

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1352
16 June 1969

ENGLISH

Thirty-sixth Session

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND
FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

17 JUN 1969

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 13 June 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

President
President

Mr. SHAW
(Vice-President)

(Australia)

- Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities
on the administration of Trust Territories, for the year ended
30 June 1968 [4] (continued)

(b) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages (English or French), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Director, Interpretation and Meetings Service, Office of Conference Services, Room 1125. In keeping with the decision of the Trusteeship Council, such corrections will be issued as addenda and/or corrigenda to this record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 17 JUNE 1969, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 20 JUNE 1969.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

AGENDA ITEM 4

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 1968:

(b) TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1694; T/L.1144) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Edward Johnston, the Special Representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Mr. Olympio Borja, Member of the Senate of the Congress of Micronesia, and Mr. Chutomu Nimwes, Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of Micronesia, Advisers to the Special Representative, took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: Today the Council will hear the final statements of the Administering Authority in respect of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): Mr. President, before you call on the Special Advisers and the Special Representative to make their concluding statements, I should like to comment briefly on certain aspects of the remarks made by the Soviet representative during our general debate on Wednesday.

During the past few days the United States has made available a very considerable amount of information in its report to the Trusteeship Council and in statements by the High Commissioner and the two members of the Congress of Micronesia who are present with us. The High Commissioner has, I believe, answered with great candour questions raised by the members of the Council.

In response the Soviet representative has seen fit to make unfounded charges regarding United States efforts to advance the welfare of the Micronesians. Obviously, none of our efforts will serve to convince the representative of the Soviet Union if he persists in ignoring the facts presented. However, he made certain charges which are so patently false that the record must not stand uncorrected. He charged, for example, that the United States planned to annex the Territory or deny the people of the Territory the right of self-determination. That is a categorical mis-statement of fact.

(Mr. Phillips, United States)

As I said earlier, the underlying purpose of the new Administration in the Trust Territory is to accelerate progress in economic social and political development of the Micronesian people so that they can at the earliest possible date exercise a meaningful act of self-determination. The same objective has been set forth by Secretary Hickel on numerous occasions, and his remarks to that effect have been quoted by the Special Representative and in my own earlier statements before the Council.

We note that the Soviet representative has called for the elimination ✓ of all United States bases in Micronesia. Members of this Council are well aware of the fact that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a strategic trust under an agreement sanctioned by the Security Council of the United Nations. As the members also well know, the Soviet Union not only was a member of the Security Council at that time but had the right to exercise the veto if it so chose, a right it has exercised on more than one hundred occasions.

The United States makes no apology for maintaining in the Trust Territory military installations necessary for international peace and security. Indeed, taking into account the continued existence of predatory nations, one wonders what the fate of the islands of the Trust Territory might have been were such protection not available to them.

What impressed me about certain remarks of the Soviet representative was the striking contrast they provided between the words of the Soviet representative and the actions of the Government he represents. His avowed concern for the people of Micronesia and his expressed fear for their future would have been a great deal more convincing had they borne some relationship to the policies of the Soviet Government towards small nations and independent peoples.

During the Second World War another group of islands which had been under Japanese sovereignty was detached for alleged strategic reasons. The islands I refer to are the Southern Kuriles. What, one may ask, was the policy of the Soviet Government with respect to those territories it seized from Japan? Did it offer to place them under a United Nations trusteeship arrangement? Did it undertake to promote the political, economic, social and educational

(Mr. Phillips, United States)

advancement of the inhabitants and their progressive development towards self-government or independence? Did it encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all? Certainly not. Most of the inhabitants of those islands were forcibly ejected, and the islands turned into Soviet Air Force bases. Even former residents who asked only to be allowed to return to visit family graves on the islands in accordance with religious practices were formally refused permission.

There are no petitions from a congress of the Kurile Islands; there are no petitions from individual citizens of those islands. There is no accounting of the fate or economic and social welfare of the remaining inhabitants of those islands; there is no status commission concerned with the future status of those islands.

(Mr. Phillips, United States)

The Soviet Union has not only taken without asking the price; it has taken the islands without any regard for international obligations or its obligations to the citizens of those islands.

But perhaps it is not too surprising that petitions from the Southern Kurile Islands do not reach the United Nations. Authoritative sources indicate that petitions even from Soviet citizens in Moscow do not reach their destination.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to request you, Mr. President, to ask the representative of the United States to confine himself to the item on the agenda of the Trusteeship Council and not to address himself to items which are not on the agenda.

