake, and I would like it to be embodied in the text which is now submitted to the Council.

With regard to the statement of the United States representative, I would like to state that as a result of his answers to the questions put by the Soviet delegation during the questioning period there appeared a glimmer of hope, at least to my delegation, that the United States delegation and the United States had associated themselves with the large number of States which voted for General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). We do not see any contradiction between the Declaration and Article 76 of the Charter. I have no doubt that all the delegations which voted for the Declaration in the General Assembly bore fully in mind the relevant provisions of the Articles of the Charter.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I would like to associate my delegation with some of the remarks made by the United States representative. It seems to us, in the first place, particularly important that since the proposed Soviet amendment is based on a statement of the Administering Authority it should truly reflect that statement. As I said earlier in relation to the discussion on New Guinea, it seems to us to be particularly important that a change has taken place in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It also seems to us to be particularly important that the position of the Administering Authority in this, as in every other Trust Territory, in relation to the Charter should be adequately brought out.

It also seems to us, as I have said before, to be particularly important to stress that in these Trust Territories it is not the undivided prerogative of the Administering Authority to set dates for the ultimate political development of the people of the Territory. We have stressed continually that the voice of the people is the voice that must be heard.

Against that background, I would like to suggest that the words as they appear in sub-paragraph 10 (a) of the Soviet amendment should be amended to read:

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

"The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that the essential elements of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), including its operative paragraphs 2 and 5, when taken in context with Article 76 of the Charter, fully extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

I would ask if my understanding of what the United States representative said in this connexion is correct, since this is attributed to the statement of his delegation.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Would the Australian representative tell me what he means by "the essential elements" of the Declaration. To me, the Declaration as a whole is essential.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): To me, among the essential elements I had in mind are the immediate steps which should be taken in the context of the Declaration itself and the freely expressed wishes of the people themselves.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): Can I take it that paragraph 10 (b) of the Soviet amendment has been amended to include the following words in the third line from the end, "requests the Administering Authority, in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory, to establish such planned dates"? This would remove the element which by accident was left out, and would affect my position on this particular proposal.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have already stated that the omission of this phrase from the text of the Soviet amendment was purely accidental. Of course, one would have to find an appropriate place for the inclusion of this phrase in the text of the amendment. However, I would like to propose that the most appropriate place would be that part which contains the reference to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The amendment would thus state:

"... and again requests the Administering Authority to establish such planned dates in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), in consultation with the representative organs of public opinion in the Territory."

(Mr. Potin, USSR)

I would like to make one more comment. The Australian representative submitted an amendment to the text proposed by the Soviet Union. However, we cannot fail to note that the Australian representative talks about the essential elements of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Does he consider, in particular, such a thing as paragraph 5 to be important or essential? Although in his text he refers to paragraph 5, together with paragraph 2, I must say that for the Soviet delegation the amendments, in particular the first amendment proposed by the Australian representative, are not acceptable because they would mean a retrogression even by comparison with last year. As is well known, the Council spent a lot of time at its twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth sessions in an attempt to find out whether the General Assembly Declaration is acceptable to the Administering Authority, the United States, and whether they consider that the Declaration extends to the Pacific Islands.

(Mr. Potvin, USSR)

I think that it was at the twenty-ninth session of the Council that the representative of the United States replied in the spirit of the amendment which the representative of Australia is now proposing -- in other words, that the essential elements of the Declaration are applied in the Trust Territory.

At the thirtieth session of the Council, as can be proved by reference to the documents, certain changes appeared in the United States position. There was a statement made that the United States recognized that the Declaration extended to the Trust Territory, and the United States even admitted that paragraphs 2 and 5 did extend to the Trust Territory. The United States did add that its definition of this concept also included the fact that Article 76 must be borne in mind in defining the United States position on this point.

Thus I cannot fail to point out that what is now proposed by the representative of Australia is really a step backwards, and for this reason it is unacceptable to the Soviet delegation, and I cannot understand how it could be acceptable to the United States, although I have not heard the United States delegation give its views in this connexion.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I think that this question could be resolved in the following manner. I believe that the Council should assume its responsibility concerning the applicability of the Declaration. Therefore, since the representative of the United States has said that he has not been properly quoted, the Council could say:

"Noting that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including its paragraphs 2 and 5, is fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Then we could proceed with sub-paragraph (b) as amended.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union said that the suggestion of the representative of Australia would constitute a backward step, and I suggest that the representative of the Soviet Union would be in a position to recognise a backward step, but I do not think that it is appropriate here. I think that the best thing for me to do is to read the statement made last year in the Trusteeship Council by the then representative

(Mr. Bates, United States)

of the United States. Thus we may know once and for all what the position of the United States was at that time. The statement to which I refer was concerned with what the representative of the United States said were the essential elements of the resolution:

