



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL
Twenty-seventh Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 14 July 1961,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Report of the Secretary-General (Trusteeship Council resolution 36 (III) and General Assembly resolution 754 (VIII));</i>	
(b) <i>Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1607 (XV)</i>	203
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960;</i>	
(ii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands</i>	203

President: U TIN MAUNG (Burma).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France India, 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.

Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories (continued): *

- (a) **Report of the Secretary-General (Trusteeship Council resolution 36 (III) and General Assembly resolution 754 (VIII)) (T/1563);**
- (b) **Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1607 (XV) (T/1576)**

[Agenda item 12 (a) and (b)]

1. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories), replying to a question asked by the USSR representative at the 1166th meeting, said that he was now in possession of information pertaining to the distribution of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Two thousand copies had been made available to the Information Centre in London for distribution in British

overseas Territories, 2,000 in Paris for Frenchoverseas Territories, 2,000 in Sydney for New Guinea, Nauru and Samoa, 2,000 in Tanganyika for East Africa, 1,000 at Addis Ababa, 1,000 at Accra, 2,000 at Bangkok for South-East Asia, 500 in Washington, in addition to material sent direct to Guam for distribution in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and 600 in Ruanda-Urundi. Distribution would be continued throughout the year.

2. The Director of the Information Centre at Dar es Salaam had been requested to arrange for the translation and printing of the declaration in Swahili. The Director of the Information Centre at Usumbura had been directed to arrange for the translation and printing of versions in Kinyarwanda and Kirundi. The Administering Authority for the Pacific Islands had arranged to have the Declaration translated into Chamorro and Marshallese. When the translations had been completed the leaflets would be printed in New York.

3. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Under-Secretary for the information he had given. He understood that the initial dissemination of the text of the Declaration in a limited number of copies through Information Centres was only a first step. The Secretariat, in accordance with the decisions of the General Assembly, should take steps to disseminate the text more widely throughout all the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

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

- (i) **Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1960 (T/1574, T/L.1014 and Add.1);**
- (ii) **Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961 (T/1560, T/L.1025)**

[Agenda items 4 (f) and 6]

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1020)

4. U AUNG THANT (Burma), Chairman of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, introducing the Committee's report (T/L.1020), drew attention to the fact that its conclusions and recommendations closely followed those of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1961.

5. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Drafting Committee had formulated no recommendation with regard to the immediate implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and

*Resumed from the 1166th meeting.

**Resumed from the 1155th meeting.

peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)) in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Furthermore, such positive recommendations as had been made by the Visiting Mission were not fully reflected in document T/L.1020.

6. He would therefore be unable to support the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee, particularly the passages which bestowed undeserved praise upon the Administering Authority for alleged progress, no factual evidence of which had been submitted to the Council, and would even be obliged to vote against certain passages.

7. Throughout the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council, the Administering Members had been stubbornly resisting all proposals designed to ensure the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. That fact should be placed on record in the Council's report for the information of the General Assembly.

8. He wished to restate his delegation's position, which was that the Declaration fully applied to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and that the Administering Authority was obliged to implement it without reservations or delay. In consultation with the indigenous inhabitants, the Administering Authority should set a date for the granting of independence to the Trust Territory without delay and submit to the United Nations a plan outlining immediate steps designed to ensure the transfer of all powers to the people of the Territory in accordance with the provisions of operative paragraph 5 of the Declaration.

9. He therefore considered paragraph 45 of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1020) to be altogether inadequate. No Administering Authority was entitled to interpret the Declaration as it pleased and decide which of its provisions applied to a Trust Territory under its administration and which did not. It was explicitly stated in the Declaration that it applied to all Territories which had not yet attained independence, including Trust Territories; the Declaration made no provision for any exceptions and he felt that the Trusteeship Council should be guided by what the General Assembly had decided.

10. His delegation would also vote against paragraph 44, since it included no recommendation addressed to the Administering Authority.

11. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he did not think that paragraphs 44 and 45 were sufficiently clear. He would endeavour to draft an alternative text and would submit it to the Council for consideration.

12. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic), speaking as a member of the Drafting Committee, pointed out that the Committee had had to work within a specific framework—that established by the views expressed by the majority in the Council. It could not be blamed for not giving emphasis to ideas which had been expressed by one, two or, at most, three members of the Council or had never been put forward in the general debate. On the basis of the views expressed by the majority in the Council, the Drafting Committee could not have formulated any recommendations other than those presented in document T/L.1020. That did not, of course, mean that his delegation was fully satisfied with them.

13. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) felt that the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1020) failed to take into account some of the Visiting Mission's comments, such as the concerning the absence of any plan or targets in the field of economic advancement, not to mention political advancement. That point should be reflected in the report.

14. Paragraph 44 was, in his view, too passive in its acceptance of the Administering Authority's hope to be able to advance the date fixed for the establishment of a Territorial legislature. In the light of the views expressed in the Council by certain delegations, including his own, he thought that the Council should recommend that the date be advanced.

15. He did not find the wording of paragraph 45 very felicitous; while an Administering Authority was entitled to say that it accepted the essential elements of a General Assembly resolution, he did not think that the Council as a body should be associated with such a selective approach to General Assembly decisions. The wording adopted by the Council in the case of the Trust Territory of New Guinea (T/L.1023, para. 40) was more appropriate.

16. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1020) paragraph by paragraph.

17. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) felt that the Council's report should reflect the Visiting Mission's view that the Administering Authority should introduce a greater sense of urgency into the administration of the Trust Territory, since that view had been endorsed by the Council. He therefore proposed that paragraph 1 should be amended to read:

"The Council takes note of the observations, conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the 1961 Visiting Mission and commends them to the most urgent attention of the Administering Authority for necessary action."

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the first sentence of paragraph 3 was at variance with specific statements in the reports of the medical teams which had carried out surveys in Rongelap. Furthermore, certain other facts appearing in the Visiting Mission's report were not reflected in the first sentence of paragraph 3. His delegation would vote against that sentence, since it was not an accurate statement of fact.

19. With regard to the second sentence of paragraph 3, he failed to understand why reference was made to leukaemia only, whereas the report of the Brookhaven National Laboratory^{1/} which had been made available to the Trusteeship Council referred to the possibility of other after-effects of fall-out such as a shorter life span, premature aging and genetic mutations. He felt that the sentence should be amended to include a fuller reference to the medical team's report.

^{1/}Medical Survey of Rongelap People Five and Six Years after Exposure to Fallout (With an Addendum on Vegetation). (Upton, N.Y., Brookhaven National Laboratory, September 1960). Transmitted by a note of the Secretary-General (A/AC.82/G/L.566).

20. His delegation could not endorse a text which took the Administering Authority at its word and failed to put forward any concrete recommendations.

21. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) thought that it was proper for the Council both to note the Administering Authority's statement, which was set out in the first sentence of paragraph 3, and to recognize the need for continued surveys, as it did in the second sentence. Those two sentences should, however, be linked by a reference to additional information in the Council's possession. He therefore suggested that the following sentence should be inserted after the first sentence:

"On the other hand, it was conscious that there is a recurring incidence of certain diseases among the exposed population, and the team of experts considers that these diseases are among those which might occur as a result of exposure to radio-active fall-out."

22. He did not think that the Council could merely take note of an assertion that there were no physical after-effects of exposure to radio-active fall-out. If that were the case, the importance which the world attached to a ban on nuclear weapons tests would not be justified.

23. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that to adopt the Indian amendment was the least that the Council could do. The first sentence of paragraph 3, which was incompatible with the Indian amendment, should be deleted and the paragraph should include a reference to the facts quoted in the Visiting Mission's report and to the views of United States medical specialists—which the Council could not disregard—to the effect that the five years to come would be the critical period for the possible development of various diseases and genetic mutations.

24. He could not accept the passage expressing the hope that the surveys would be continued. The Council should remember that the inhabitants of Rongelap were human beings who had suffered through the fault of the Administering Authority, which had illegally carried out nuclear tests in a Trust Territory. The minimum that could, in fairness, be done would be to add a recommendation calling upon the Administering Authority to furnish all the medical and material assistance of which the victims of the fall-out were in need.

25. The Council should also draw the Administering Authority's attention to the fact that it was inadmissible that the Trust Territory should be used for nuclear weapons tests. It was the duty of the Council to ensure that the Trust Territory was never again used for that purpose.

26. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that, although there was nothing in the Indian amendment to which he could take exception, he feared that, as it stood, it might convey the impression that the negative findings of the medical team were not conclusive. For instance, there was no indication in the report of the medical experts that the diseases in question were any more wide-spread among the inhabitants of Rongelap who had been exposed to radio-active fall-out than among those who had not. He therefore proposed that consideration of paragraph 3 should be postponed until a later meeting, so that in the meantime a more acceptable text could be drafted. If a vote was taken now, his delegation would abstain.

27. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) recalled that the Visiting Mission had stated in paragraph 199 of its report (T/1560) that it did not consider itself competent to pass judgement on matters concerning the effects of radiation and radio-active contamination and the extent to which they persisted in Rongelap. While he would have preferred the Council's report to follow the same lines, he realized that the Council had examined technical evidence which had not been available to the Visiting Mission.

28. On the other hand, he did not think that any expert could state with certainty what the effects of radio-active fall-out were on the present and future health of persons who had been exposed to it. As paragraph 3 stood, the statement in the first sentence to the effect that no physical diseases attributable to exposure to radio-active fall-out had been found accorded ill with the statement in the second sentence that the five years to come would be the critical period for the possible development of leukaemia. The first sentence might therefore be deleted without detriment to the sense of paragraph 3.

29. He endorsed the United States representative's suggestion that the Council should postpone consideration of paragraph 3 pending the drafting of a new text on the basis of the Indian amendment.

It was so decided.

30. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that in paragraph 4 the phrase "expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will take speedy action" should be replaced by "recommends that the Administering Authority should take speedy action".

31. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) observed that paragraph 4 dealt with only one aspect of the matter as brought to the Council's attention by the Visiting Mission. He therefore proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:

"The Council recommends that improved facilities of medical attention and care and other necessary assistance should be provided to the Rongelapese by the Administering Authority as recommended in paragraph 201 of the Visiting Mission's report."

32. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that he had no objection to the amendment proposed by the USSR representative but he was in some difficulty with regard to the Indian amendment. Paragraph 2 of the annex to the draft report, which had already been adopted, commended to the Administering Authority a suggestion made by the Visiting Mission with regard to the rehabilitation of the Rongelapese. It seemed to him that that should cover the matter. Moreover, there was one phrase in paragraph 201 of the Visiting Mission's report which his delegation would be unable to endorse because it called for a substantial increase in the frequency of field trips. Unless the number of ships were increased, it would be impossible to increase the number of field trips to one area without reducing the number to another area. His delegation could not commit the United States Government to an increase in the total number of field trips in the Territory, since the expenditure entailed would require the approval of the Congress. It would therefore be compelled to abstain in the vote on the final phrase of the Indian amendment.

33. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that, while he appreciated the United States representative's point of view, it was, so to speak, one of the functions of the Trusteeship Council to commit Administering Authorities to increased expenditure. The considerations just advanced by the United States representative had been advanced to the Visiting Mission, yet the Visiting Mission had considered it necessary to make the specific recommendations in paragraph 201 of its report. The general recommendation in paragraph 2 of the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee was of a different character.

34. In order to meet the United States representative's views, he would add the word "especially" to the last part of his amendment, which would now read: "... especially as recommended in paragraph 201 of the Visiting Mission's report".

The Indian amendment was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

35. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) asked for a separate vote on the first two sentences of paragraph 4 as amended by the USSR representative.

The first two sentences of paragraph 4, as amended, were adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 4 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

36. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed that paragraph 5 should be redrafted to read:

"The Council notes the statement of the Administering Authority that it has no plans to resume nuclear or thermo-nuclear tests in the Territory, and earnestly hopes that no nuclear or thermo-nuclear tests will be carried out in the future."

That would be consistent with the wording used by the Visiting Mission in paragraph 202 of its report.

37. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Indian proposal.

The Indian amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 6 was adopted unanimously.

38. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that, while his delegation was in favour of the recommendations in paragraph 6, he must make a reservation with regard to the words "without further delay". Every effort would be made to prevent delay, but in view of the complicated nature of the problem his delegation could not give an absolute assurance that there would be no delays in the matter.

39. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 7.

40. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed the insertion of the words "and equal" between the words "full" and "members" in paragraph 7.

The Indian amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 7, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

41. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the first sentence of paragraph 8. His delegation would vote in favour of that sentence but against the remainder of the para-

graph, because it considered that a Territorial legislature should be established without delay and certainly before 1965.

42. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed that the word "adult" be inserted between "universal" and "suffrage", and that the word "greatly" be inserted before the word "accelerated".

43. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) pointed out that in most countries people became adult at the age of twenty-one, whereas in some systems of franchise, such as that in the Trust Territory, people might vote at the age of eighteen. He had no objection to the proposed insertion so long as it was understood that it was not restrictive and that legal minors could vote as long as they were of age to do so in accordance with the current regulations.

The first sentence of paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

44. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed that the last sentence of paragraph 8 should be redrafted to read:

"The Council recommends that the Administering Authority should, at the earliest possible time, introduce popular elections as the basis for the appointment of members to the Advisory Committee."

The Indian amendment was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 8 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

45. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraphs 9, 10 and 11.

Paragraphs 9 and 10 were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

46. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) felt that the first part of paragraph 11 needed a little redrafting. The word "solid", for example, qualifying the word "foundations", was not necessary. He suggested that the first sentence should be amended to read:

"Considering that foundations for political development have been laid at the local and district level, and bearing in mind the pressing need to further promote territorial consciousness and a sense of national identity in the Territory as a whole, the Council recommends"

47. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that, while his delegation would not oppose the amendment, it would be sorry to see the word "solid" deleted.

48. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) explained that in proposing his amendment he was not questioning the fact that the foundations in question had been well laid.

49. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America), suggested that the word "well" should be inserted before the word "laid" in the Indian amendment.

50. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) agreed to that suggestion.

The Indian amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 11, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

51. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed that in the first sentence of paragraph 12 the word "helped" should be replaced by "helps", and the word "was" should be

replaced by "is"; he also proposed that the words "the utmost" should be added before the words "urgency and importance" in the last sentence of paragraph 12.

52. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported that amendment and suggested that the last phrase in the paragraph should be amended to read: "and recommends that this decision should be implemented without delay".

The Indian and USSR amendments were adopted.

Paragraph 12, as amended, was adopted.

53. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 13 should be replaced by the following:

"The Council, recalling its previous recommendations concerning the need to locate the Headquarters within the Territory, endorses the views of the 1961 Visiting Mission and draws them to the attention of the Administering Authority. It considers that a decision on a site should be made as soon as possible and the necessary steps undertaken to transfer the Headquarters there."

He also proposed that the words "become familiar with possible sites and thereby" in the final sentence should be deleted. During the Mission's visit to the Territory he had met practically all the members of the Inter-District Advisory Committee in various districts and they were already familiar with the various possible sites. All that was necessary was for them to discuss the matter and take a decision or assist the Administering Authority in taking a decision.

54. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) recalled that in earlier discussions, when members of the Council had expressed the opinion that the choice of a Headquarters for the administration should be the subject of a political decision on the part of the population, he had maintained the view that such a decision should be an administrative one based on technical considerations. He would therefore prefer the last sentence of paragraph 13 to remain as it stood, for it seemed to him to present the possibilities in a balanced way.

55. Miss TENZER (Belgium) expressed reservations on the Indian representative's last amendment. She wondered what the views of the Administering Authority were on the matter.

56. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that it was the view of the Administering Authority that it would be helpful for the members of the Inter-District Advisory Committee to visit the various island centres and district centres so as to become familiar with them. The Indian representative had expressed the view that the members of the Committee were already familiar with the various possible islands, but his information was that that was not so in many cases. That was why it was desirable for the Committee to meet in various places in order to become familiar with the general characteristics of those places. The present draft therefore seemed to his delegation entirely appropriate.

57. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed that in the final sentence, the words "would be located" be replaced by "will be located". He requested separate votes on the first part of the final sentence, ending with the words "within the Territory", on the words "become familiar with possible sites and thereby", and on the second section of the sentence from the words "and that it plans" to the end.

58. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation agreed with the conclusions of the Visiting Mission stated in the first part of the paragraph but not with those expressed in the final sentence. It would accordingly abstain in the vote on that sentence and on the paragraph as a whole.

The two sentences proposed by the Indian representative to replace the first sentence of paragraph 13 were adopted unanimously.

The words "It notes that ... within the Territory" were adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The words "become familiar with possible sites and thereby" were adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The words "and that it plans ... of the Trust Territory" were adopted by 7 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 13 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.