The PRESIDENT: It is a fact that the item under consideration relates to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It is true also that in the discussion on this item a few days ago there was a fairly wide-ranging debate including some comments on some Territories which are not strictly within the purview of that Territory. However, in response to the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, I do call upon the representatives of the Administering Authority to bear in mind the title of the item which we are now considering.

Mr. BORJA (Special Adviser): It has certainly been a privilege to participate in the deliberations of this august body. It has also been an honour for me and my colleague, the Honourable Chutomu Nimwes, to be here during the past few days to hear the distinguished members of this Council make their observations and comments regarding the past accomplishments, the present undertakings and the future plans for the islands of Micronesia and our people.

(Mr. Ecrja. Special Adviser)

As my colleague, Congressman Chutomu Nimwes, and I leave this Council chamber and prepare to depart from this great city of New York, we would like to express to you, Mr. President, and distinguished members of this Council, our sincere appreciation for the many courtesies extended to us. Our appearance before you has not only proved eventful but also has enriched us in experience and given us insight into the task before us in Micronesia.

During the past few days your examination of, and deliberations on, the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have convinced us of this Council's keen interest and deep understanding of the problems, needs, and aspirations of our Micronesian people. The several suggested solutions offered by the representatives of Australia, China, and France to cope with some of the chronic and very difficult problems in Micronesia will be explored and pursued with diligence.

With the Congress of Micronesia scheduled to convene next month for its regular session, we plan to report to our colleagues in the Congress at that time and to share with them the views, comments, and observations of this Council. We will also convey to our colleagues in the Congress your sense of urgency in advancing the social and economic development of the Trust Territory.

Thus we depart with better understanding than when we first came and with greater hopes for larger strides in the progress lying ahead for Micronesia. While this Council has heard during the past few days the shortcomings as well as the progress and gains made in the development of the Trust Territory, we interpret the pledge to move ahead in all programme areas to be sincere and, as Micronesians, we are willing to give the new Administration every opportunity and full co-operation to attain the goals and objectives it has set for itself. We are confident that, by the time this distinguished Council convenes next year, greater strides and progress in all fields of endeavour will be reported to the Council.

Mr. Nimwes and I thank you, Mr. President, for the privilege and honour of speaking again before the distinguished members of this Council.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): On behalf of the Special Advisers and others who have accompanied me from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may I first of all thank the President and all members of the Council for the many courtesies which have been extended to us during these past few days.

We have found our discussions with the members of this Council most enlightening and wish to assure you that we will attempt to carry out many of the suggestions which we have received upon our return to Micronesia.

We greatly appreciate the very favourable comments made by the representative of UNESCO and wish to assure them and this Council that we will continue to give the education of Micronesia's young people a very high priority among our many problems.

One matter in the field of education which was not specifically answered previously was a request for the number of Trust Territory students who had been educated away from Micronesia and had returned to their homeland subsequent to their training. We would like the record to indicate that in the fiscal year 1968, 149 of our promising young Micronesian students returned to the Trust Territory after advanced training in many different fields. The Council also indicated great interest in the total number of scholarships granted for advanced study. In this regard, in addition to the 233 Trust Territory government-granted scholarships, during the fiscal year 1968, 118 were made available by district legislators, religious organizations and private sources.

We would also like to thank the representatives of France, Australia and the United Kingdom for their very helpful and specific suggestions in regard to handicraft training, and the perpetuation of our Micronesian culture and arts through student involvement. We pledge to the Council that we will follow up on these suggestions within the near future.

Much has been said during the past few days concerning the critical land problem in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. All of us seem to be in agreement that it is at the same time our most frustrating and yet most challenging situation. We deeply appreciate the suggestions of the representative of China and the sincere concern of the other delegations with regard to this problem, the solution of which is so vital to our future progress. You can rest assured that next year we will report definite progress in this area.

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

The representative of the Soviet Union asked several very searching questions concerning the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Trust Territory Government, and specifically asked, in regard to vetoes of legislation by the High Commissioner:

"... will this then depend on his good-will, or are there any definite provisions for instructions which may be found in legislation or in some administrative documents?" (1349th meeting, p. 6)

This is a very important relationship in any democratic form of government and I would like completely to clarify the situation as it pertains to the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for the records of this Council and for future reference.