"... The members of this Council should know that the United States considers that the essential elements of resolution 1514 are applicable to the Trust Territory. Thus we have always insisted upon the view, as stated in operative paragraph 2 of this resolution, that:

"All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

"My Government is taking immediate and continuing steps to stimulate the political development of the Territory in the direction of increased self-government with a view to giving the people of the Territory a free choice with respect to their political future. My Government thus considers that its policy with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is entirely consistent with the main policy recommendations for action contained in resolution 1514." (T/PV.2220, pp. 52-53)

Accordingly, we welcome discussion in this Council of political developments in the Territory and encourage this decision in the context of the principles and criteria set forth in resolution 1514 (XV) and in the relevant parts of the Charter of the United Nations.

I wish to point out that in certain aspects the phraseology of resolution 1514 (XV) is not factually appropriate to the situation in the Trust Territory. For example, the word "colonialism", which implies economic exploitation, is not relevant. Likewise, the wording of paragraph 1, which speaks of "alien subjugation, domination and exploitation" is completely inappropriate. When the representative of Liberia asked about essential elements it was, I think, in line with what the representative of the United States said last year, namely, that there were certain parts of the resolution which I have itemized which we consider inappropriate in its application to the Trust Territory.

During the course of the debate, the representative of the Soviet Union asked the representative of the United States point blank whether the United States delegation accepted -- as it had accepted paragraph 2 -- paragraph 5 of the resolution. The representative of the United States replied in the affirmative, stating that his statement was to be accepted in conjunction with the appropriate provisions of the Charter, and particularly, Article 76. This, I think, clarifies the situation.

I really believe that, in view of the record, there is no need for this resolution at all, and I think that attempting to vote on the original draft resolution or upon the amendments suggested, or upon the other suggestions that have been made, will only cloud the statement that has been made by the delegation of the United States. For that reason, I suggest that this part of the amendment offered by the representative of the Soviet Union should be voted down. I have already indicated, for reasons previously expressed, that I thought the second sub-paragraph should be voted down as well.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I shall vote against paragraph 10 (a) and in favour of paragraph 10 (b) as amended.

I believe that if the conclusions of the Council ended with three paragraphs -- that is, paragraph 10 (b) of the amendment and the existing paragraphs 38 and 39 -- we would have a very good balance setting out the whole position affecting the Territory.

In paragraph 10 (b) I find two words that cause me a little difficulty. The first is in the third line from the bottom in the phrase "such planned dates". This may be a quibble, but a planned date seems to me to be an unnecessary phrase. The words "such dates" seem to me to be adequate.

The other word is in the line above: "again requests". I prefer "again" to be deleted.

Therefore, if it were possible, I should like to have a separate vote, in paragraph 10 (b), on the word "again" and on the word "planned". As I say, I shall vote against paragraph 10 (a), in favour of 10 (b) as amended, and in favour of paragraphs 38 and 39 of the proposals of the Drafting Committee.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I would not like to vote for a paragraph on which there is some misunderstanding as to the correct quotation. On the other hand, my delegation opposes the statement that the Declaration does extend to the Trust Territory. If the Council is willing to take this responsibility in that regard, I should have to abstain from voting on paragraph 10 (a).

As to paragraph 10 (b) as amended to include the words of the former text that was adopted, my delegation will vote in favour, but I think that the word "planned" should be retained since it occurs in a quotation.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think that what was said a few moments ago by the representative of the United States simply confirms the point of view put forward by the Soviet delegation. That is my first comment.

My second is that, if we look carefully at the text of the proposed draft conclusions and recommendations, we will see in many paragraphs references to statements made by the Administering Authority on this or that point. Therefore, I cannot fail to note that the reluctance of the United States representative to allow quotations from his own words, on a question which is of extreme importance to our discussion, is most odd and difficult to explain.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I dislike intensely to prolong this conversation. I agree with the representative of Liberia that it serves no useful purpose to attempt to quote a member of the Council and to put that quotation in a formal form, as the representative of the Soviet Union is attempting to do. If it will serve any useful purpose -- and I still think that that portion of the resolution should be voted down -- may I quote my statement from the verbatim record:

"To continue, if I may: yesterday, the representative of the Soviet Union alluded to my opening statement, in which I had made reference to resolution 1514 (XV), and he directed a question to me as to the position taken by my Government with respect to paragraph 5 of the same resolution. In reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, may I say that my Government supports paragraph 5 of the resolution, and that it should be pointed out that we interpret the resolution and assume it to be read in context with the Charter of the United Nations, and specifically with respect to Article 76 of the Charter, which I read yesterday..."

