



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 26 April 1960,
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Telegram of congratulations to the Republic of Togo</i>	51
<i>Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (continued)</i>	51
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (continued)</i>	52
<i>Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority (continued)</i>	53

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

Telegram of congratulations to the Republic of Togo

1. The PRESIDENT reminded the members of the Council that 27 April would mark an auspicious occasion in the annals of the Trusteeship Council: namely, the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Togo. He proposed that the following cable should be sent to the Prime Minister of Togo:

"On behalf of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, I have the honour to transmit warmest congratulations to the Government and people of Togo on the occasion of the attainment of independence by their country and to address to them sincerest wishes for prosperity in the future."

It was so decided.

Report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1520)
(continued)*

[Agenda item 2]

2. The PRESIDENT proposed that if there were no objections the Council should adopt the report (T/1520).

3. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the Council's attention to the fact that the Secretary-General's report on credentials did not mention the legitimate representatives of the People's Republic of China. Mr. Oberemko considered it his duty to state that only a representative appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China could be the legitimate representative of China in the Trusteeship Council or in any other organ of the United Nations. For that reason he wished to propose that the credentials of the persons who did not represent China and who were unlawfully occupying the seat of China in the Trusteeship Council should not be recognized. He therefore submitted an amendment to the President's proposal, calling for the addition of the words "with the exception of the credentials of the persons enumerated under the heading 'China' in the annex to document T/1520".

4. Mr. KIANG (China) stated that the Government of the Republic of China which he represented, was the only freely and legitimately constituted Government of China which could speak for the Chinese people in the United Nations.

5. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that, for reasons which were well known, the United States opposed any proposal designed to exclude representatives of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Chinese Communist régime. He therefore proposed the following motion:

"The Trusteeship Council decides not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth session any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

6. In his delegation's view, under the terms of rule 63 of the rules of procedure, that motion, as the furthest removed, had priority over the proposal made by the USSR representative.

7. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that his delegation had not made a proposal but had introduced an amendment to the proposal made by the President. He therefore considered that that amendment should be put to the vote first, under rule 61 of the rules of procedure.

8. The PRESIDENT held that the United States proposal should be put to the vote before the USSR proposal, as being furthest removed from the subject under consideration. If, however, there were any objections to that procedure, he would ask the Council to decide by vote which of the two proposals had priority.

9. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that in his opinion the USSR representative had not made a proposal but had simply moved an amendment to the President's original proposal.

* Resumed from the 1051st meeting.

10. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) thought that the qualification of "furthest removed" could apply only to different amendments to one and the same proposal. What the Council had before it was two separate proposals: the President's proposal, to which the USSR representative had proposed an amendment, and the United States proposal.

11. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) considered that as there was disagreement on the point the Council should vote forthwith to decide which of the proposals should be given priority.

12. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that in his opinion the President's proposal was not a proposal in the true sense of the word: it was merely a suggestion that the Council should adopt the Secretary-General's report. It seemed to him that the Council could either adopt or not adopt the Secretary-General's report; it could not amend it. Hence there was only one valid proposal before the Council—the United States proposal—and he thought that the Council should vote upon that.

13. Mr. KIANG (China) fully supported the Australian representative's views. He reminded the Council that a similar situation had arisen at the twenty-fourth session of the Council and it had then been decided (984th meeting) that an amendment to the report of the Secretary-General was not admissible.

14. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) proposed formally that his delegation's proposal should have priority over the President's proposal and the USSR motion.

15. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that if the Council took a decision on that procedural proposal and then proceeded to vote on the United States substantive proposal, it would be tantamount to prejudging the action the Council might take on the Secretary-General's report, since the United States substantive proposal related to one part of that report. He therefore objected to any such procedure and would be constrained to vote against the proposal for priority and against the substantive proposal should that be put to the vote subsequently.

16. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States delegation's proposal that under rule 63 of the rules of procedure its proposal should have priority over the President's proposal and the motion of the USSR.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 4.

17. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States proposal that the Trusteeship Council should decide not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth session any proposal to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat the representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 4.

18. U THANT (Burma) wished to state his delegation's position before a vote was taken on the Secretary-General's report on credentials. The Government of the Union of Burma recognized only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and therefore, in the view of his delegation, the credentials of the Republic of China were not valid. His delegation would vote in favour of the adoption of the Secretary-General's report on credentials, but its vote should not be construed as acceptance of all the implications in the report; it was for that reason that

his delegation had voted against the proposal for priority moved by the United States representative and against the United States substantive proposal.

19. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that the credentials of a member of the Trusteeship Council or of any other organ of the United Nations were issued individually by the Government concerned. The rules of procedure referred to credentials, not of the Council collectively, but of its members. Hence any member of the Council was entitled to ask for a separate vote under an appropriate rule of procedure on the credentials of a particular representative. The Government of India recognized only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the Government of that country and considered that that Government alone was competent to accredit representatives to the Trusteeship Council and to other organs of the United Nations. His delegation's vote in favour of the Secretary-General's report as a whole was therefore subject to that reservation.

20. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) stated that the Government of the United Arab Republic recognized the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and had steadfastly adhered to the view that only that Government was legitimately entitled to be represented in the organs of the United Nations. For that reason his delegation's affirmative vote for the report would be subject to a reservation regarding that point.

21. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation was not in agreement with the arbitrary procedure that had been followed, by which a majority in the Council, contrary to the provisions of the rules of procedure, had impeded a vote on the Soviet amendment. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the report as a whole.

22. He proposed that a separate vote should be taken on the credentials of the persons mentioned under the heading "China" in the Secretary-General's report. His delegation would vote against the approval of those credentials.

23. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that in the view of his delegation it was unnecessary and inappropriate to vote separately on parts of the report on credentials. He therefore requested that, in accordance with the provisions of rule 60 of the rules of procedure, a vote should be taken on the proposal of the USSR representative. His delegation would vote against it.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 4.

The report of the Secretary-General on credentials (T/1520) was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (T/1511, T/1513, T/L.964) (continued)

[Agenda item 3 (f)]

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

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY
AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINIS-
TERING AUTHORITY (continued)

Political advancement (continued)

24. U THANT (Burma) asked whether the question of shifting the Territorial headquarters from Guam and of placing the entire Territory under a single civilian authority had been discussed at the annual meeting of the Inter-District Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner.

25. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative. None of the delegates had seemed anxious to have the headquarters shifted at the present time, for they had felt that the decision could best be made later, as the district congresses evolved. The delegates from Saipan had showed no particular desire to have the administration transferred from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior and the delegates from the other districts had felt that the matter was for the Saipanese group to decide.

26. U THANT (Burma), noting the statement on page 20 of the Administering Authority's annual report ^{1/} that the Inter-District Advisory Committee was one of the preliminary steps towards the eventual development of an elected Territorial council, asked in what way the functions of the council would be different from those of the existing Committee.

27. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that whereas the Committee was composed of two members from each district, elected by the district congresses, which in turn were elected by the communities they represented, it was envisaged that it would evolve into an inter-district congress whose members would be elected direct by the voters in each district. That body would deal with the problems concerning the Territory as a whole and those affecting the relations between two or more districts, leaving the district congresses to consider only matters of local interest. At the Committee's recent meeting there had been some discussion of the possibility that within the next two years a change might be introduced whereby the members of the Committee would be elected direct by the people of each district.

28. U THANT (Burma) asked whether the Committee's proceedings were recorded and, if so, whether they were made known to the people throughout the Territory.

29. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the proceedings were recorded and were distributed to the leaders and local congressmen in each district in the language spoken there. In addition each delegation reported to the district congress on its return home.

30. U THANT (Burma) was glad to note the statement on page 27 of the annual report that the Micronesian Title and Pay Plan provided equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, race, nationality, religion or class.

He asked whether there were any organizations affiliating the members of the civil service with people engaged in the same type of work in other countries or territories.

31. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that there were no organized labour unions as such, although there were credit unions and other groupings of Micronesian employees in each district.

32. U THANT (Burma) asked whether any Micronesian civil servants or groups of civil servants had ever expressed the desire to organize themselves.

33. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the negative but added that the Administration would have no objection to that and would probably assist them in setting up an organization if they so desired.

34. U THANT (Burma) said that his delegation had been pleased to note the information on page 28 of the report concerning the increase in the number of Micronesians holding positions formerly occupied by American staff members. He suggested that in future annual reports the relevant statistics should be given in tabular form showing increases over a particular period, such as three years.

35. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) thanked the representative of Burma for that suggestion and said that he, too, would like to see such a comparative table included in the report for it would be a graphic demonstration of the progress realized in the Territory.

36. U THANT (Burma) noted the statement on page 30 of the report that political organizations or parties did not exist in the Territory. He asked if the special representative was aware of any move on the part of the Micronesians to form such bodies.

37. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, although in Ponape there was more evidence than in the other districts of people joining to promote the candidacy of a person running for the district congress, there was as yet nothing that could be described as party activity. The people were still primarily interested in district problems and had not shown any desire for the establishment of Territory-wide political parties.

38. U THANT (Burma) noted that according to the annual report it was planned to produce a book on the Territory for use in the schools. He asked when the book was expected to be ready.

39. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that he understood that several chapters of the book had been completed and that the author expected it to be ready for distribution by 1 January 1961.

40. U THANT (Burma) recalled that the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959, had strongly recommended that the Administering Authority should consider combining the Rota and Saipan Districts (T/1447, para. 58). He would like to know whether the Administering Authority had considered the question during the year under review and whether the people of the districts had expressed their views on the subject.

41. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that although no decision had yet been taken the problem had been under serious consideration for the

^{1/} 12th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959; Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations, Department of State Publication 6945 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1513).

past few months. It was his impression that the people of Rota were in favour of joining Saipan and apparently the Saipanese had no objection to the combining of the two districts.

42. U THANT (Burma) noted the statement on page 145 of the annual report to the effect that the Administering Authority, while recognizing the advantages of a uniform system with regard to the qualifications of voters, thought that such uniformity should be brought about by the desire of the people rather than imposed by the Administration. He asked if he was correct in understanding that the minimum voting age of eighteen, which had been fixed in all districts other than Palau, had been voluntarily decided upon by the districts concerned.

43. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that that was the case. It should be recognized that the people of Palau had made a great departure from tradition when they had lowered the voting age to twenty-one, for in the past men had received no recognition in their society until reaching the age of twenty-six. At the November 1959 session of the Palau Congress the possibility of lowering the voting age to eighteen had been discussed and the question had been held over for the next session. That session had now been convened and he understood that the matter was being considered in committee.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.