Prior to the creation of the Congress of Micronesia, the High Commissioner exercised full legislative authority. However, with the creation of the Congress, such legislative authority passed to it. For a time, the High Commissioner was authorized to designate legislation as "urgent" and, if such legislation was not passed in a form acceptable to him, he could, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, promulgate it as law. As of December 1968, this authority was rescinded.

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

Secretarial Order 2918, issued by the Interior Department on 27 December 1968, part III, section 3, provides that "At the opening of a legislative session and at any time thereafter, the High Commissioner may submit to the Congress and recommend the enactment of legislation". This authority dates from the establishment of the Congress. It authorizes the Executive Branch family to present legislative proposals to the Congress. It does not authorize the High Commissioner to introduce legislation; this right is reserved for members of the Congress.

In the third regular session, the 1967 session, the Executive Branch transmitted twenty-eight bills to the Congress. All were introduced. Eight were passed by the Congress and were approved by the High Commissioner. Three were passed but were vetoed because of unacceptable changes which had been made in them. Nine of the measures were reported by Committees but failed enactment in the Congress. Eight were not reported from Committee.

In the fourth regular session, the 1968 session, the Executive Branch transmitted a total of twenty-six legislative proposals to the Congress. Of that number, twelve were enacted by the Congress and approved; ten were reported by Committee but failed enactment in the Congress; and four were not reported by the Committees which had them for initial consideration.

At the January 1969 session, the first session of the third Congress, four bills were transmitted to the Congress by the Executive Branch. They have been introduced and referred to the appropriate Committees. The Committees have not taken action on them, but under the current rules of the Congress they will carry over to the second and third sessions of the Congress, unless sooner acted on.

In order that the record may be completely accurate as to the veto power of the High Commissioner, I quote part III, section 13, of Secretariat Order 2918:

"Every bill passed by the Congress shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the High Commissioner. If the High Commissioner approves the bill, he shall sign it. If the High Commissioner disapproves the bill he shall, except as hereinafter provided, return it, with his objections, to the Congress within ten consecutive calendar days after it shall have

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

been presented to him. If the High Commissioner does not return the bill within such period, it shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by adjournment, prevents its return, in which case it shall be a law if signed by the High Commissioner within thirty days after it shall have been presented to him; otherwise it shall not be a law.

"When a bill is returned by the High Commissioner to the Congress with his objections, each House may proceed to reconsider it. If the bill is repassed by both Houses of the Congress by a two-third's majority of the entire membership of each House, it shall again be presented to the High Commissioner. If he does not approve it within twenty days, he shall send it, together with his comment thereon, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within ninety days after its receipt by him, the Secretary of the Interior shall either approve or disapprove the bill. If he approves it, it shall become a law; otherwise it shall not. The foregoing provision shall not preclude the reconsideration by the Congress, during either of the 1969 regular sessions, of any bill returned by the High Commissioner during the 1968 session.

"If any bill presented to the High Commissioner shall contain several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items, or any part or parts thereof, while approving the other items or parts of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the item or items, part or parts thereof, to which he objects, and the item or items, part or parts thereof, so objected to shall have the effect of being vetoed."

With respect to the "pocket-veto" -- the usual term for legislation which is allowed to die without signature by the executive -- I have already stated that I firmly believe the Congress of Micronesia is entitled to know the reasons why a bill is not approved. Although there is no requirement that "pocket-vetoes" be explained, I intend to provide the Congress with my thoughts in writing on every bill which does not become law.

With respect to the petitions before the Council, there is little I can add to the official responses of the United States delegation and the several comments which were made by Ambassador Phillips and myself during the discussion of the petitions last Wednesday.

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

I believe that Ambassador Phillips' comments and mine, following the questioning of the petitioner, also adequately summarize our views. I do believe, however, that the petitioner's totally unfounded insinuation that the people of the Trust Territory have been used as "guinea pigs" requires further comment. He referred to the 1954 incident which exposed Rongelap to radioactive fallout. The fact is that there was an unpredicted and unexpected wind shift in the upper atmosphere during that 1954 test. The unfortunate consequence was that the people of Rongelap were exposed to fallout, as were a number of American personnel on a nearby atoll.

The Rongelap people were promptly evacuated from their contaminated atolls, given medical treatment, and provided housing and subsistence until they could be returned. New village facilities and houses were built on Rongelap at the time of their return, and subsequently the United States paid those Rongelapese who were exposed \$950,000, a payment of approximately \$11,000 each.