I then cited the relevant portion of the Charter, and continued:

"In so far as paragraph 5 limits that choice to independence, we think it is incompatible with the provisions of the Charter. I think the best example of what has occurred under Article 76, as a possibility of what may occur with respect to the Trust Territories, is to cite the example of Togo, which affiliated with an existing State; and it may be that, when the

time comes for self-determination, the people of the Trust Territory may want to affiliate themselves with an existing State, rather than opt for independence, although independence, we say, is still a choice. The point we make is that, in the exercise of self-determination, the choice should be the people's to decide whether they want independence or whether they want to affiliate with an existing State, or to state what their preference is." (T/PV.1211, pages 2 and 3-5)

I suggest that this explanation of my position -- namely, that paragraph 5, that paragraph 2, that resolution 1514, is to be read in context with the Articles of the Charter -- is my position, and it serves no useful purpose for the representative of the Soviet Union to try to embody that position in the brief words that he has placed in that amendment. The amendment should be rejected.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I want to clarify one point. The quotation, as stated in this amendment, does serve a useful purpose. But what I am saying is that, if the representative of the United States says that this is not an exact quotation of what he said, then I find myself not in a position to vote for it.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the amendment to sub-paragraph (a) submitted by the representative of Australia.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I am becoming a bit confused. This amendment is, of course, based on our understanding of the position of the United States on this matter, since it was begun by the Council's noting the statement of the Administering Authority, which is the United States. If my understanding of the attitude of the United States is correctly expressed in that amendment, I am quite happy to have that amendment stand. But, if that is not a proper statement of the attitude of the Administering Authority, then I will withdraw the statement -- and I will vote, for similar reasons, against the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): If I may state my point of view most succinctly, my delegation does not want to have its viewpoint interpreted by the delegation of the Soviet Union in the brief context of sub-paragraph (a), as proposed by the Soviet Union, because we do not think that that statement correctly sets forth the viewpoint of the United States. I have several times made that viewpoint clear. I have read from the statement as it appears in the verbatim record. I suggest that sub-paragraph (a), as proposed by the Soviet Union, be rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I was struggling with my own amendment, not with the proposal put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union, and I asked -- since this is based on the statement of the Administering Authority -- whether this does adequately reflect the statement made by the Administering Authority. It is completely dependent on that. If, in the view of the United States delegation, this does not adequately reflect its views, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I have lost contact with the amendment offered by the representative of Australia as of this time, and I would request that the amendment be read in order that I may be in a position to answer his question.

The PRESIDENT: I have also lost contact with the amendment, and I shall ask the Secretary to read it.

The SECRETARY: The amended sub-paragraph (a) would read as follows:

"The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that the essential elements of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), including its paragraphs 2 and 5, when taken in context with Article 76 of the Charter, are fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

The PRESIDENT: That is the amendment proposed by the representative of Australia to the proposal of the Soviet representative.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I would say that the representative of Australia has done much to correct the initial error in the amendment offered by the representative of the Soviet Union, and I would say that it generally is the reflection of the viewpoint of the delegation of the United States.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, I shall ask the Council to consider the amendment proposed by the representative of Australia to sub-paragraph (a) of the proposal submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union. The proposal of the Soviet Union was that two new paragraphs be inserted before paragraph 33: sub-paragraph (a) would constitute the first such paragraph, and sub-paragraph (b) the second. What we have before us now is the amendment to sub-paragraph (a) submitted by the Australian delegation, which the Secretary of the Council has read. We shall now vote on that Australian amendment.

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Will the Secretary read out paragraph (a) of the amendment as a whole as amended by the representative of Australia?

The SECRETARY: "The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that the essential elements of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), including its paragraphs 2 and 5, when taken in context with Article 76 of the Charter, is fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

There was one vote in favour and one against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 50 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): If the amendment is put to reflect the fact that that is what the Administering Authority says, it is a different thing. But as far as my delegation is concerned, the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples applies fully to all Trust Territories.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Liberia, but we are now engaged in the vote and I would be glad if we could take a vote on this question and dispose of this paragraph.

The paragraph as amended was rejected by 1 vote to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up paragraph (b) as it appears in the document and as it is amended. The representative of New Zealand has asked for a separate vote on the word "again" in the fourth line and the word "planned" in the fifth line. Will the Secretary read the paragraph as amended?

The SECRETARY: The paragraph reads:

"The Council reaffirms its recommendation at its twenty-ninth session concerning the necessity of establishing 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, and again requests the Administering Authority to establish such planned dates in the light

of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), in consultation with the representatives organs of public opinion in the Territory."

The PRESIDENT: We shall first take a separate vote on the word "again" in the fourth line of paragraph (b) and the word "planned" in the fifth line of paragraph (b).

The result of the vote was 2 votes in favour, 4 against with 2 abstentions.

The words "again" and "planned" were eliminated from the text.

Paragraph (b) as revised was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 33 of document T/L.1962 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 39 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 4 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The report as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: It has not been possible to circulate the text of the individual observations on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. May it be taken that the Council adopts these observations as approved by each delegation and will communicate them to the Secretariat. The observations will be inserted in the Council's report under the relevant headings.

Mr. KIANG (China): Do I understand that we have already approved the report? If that is the case, I have something to say.

The PRESIDENT: I took it that the report had been adopted by the Council.

Mr. KIANG (China): I think that with the approval of the report, the way is clear for me to make a brief comment on what the representative of Liberia had said in reference to the Drafting Committee. If I understood the representative of Liberia correctly, she questioned the attitude of the Drafting Committee. I think that I cannot let it pass without a brief comment from us.

The PRESIDENT: I did not get through with the statement I was making concerning the adoption of the report and the individual observations of the members of the Council. I will give the floor to the representative of China when I have completed that statement.

I should like to repeat what I said, that it has not been possible to circulate the text of the individual observations on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. May it be taken that the Council adopts these observations as approved by each delegation and will communicate them to the Secretariat. The observations will be inserted in the Council's report under the relevant headings. If I hear no objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Thus the chapter on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is approved as a whole. Before I ask the Council to take up the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union (T/L.1059 and T/L.1069), I will give the floor to the representative of China.

Mr. HUI (China): The representative of Liberia also said that there were too many expressions of commendation in the report. While we were voting, I tried to search for all those expressions of commendations; and I found none. But I did find three expressions of regret in the report. If the representative of Liberia were present at the meetings of the Drafting Committee and observed the Committee in action, I think she would not have said what she said today in the Council. I think that what we did in the Drafting Committee, and any recommendations and conclusions formulated in the draft report, should be considered as a credit to the Council. And the votes registered on the recommendations, including the votes of the representative of Liberia, would show that the Drafting Committee had not failed in its duty, which had in fact been discharged faithfully and seriously.

I can assure the representative of Liberia that I will certainly applaud, and in a very energetic manner, each time the representative of Liberia makes her valuable contribution to the work of the Council.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): As the representative of China has said, by the vote of Liberia there was no real opposition to the draft report. But there are certain terminologies which probably may not have been expressed as words of commendation but meant the same thing, and used excessively they detract from the real value of the report.

Mr. KIANG (China): All that I wish to say now is that the credit should go where it is due and where it belongs.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the two draft resolutions contained in documents T/L.1059 and T/L.1069. The representative of the Soviet Union has already introduced the draft resolutions before the Council and the necessity does not arise to repeat that introduction.

Mr. KOZIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not intend in fact to reintroduce the draft resolutions, but I would like to point that each of them must be considered separately under the appropriate items of our agenda. I am simply making this comment in order to point out that we cannot consider them within the framework of the same items of the agenda. For example, the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1069 comes under item 6 of the agenda, whereas the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1059 comes under item 1 of the agenda of today's meeting.

The PRESIDENT: It was for the sake of trying to expedite the work of the Council that I had hoped we would conclude the consideration of the two draft resolutions this afternoon. The Soviet representative has correctly pointed out that the draft resolutions come under different items of our agenda for today. We shall deal first with the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1059 which falls under item 1. Are there any comments from members of the Council on this draft resolution?

Mr. WELLS (United States of America): I would say that the resolution is most inappropriate. It is predicated on the assumption that the resolution of the Trusteeship Council had approved a method of payment based on arbitration. During the course of the discussions of the Council, I read the actual wording of the resolution, and pointed out that there was a qualifying condition in the wording of the resolution, to the effect that, in the event the Administering Authority failed to obtain the approval of the claimants, arbitration should be resorted to.

That situation has not been reached as yet; the method of payment has not yet been approved by Congress although it is presently under consideration; and it has not yet been placed before the inhabitants of the Territory for their rejection or for their approval.

Therefore, I suggest that this draft resolution is not appropriate, and it should be rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I was concerned about this draft resolution for similar reasons, and we did turn to the previous resolution to which it refers. If you examine paragraph 2 of this draft resolution as it stands, you will find a series of resolutions spelt out there, including resolution 2135 (XXIX), of 12 July.

It seemed to us, in the light of that, that the repetition of resolution 2135 (XXIX) in the context in which it appears in paragraph 3 was unnecessary; and it seemed to us also, recalling the information which was placed before this Council by the representative of the United States and the Special Representative, that this matter, as we understood it, was before the courts. That being so, the matter was under decision, and the matter of arbitration, as referred to in the previous resolution of the Trusteeship Council which forms the subject of this, was an inappropriate reference. Therefore, we would vote against this proposed amendment.