In Ambassador Phillips' words, there is absolutely no difference in our attitude toward the lives of Micronesians and the lives of Americans. The accident was most certainly not the result of any indifference toward the people of Micronesia or any desire to use them as "guinea pigs".

The representative of France stated that his delegation welcomes the efforts currently under way with respect to the return of the people of Bikini to their home atoll and expressed the hope that other displaced peoples can also return.

For my part, I wish to pledge the deep and continuing interest of the Trust Territory Government and that of the United States in moving as rapidly as possible in the return of the Bikini people. The work of clearing the atoll of debris dating from the testing period is currently under way. This is material which will be useless to the returned people or, if left in place, would impede the economic and effective use of their lands. We expect the clearing work to be completed in the next several months and we shall then begin the replanting, reconstruction of community facilities and the housing which is necessary before the return can be completed. In earlier meetings of the Council, I stated that the current anticipated expenditures for the rehabilitation programme are approximately \$3 million and that the project is being phased over a six-year period.

I would like to stress two points, however. First, since there is no longer a government requirement for this atoll, which was originally acquired for testing purposes in 1946, we have moved promptly to develop a programme for rehabilitating the islands and assisting the Bikini people to re-establish themselves. The second point which I wish to stress is that we are making the Bikini people full partners in the planning for the new village and housing. They will also be active participants in the rehabilitation, replanting and reconstruction work.

During our discussions these past few days, much has been made of the unusually large number of petitions and communications received by the Council this year from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Some would view this as a symbol of great unrest and unhappiness in Micronesia, but the United States delegation strongly subscribes to the view taken by the representative of France, who stated in the general debate a few days ago that he was impressed by the frankness of shared hopes and shortcomings, and concluded that "democracy has taken solid roots in the Islands". My opening remarks to the Trusteeship Council concluded with the pledge of the new administration to involve Micronesians even more completely in every phase of their Government. May I emphasize this point again and further state that when this Council meets next year, we predict

that even the most sceptical will admit that we have kept our pledge in this respect. I am certain that I speak for all the people of Micronesia when I say that we look forward to the visit early next year of the United Nations Visiting Mission and that we will co-operate with this mission to the fullest extent.

In conclusion, may I most sincerely thank you, Mr. President, the staff of the Secretariat, and all the distinguished members of this Council for your extreme courtesy and understanding extended to one so recently installed in his assignment, and assure you that I am already looking forward to reporting to the Council again next year.

May I also state for the permanent record of this Council of the United Nations how proud I am to have appeared before it in the company of our two outstanding representatives of the Congress of Micronesia -- our special advisers, Senator Borja and Representative Nimwes -- two shining examples of the new political maturity of the Micronesian people. Both of these gentlemen, along with Mr. Falcam and Mr. Udui who have accompanied us on this mission, are representative of the enlightened, dedicated and articulate indigenous leaders who are the real hope of Micronesia's future. I look forward with great anticipation to working closely with them as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands proceeds on the road to political self-determination.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had not intended to speak today, but in connexion with the statement made by the representative of the United States I find to make the following remarks.

The statement of the representative of the United States was both to the Soviet Union and to the Soviet delegation. Unlike the representative of the United States, I shall try to substantiate my point of view.

The Soviet delegation has stated that the United States Government is pursuing a policy of annexation with respect to the Pacific Island Trust Territory of Micronesia. This conclusion of the Soviet delegation was based on facts, facts set forth in documents that have been submitted to the Trusteeship Council. We have already mentioned these documents T/PET.10/50, T/PET.10/52, T/PET.10/54, and many others which are under the heading "Communications". This was also mentioned by one of the

But these facts have not been taken into account by the United States representative. Allow me, therefore, to recall the facts which have been gleaned from United States sources. The magazine Foreign Affairs, which is published in New York, wrote in April of this year -- and this is not a Soviet publication:

"A widespread view in Washington, especially in the Defense Department, is that independence is not a realistic option and that it would therefore be dishonest to offer it." (Foreign Affairs, Vol. 47, No. 3, page 503)

What does this prove? It proves that there is a tendency towards, and a desire for, annexation. Now I quote a statement made by Mr. Skinner:

"He foresees the day when the general interests of Guam and Micronesia and American Samoa may lead to the creation of an economically viable state of the United States of America."