Mr. DZINK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand the position adopted by the representative of the Administering Authority on this point, and also the position of another Administering Authority represented here in the Trusteeship Council.

We realize, naturally, that, if the delegations will all vote against the draft resolution submitted by my delegation at this stage, simultaneously they will vote against the resolution adopted last year by the Trusteeship Council on this point. I would like to remind the representatives that, in the final drafting of the resolution passed last year by the Trusteeship Council, there was a wording included as a result of the proposal by the representatives of Bolivia and India. The Council, last year, agreed upon the need for having recourse to the procedure of arbitration. Nevertheless, the representatives of the Administering Authorities did not intend to bear this in mind. I would like to use the words of the representative of Australia and say that, really, the whole mass -- or, at least, many -- of the previous resolutions adopted by the Council at its session, starting with the twenty-fourth, are enumerated here, beginning with 1959. Four years have gone by, but in spite of the adoption of all these resolutions, in spite of the fact that a new resolution has been adopted at the twenty-sixth session -- another resolution was passed last year by the Trusteeship Council -- the Administering Authority has not condescended to do what the Trusteeship Council proposes it should do. Last year, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the Trusteeship Council passed a very correct decision proposing to the United States a way out of the situation. Nevertheless, this year, we hear that the complaints of inhabitants of the Trust Territory have not been satisfied, and that the question seems to have got bogged down, in certain legislative instances, in the United States; and that the inhabitants of the Trust Territory have no remedy left but to wait further.

The aims of this draft resolution are to propose to the Administering Authority that it accelerate solution of this question, of course, referring to all the resolutions adopted in the past. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to point out in this case that, at this session, as well, the United States has been adopting an attitude which shows quite clearly its unwillingness to comply with the decisions of the Trusteeship Council. The United States delegation is even afraid to have any mention made by the Trusteeship Council to the effect that the Administering Authority should comply with decisions passed here.

The question has been going on since 1959. It has gone through many stages; and, this year, nothing new is proposed: the only thing proposed in this new legislation before the Congress of the United States is the following -- I will quote the words of the representative of the United States: "... to give an opportunity to institute proceedings in United States courts". So nothing is being said about when the question will be decided or solved; there are no prospects for solution of this question. The question has been referred to the United States courts -- a fact against which the Soviet Union protested last year, in a most serious way.

Therefore, from the comments made by the representative of the United States, we can only deduce that they are attempting, this year again, to evade the attention of the Council. The Council cannot be satisfied with this abnormal situation, and cannot fail to pass another recommendation in order to point out to the Administering Authority that there are several resolutions that are not being implemented by the United States and that the question has been under consideration for some time, without any positive results.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): As I look at the draft resolution and refer to the particular portion which requests its implementation, I really do not see the difference between the views of the United States and those of the Soviet Union, although, from their explanations, they would appear to be different. In this resolution, in its pertinent paragraph 2, recommendation is made that, in the absence of agreement of the inhabitants of Kwajalein to the procedure now contemplated by the Administering Authority for the settlement of the question of compensation to the inhabitants of Kwajalein, that the question should be settled without delay by arbitration, as recommended by the Visiting Mission, with procedure for arbitration being agreed upon by the parties.

Because of the delay, the Visiting Mission recommended that there should be arbitration subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us, which calls upon the Administering Authority to expedite decision in the matter, in keeping with the above-mentioned recommendation of the Trusteeship Council at its twenty-ninth session. That is the recommendation. Where is the difference?

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

It seems to me, from the arguments of both sides, there are two different aspects to the question. The essential thing is that it be implemented -- and implemented soon. If you cannot proceed other than by arbitration, you accept arbitration; you cannot proceed without it. That is the way I look at it.

Mr. McARTHUR (Australia): We share the concern about this matter which has been expressed in statements to the Council on the subject by the delegation of the Soviet Union and other delegations. Would the following amendment meet the position of the Soviet Union delegation: to leave paragraph 1 as it stands in document T/L.1059, leave paragraph 2 as it stands, delete paragraph 3 -- which we feel to be unnecessary -- and reword paragraph 4 as follows: "Urges the Administering Authority to expedite a decision in the matter in keeping with the concern expressed in the above-mentioned resolutions of the Trusteeship Council"?

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that in addition to the decisions already read out by the representative of Liberia the Council, in resolution 2135 (XXIX), among other things expressed the hope -- when faced with a very powerful Administering Authority, the Council can only express a hope -- that "the Administering Authority will be able to report satisfactory settlement of this question at the thirtieth session of the Council".

When the United States representative and the Special Representative made their introductory statements at the beginning of the debate on this Trust Territory, I believe that the United States representative said that a solution of this question would start on 11 July. Did he not mention that date? I am not absolutely certain that he did, but I think so. I should merely like to have some confirmation. I make these references in order to demonstrate once again that on three occasions at previous sessions the Council has expressed its alarm about this situation. It has recommended specific steps to the Administering Authority, has proposed a way out of the problem and has expressed the hope that at the thirtieth session the Trusteeship Council would receive information on a satisfactory settlement.

The present situation is perfectly well known to everyone here, and the Soviet delegation will not revert to the question.

As regards the amendment suggested by the representative of Australia, unfortunately the proposal to delete paragraph 3 of the Soviet draft resolution is not acceptable to us. We should not close our eyes to the existing situation. It is a fact that not only resolution 2135 (XXIX) but also resolutions 2006 (XXIV) and 2063 (XXVI), of 1959 and 1960, respectively, have still not been implemented. For those reasons, I propose that paragraph 3 should be retained.

The Soviet delegation also prefers the original text of the last paragraph of the draft resolution.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I do not propose to detain the Council; the hour is late, and the Council wants to dispose of these matters. I wish only to make the following brief comment.

First, the Soviet representative referred to a date. I think that the date he had in mind was 11 June, and it related to the date on which the Senate Committee on Insular Affairs was to consider the bill that had been passed by the House of Representatives touching upon these claims. The Congress is considering the matter, and we have every hope that appropriate legislation will be enacted in the very near future.

Secondly, the representative of the Soviet Union failed to point out what I had said in the course of the debate about the manner in which these claims would be paid -- namely, that it was proposed under the bill that representatives of the United States Court of Claims would go to the Islands in order to conduct the hearings of claims of inhabitants. Thus, the hardships envisaged by the representative of the Soviet Union would not in fact exist.

Thirdly, I should like to address myself to the amendment offered by the representative of Australia. I think that the amendment is a good one, and I propose to vote for it. If it is adopted, I propose to abstain from the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. POTER (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should simply like to say that whether the Court sits in United States territory or in the Trust Territory itself, it will still be a United States court. Thus, as we have already pointed out, the inhabitants will not be in a privileged position at all.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Australia has proposed an amendment to the draft resolution (T/L.1059) submitted by the Soviet delegation. The amendment would delete paragraph 5 of the draft resolution and reword paragraph 4 as follows: "Urges the Administering Authority to expedite a decision in the matter in keeping with the concern expressed in the above-mentioned resolutions of the Trusteeship Council". I shall now put that amendment to the vote.

Mr. KIANG (China): Before the amendment is put to the vote, I should like to explain my delegation's vote.

If the draft resolution in document T/L.1059, which is dated 13 June 1963, had been put to the vote before the Council had adopted certain recommendations today, my delegation might have voted for it. But with the adoption of the recommendations contained in paragraph 32 of the report, I see no point in having another resolution on the same subject.

Miss EROOKS (Liberia): I cannot vote for the deletion of a reference to a recommendation of the Trusteeship Council which has not been fulfilled. It is a fact that this recommendation has not been fulfilled. To vote in favour of the amendment of the representative of Australia would mean to vote in favour of the elimination of a reference to a recommendation of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: I would remind members of the Council that they should request permission to speak at this time only in explanation of vote. We have already had a lengthy discussion of this matter, and I do not think that there is any need to continue it.

Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the comments just made, I should like to point out that the Soviet delegation submitted this draft on this question on 13 June 1963; then the Drafting Committee's report was submitted here on 21 June 1963. So any statement that this need not be put to the vote is not at all justified and is not in keeping with the rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now put to the vote the amendments proposed by the representative of Australia.

The amendments were adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL (T/L.1065)

The PRESIDENT: We now take up the draft resolution in document T/L.1069, which pertains to this item. This was introduced this morning by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KING (United Kingdom): I just have a short comment to make on this draft resolution. I make it with diffidence as I have not been very long in the United Nations and I am not as familiar with its workings and procedures as a great many people in this Council. But it is difficult for me to understand the need for this draft resolution. I wonder why the representative of the Soviet Union has introduced it, because it seems to me that the Security Council, which will receive a copy of the report of the Trusteeship Council, is well able to decide for itself whether or not it wishes to take any action about anything at all, and when. It does not seem to me to be for the Trusteeship Council or any other body to recommend to the Security Council what it should do.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I do not want to comment on the first part of the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom with regard to his familiarity with the United Nations and its workings. Of course this falls beyond my own terms of reference or competence. Nevertheless, I should like to point out firstly, and if I am not right, I would like the representatives to correct me, from 1947 when the United States signed the Trusteeship Agreement with the representatives of the United Nations, the situation on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has not been considered by the Security Council although the Security Council is that organ in the United Nations which has final and supreme responsibility for the Pacific Islands.