I should like to ask what this means. From our point of view, it means another tendency towards annexation.

In The New York Times of 7 May 1969 -- and this is not a statement of a Soviet publication -- we find the remarks of one of the persons who accompanied Mr. Hickel on his visit to Micronesia:

"The United States simply is not going to give up Micronesia."
(The New York Times, 7 May 1969, page 15)

I should like to ask: what does this prove? It proves that there is a desire and an attempt on the part of the United States to annex Micronesia. And here is another quotation from The New York Times of 11 May. Admiral Cole said:

"No matter what shape your future Government may take, the United States will be responsible for the security of this area." (The New York Times, 11 May 1969, page 2)

(Mr. Issraelyan. USSR)

Apparently the attempt to impose an American army on Micronesia is the practical expression of that responsibility of the United States for Micronesia. These are simply facts, and the Soviet delegation has drawn the conclusion pointing to the attempts of the United States to annex the Territory. These are simply facts and nothing more.

The representative of the United States has referred to the nature of the agreement between the United States and the United Nations concerning its Trusteeship over the Pacific Islands. We are fully familiar with that agreement. We also know full well that the Soviet Union gave its assent to that agreement. We also know that that area is a strategic area. But I should like to remind Mr. Phillips of Article 83, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which states:

"The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area."

Article 76 (b) reads as follows:

"to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence..."

The agreement signed by the United States in 1947 did not purport to establish perpetual domination of the United States over that area. That is what our delegation stated when it pointed to the need to eliminate military bases. Mr. Phillips apparently does not recall that that was not only a statement of the Soviet delegation; it was an expression of the wish of the United Nations which was reflected in four resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the most recent of which was adopted at the twenty-third session. I can cite also resolutions 2105 (XX), 2189 (XXI) and 2326 (XXII).

Resolution 2465 (XXIII), which was adopted at the last session of the General Assembly, reads in its operative paragraph 5 as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Requests the colonial Powers to dismantle their military bases and installations in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones and from using those that still exist to interfere with the liberation of the peoples in colonial Territories in the exercise of their legitimate rights to freedom and independence."

(continued in Russian)

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

That is why we are concerned with the question of military bases and the need to eliminate them.

Finally, I come now to a last point. I must vigorously protest -- and I ask that this be included in the verbatim record of our meeting -- against the attempt of the representative of the United States to intervene in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. I do not think it is necessary to explain here the internal policy of the Soviet Union, because that is not a subject which falls within the competence of the Trusteeship Council. However, inasmuch as Mr. Phillips referred to the Kurile Islands, I should like to remind him briefly of the history of the transition of those islands to the Soviet Union.

In 1943 the United States Government submitted to the Soviet Union the question of Soviet participation in the war against Japan, and suggested discussion of the conditions for the entry into that war of the Soviet Union. President Roosevelt, during the course of his consultations with the head of the Soviet Government, Comrade Stalin, at the Teheran Conference, requested information relating to how and under what conditions the Soviet Union would participate in the war against Japan. Thereafter, Mr. Harriman, who was the United States Ambassador in Moscow, returned again and again in the conversations that took place in the Kremlin to the question of the Soviet Union assisting its allies in the Pacific theatre of operations. Finally, at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, upon the initiative of President Roosevelt, negotiations were held and a document was prepared, which was signed by the three Governments: President Roosevelt for the United States, Comrade Stalin for the Soviet Union and Prime Minister Churchill for the United Kingdom. That document called for the transfer to the Soviet Union of the Kurile Islands. That agreement, which was signed by the leaders of the three Governments, was therefore the result of an insistent diplomatic initiative undertaken by the United States. The Soviet Union fulfilled its obligations under that agreement and entered the war against Japan on 9 August 1945. All the conditions concerning Soviet participation in the war against Japan which were stipulated at the Yalta Conference were fulfilled by the Soviet Union. Consequently, no one has the slightest reason or any right now to raise any questions on that subject.