Secondly, in various bodies of the United Nations for a relatively long period of time now, in particular in the Fourth Committee, many delegations have raised the question that it is necessary in the long run to consider the question of the Pacific Islands in the Security Council because if this is not done the Administering Authority, in view of the membership of the Trusteeship Council, will have its hands completely free with regard to the Trust Territory.

These are two factors which are self-evident and which many members cannot fail to draw attention to in the past and in the present. Moreover, as I have already had an opportunity to say in one of my previous numerous statements today, the United States has already stated that it does not object to the question of the Pacific Islands being discussed in the Security Council; as Mr. Bingham has said in the Fourth Committee, it is prepared to discuss this question at any time. We all know that the Security Council deals with very important and complicated questions, and possibly by comparison with colonial problems in Africa the problem of the situation in the Pacific Islands is not so important, at least, it might appear. But it cannot fail to appear strange that for so many years -- sixteen years -- which have elapsed since the signing of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Security Council has not discussed this matter of the Pacific Islands at any of its meetings. We think that the Trusteeship Council should speak out on this and state its attitude clearly.

That is why the Soviet delegation has submitted this draft resolution which is now before you.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): During the course of the debate, on many occasions the representative of the Soviet Union made clear that in his viewpoint the Trusteeship Council does not perform a very useful function; and I think that this draft resolution is submitted pursuant to that viewpoint. I think there is implicit in this draft resolution the idea that there has been some sort of a gross mismanagement by the Administering Authority without having been able to point out that such mismanagement exists. I should point out that such an inference is totally and patently far from the actual facts as has been indicated by the report that has just been adopted. I think that such a draft resolution can only serve to demean further the function and the work of the Trusteeship Council. It is the latest example of the high disregard that the Soviet delegation has shown for the Trusteeship System. It completely overlooks the shining record of the Trusteeship Council in having brought to independence a number of territories which now grace proudly the membership of the United Nations.

Secondly, I think this is the latest example of the attitude of the Soviet Union in terms of the Security Council. It used to be said that all roads lead to Rome. In terms of the Soviet Union's viewpoint, as has been indicated from time to time, all roads lead to the Security Council.

There is a great deal of work for the Trusteeship Council still to do. It is doing it. It is doing it well. There is no occasion for the work of the Trusteeship Council to be referred to the Security Council. As a matter of fact, Article 85 of the Charter provides:

"The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas."

Because the Security Council has delegated this initial responsibility to the Trusteeship Council, the Security Council, if it wishes to, could recall it; but certainly, without such a recall, I think that an action referring it to the Security Council by the Trusteeship Council is not warranted at all.

Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): I also find myself mystified by this proposal; the Security Council has delegated its functions in respect of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Trusteeship Council in the past, but this is not to say that the Security Council cannot recall the matter back within its own orbit if it considered that the trust was being abused. That it is not being abused is patently clear, I think, from the report we have just adopted.

The matter could also be raised in the Security Council under Chapter VI, which states that:

"The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might ...give rise to a dispute."

I think there is no reason for referring the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Security Council under Chapter VI, which deals with the pacific settlement of disputes, since no dispute exists.

The Security Council could also consider the matter of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under Chapter VII, "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression". There has been no suggestion that there is a threat to the peace, breaches of the peace or acts of aggression in the case of these Islands.

For these reasons it seems to me that this strange proposal does not fit at all into the normal work of this Council. If the Soviet Union itself is dissatisfied with the carrying out by the United States of its trust in the Pacific Territories, and it has made clear that it is dissatisfied, then, of course, it does have the right to raise the matter in the Security Council. That is its right as a member of the Security Council, and it could do so at any time. What this draft resolution is proposing is that the members of the Trusteeship Council should associate themselves in complaining, in effect, to the Security Council that the trust is not being adequately discharged. That, I think, would go against the whole trend of the debate and the whole tenor of the report.

Mr. FORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): When the United States representative talks here about the latest examples of Soviet disrespect for the Trusteeship Council and to the effect that

all roads lead to Rome, I think that if not the members of the Council, at least other Members in the United Nations will realize that these are not examples of disrespect on the part of the Soviet Union towards the Trusteeship Council, but rather examples of disrespect by the representatives of the United States to their own words and to words pronounced by other representatives of the United States on other occasions.

The statement of the representative of the United States which I quoted earlier today and the statement he has just made are diametrically opposed to each other. I cannot fail to point out that the talk about the importance the Soviet Union attaches to the Security Council and the fact that this is merely an example of its attitude towards the Trusteeship Council is simply a screen.

In regard to this, for many years we have seen a certain fear by United States representatives to go beyond the Trusteeship Council into the Security Council for a discussion of the question of the Pacific Islands. This was so during the time when the United States tested nuclear weapons in the area, and now we see it again when the period is approaching when the people of the Trust Territory must have an opportunity to speak definitely about their future. This is a decisive period in the history of the Pacific Islands, and this is the period when the United States is using devious subterfuges to keep the unbridled control which they have over the population of the Trust Territory. Therefore, it is difficult to understand the statement of the United States representative that the Soviet Union is pursuing its own aims in proposing that the Trusteeship Council should recommend that the Security Council consider this question at one of its meetings.

If the United States representative is not afraid to have this question considered in the Security Council, and if the United States considers that the situation in the Trust Territory is so superb, how can we explain their great desire to escape from an inspection of their affairs by other United Nations bodies? What is the United States afraid of? Why is the United States delegation attempting to cover up by making references to this or that position of the Soviet Union with regard to this United body? It is rather amusing when a perfectly responsible representative states, on the one hand, that everything is perfectly all right, but, on the other hand, they will not go into it. How can we explain this ambivalent attitude?

The questions of other Trust Territories, particularly Nauru and New Guinea, are considered by the General Assembly, as well as by the Trusteeship Council. I would like to stress that they are so discussed annually. There is quite a different situation with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We are not proposing now that the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands should be discussed annually by the Security Council. However, sixteen years have passed, and in those sixteen years the Security Council has not once considered the question of the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, regardless of whether or not the United States is performing its functions properly. For this reason, we say that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is an exception to the general rule, and it is an exception that is quite unwarranted.

With regard to the question of why the Soviet Union, as a permanent member of the Security Council, does not propose to the Security Council that it consider this matter, we would like to make this reply to the representative of New Zealand. We know to which organs of the United Nations we belong, and we know what our task is. We know what we are going to do in each of these bodies. We are a member of the Security Council and also a member of the Trusteeship Council, and as a full member of the Trusteeship Council we have a perfect right to submit any proposal we consider necessary. If in the Trusteeship Council, with its present membership, the majority belongs to those delegations who will perhaps vote against my draft resolution in a few minutes, this will not surprise anyone here in the Trusteeship Council or later in the General Assembly, when the Members learn of this decision and learn that the United States prefers to disavow certain of its representatives who make incautious statements at certain sessions of the General Assembly.

I would like, on behalf of my delegation, to state that the draft resolution now submitted to the Council is important, and I would like to stress once again that the time has come for the Security Council to discuss the question of the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In this connexion, I would like to repeat that we are surprised by the attitude adopted on this point by the representative of the United States and also by other representatives here on the Trusteeship Council.

130

The PRESIDENT: We have now been sitting for about six hours and all of us have our limits of physical and mental endurance. That includes the interpreters, the translators, the précis writers and all others, seen and unseen, who are engaged in the work of the Trusteeship Council. I would respectfully suggest to the Council that we act on the draft resolution now and listen tomorrow to any explanations of vote.

Mr. YATES (United States of America): I respect your point of view, Mr. President. I wish only to make a comment regarding the challenge, that was hurled in the direction of the delegation which I am privileged and honoured to represent, as to whether or not we have abjured a statement by a former representative of the United States. The answer is no; and I think that that answer is obvious from the statement that was made by that representative. He stated that he had no fear of the matter being considered by the Security Council, and the representative of the Soviet Union takes off from that statement into a flight of fancy, goes into orbit, and suggests that the Security Council is the place for such consideration.

I suggest that the argument of the representative of the Soviet Union reinforces the point which I made previously, that he does not think that the Trusteeship Council should continue to consider this question. I think that is also obvious from the fact that he believes it ought to go to the Security Council -- a point which he made in his conclusion.

I agree with you, Mr. President, that the time has come to vote on the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I appeal to members of the Council to delay until tomorrow any explanations of vote which representatives may wish to give.

Mr. FOTEN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I fear that I shall draw down the wrath not only of the President and the members of the Council, but also of all the personnel serving this meeting, but I would like to propose that we adopt a different procedure.

(Mr. Fotin, USSR)

Could we not so organize our work as to finish today our consideration of the two remaining items on our agenda so that neither you nor the members of the Council may be loaded down tomorrow? I should like to have your opinion, Mr. President, but the delegation of the Soviet Union believes that this would be the best procedure to follow.

The PRESIDENT: I would suggest to the Council that we conclude our work tomorrow rather than this evening. There are other matters to be taken up tomorrow, and if the Council wishes to continue its work this evening I must beg to be excused and ask the Vice-President to preside.

I would appeal to the Council to agree to meet tomorrow in order to complete our work. If I hear no objection, the meeting will be adjourned.

The meeting rose at 8.05 p.m.