I apologize for having brought this matter up, but I believe that my explanation was necessary in order to clarify the question which was raised here by the representative of the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): I do not want to prolong this debate, which is clearly becoming a bit extraneous. However, I did not exercise my prerogative of intervening on a point of order because I felt that I could understand that the representative of the Soviet Union was sensitive to certain of the statements I made, particularly with reference to the past practices of the Soviet Union. I am always reminded of the maxim that "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones". But of course the representative of the Soviet Union, as is customary with him in such circumstances, has quoted freely from the free American Press -- something which can work both ways, I might add. I would only caution the representative of the Soviet Union to recognize something which perhaps is difficult for him to recognize: that we do, unlike his own country, enjoy a free Press and that statements appearing in the Press are not to be construed as official statements of the responsible authorities of my Government. Indeed, the only statements which can be considered authoritative with respect to United States policy in the Trust Territory are those uttered by the President of the United States and his properly constituted officers.

Nevertheless, I cannot help noting -- because I think it is typical of Soviet practice -- that to quote only a part of a text which is sometimes convenient for the sake of argument. I am very familiar with the publication Foreign Affairs, since I am a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and I read it very carefully, and I am, of course, very familiar with the article to which the Soviet representative referred.

For the sake of the record, may I just point out that there was a sentence which the Soviet representative conveniently forgot to add. He quoted this sentence, which I now quote from the article in Foreign Affairs:

"A widespread view in Washington, especially in the Defense Department, is that independence is not a realistic option and that it would therefore be dishonest to offer it." (Foreign Affairs, Vol. 47, No. 3, page 503)

Now, that is as far as the Soviet representative went.

Let me now quote the sentence which immediately follows:

"The State Department rightly points out that we are legally obligated by treaty with the United Nations to offer the alternative of independence, and that the U.N. will insist upon it, however impractical." (Ibid.)

Now, this, of course, has no official status because this is an article in a private publication. I cite it merely because it seems to me so characteristic of Soviet practice to present only part of the story.

While it has been suggested that a number of General Assembly resolutions have been adopted and that the United States has been in violation of those resolutions, I am not going to try to refer to each of them; I am only going to point out the obvious--that the United States, as Administering Authority, is responsible to the Trusteeship Council and, in the final analysis, to the Security Council, since we exercise administration over a strategic Trust Territory. A number of the resolutions -- which of course are only recommendations -- were, in fact, opposed and voted against by the United States delegation. In any case, I do not think these are pertinent to the questions before us.

I am perfectly happy to continue the discussion and to analyse in somewhat greater detail than did the Soviet representative the question of the Soviet occupation of the Kurile Islands; I am not sure that it would be of great interest to the Council, but I do think it worth bearing out that the Yalta Agreement, to which the Soviet representative referred, could hardly be expected to be binding upon the Japanese. Its acceptance was not a condition of their surrender; nor indeed was the Soviet Union even at war with Japan when the Yalta Agreement was signed. I can only add that the possession of those territories after seven days of warfare was certainly a convenient windfall for the Soviet Union. But, as I

say, I do not see that our activities are going to be further enhanced or promoted by continued discussion of this nature, so I am happy to let my remarks stand for the record.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am satisfied by the fact that the United States representative was unable to refute any of the facts I have cited. However, if we are able to mention the characteristic features of any particular delegation, allow me to say that a characteristic of the American delegation is that whenever the Soviet delegation quotes certain statements in the American Press which are unfavourable to the United States Government, the American delegation immediately makes a rather awkward reference to the so-called "free Press". I do not want to refer to the "free Press" of this country, because the Trusteeship Council is fully aware of the matter. We know very much about this so-called "free Press", which prints only unfavourable items about my country. But in view of the fact that the data which I have quoted has not been refuted, that, in and of itself, is an indirect recognition of the truth of the facts I have cited.

The PRESIDENT: I hope we have concluded the present stage of our examination of the item relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and if there are no further contributions to that discussion I would at this stage wish to express our thanks to the Special Representative and to the representatives of the Congress of Micronesia, who acted as Special Advisers, for the contribution they have made to the work of this Council. They may now withdraw from the Council table.

The Special Representative and his Special Advisers withdrew.

The PRESIDENT: The next stage in our proceedings relating to this item will be the setting up of a Drafting Committee to draft the section dealing with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. If it is agreeable to members of the Council, I would ask that the representatives of France and the United Kingdom constitute themselves members of that Drafting Committee, and I suggest that they may meet for that purpose on Monday afternoon.

(The President)

The understanding now is that the Council will most probably meet next Tuesday afternoon in order to take up the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea. It will take up, in addition, the two remaining items on our agenda: namely, the item relating to co-operation with the Committee of Twenty-Four and the item relating to the attainment of self-government or independence. If that is agreeable to the Council, we shall act accordingly.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.