



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1060
26 April 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND AND SIXTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 26 April 1960, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. VITELLI

(Italy)

1. Report of the Secretary-General on credentials [2]
2. Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [3f] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1060 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I would like to point out the fact that, as I am sure we are all aware, tomorrow marks an auspicious occasion in the annals of the Council, namely, the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Togo. I take this opportunity to congratulate both the Administering Authority and the Government and people of the new Republic on this historic event. I have no doubt that other members will wish to voice similar sentiments, but I would ask them to wait until tomorrow. I have referred to this matter this morning only in order to propose that on behalf of the Council the following cablegram be sent to the Prime Minister of Togo today, to arrive in time:

(continued in French)

"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 accession of their country to independence, and to address to them sincerest wishes for prosperity in the future."

(continued in English)

If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Council agrees that that message should be sent.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (T/1520)

The PRESIDENT: I propose that the Council adopt the report.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the report presented by the Secretary-General on credentials, document T/1520, the Soviet delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Trusteeship Council to the fact that in this report no indication is made of the legitimate representatives of the Chinese People's Republic. We consider it our duty to state that the only legitimate representative of China in the Trusteeship Council, as well as in other organs of the United Nations, can be a representative appointed by the Central Government of the Chinese People's Republic, the authority of which spreads over the territory of this immense country and is recognized by the multi-million people of China.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

We consider that the Trusteeship Council must rectify this completely abnormal situation as a result of which, at its session, there is no representative of a permanent member of the Council one of the founders of the United Nations, a Power within which there lives approximately one-quarter of the population of this earth. That is why the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to introduce a proposal not to recognize the credentials of those persons who come under the heading of "China", persons who do not represent China and who are unlawfully occupying the seat of China in the Trusteeship Council. We would wish to request that the vote on the credentials of these individuals be taken in parts.

But since we have heard a proposal from you, Mr. President, to approve the report of the Secretary-General (T/1520), we believe that our purpose would be served when you put our amendment to your proposal to the vote. The amendment would consist of adding the following words to your proposal:

"with the exception of the credentials of the persons enumerated under the heading 'China' in the annex to document T/1520."

Mr. KIANG (China): I do not intend to dignify those remarks which were just made in reference to my Government and my delegation. All that I wish to do is to state for the record that the Government of the Republic of China, which I have the honour to represent in this Council, is the only freely and legitimately constituted Government of China which can speak for the Chinese people in the United Nations. The Communist regime, of which someone has just spoken on its behalf, has been condemned by this Organization.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): We have heard the proposal just made by the representative of the USSR. For reasons which are well known, the United States opposes any proposal designed to exclude representatives of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Chinese Communist regime. Therefore, we make the following motion:

(Mr. Gerig, United States)

"The Trusteeship Council decides not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth regular 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."

The understanding of the United States is that under the terms of rule 63 of our rules of procedure, this motion has priority over the proposal of the representative of the USSR.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps I am speaking somewhat prematurely and perhaps it might have been possible to hear an explanation from you, Mr. President, on the procedural situation that we find ourselves in now, but it might perhaps be easier for us to do so and not for the President, and that is why I have decided to speak immediately after the statement made by the representative of the United States of America.

The point is that a proposal was introduced by the President to approve the report of the Secretary-General on credentials. To this proposal on the part of the President an amendment was introduced. It was not a proposal -- and I wish to draw the attention of the representative of the United States to this point -- but an amendment on the part of the delegation of the Soviet Union to a proposal of the President.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

The representative of the United States meanwhile made a proposal. It is his legitimate right to introduce any proposals whatsoever on the subject that he may deem necessary. Thus the representative of the United States is acting in accordance with the rules of procedure in introducing such a proposal. But no rules of procedure confirm or justify his latest claim, namely, that priority should be given to his proposal. This is an individual, independent proposal, which can be voted on, but what has been proposed by the Soviet delegation is an amendment. That is why we request that our amendment be voted on first. Then the Council may vote on your proposal, Mr. President, as amended as a result of the Soviet delegation's amendment, and then after that it can consider any other proposals that might be introduced. Therefore, Mr. President, I would request you, in accordance with the rules of procedure, to put our amendment to the vote.

Mr. CERIG (United States of America): To explain my proposal, I should like to say that what I had put before the Council was a proposal which dealt with the proposal of the Chair as amended by the USSR. Therefore I feel that my proposal is entirely in order and, since it is farthest removed, under rule 65, I feel that my proposal should have priority and be put to the vote by the Council first. To repeat: my proposal deals with the proposal of the Chair as amended by the USSR.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the representative of the United States considers that the proposal by the President is already amended, in other words, that it already embodies the amendment of the USSR, and the representative of the United States agrees to that, then of course an entirely different situation arises. If he agrees with our amendment and considers that this amendment has already been incorporated in the proposal and he is prepared to vote for that amendment, then, after we have adopted that amendment and we have adopted the President's proposal in its amended form, we shall be quite prepared to consider the proposal he has introduced.

The PRESIDENT: I think I should try to clarify the situation. I am afraid that the representative of the Soviet Union has, so to speak, worked on an assumption that I have made a proposal. I did not make any proposal at all. His amendment is therefore, as it were, hanging in the air. I simply proposed to the Council that it be adopted. Therefore, I do not see how an amendment can be proposed to something which does not exist. Therefore, if I am correct in this, I think I can draw a conclusion from the suggestion of the Soviet representative, which is that his suggestion amounts to asking for a separate vote, in which case, of course, the situation has changed, and then we will proceed accordingly.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): You do not need to have an excellent memory to remember those few words which you pronounced at the very opening of the meeting, Mr. President: you suggested that we approve the report of the Secretary-General on credentials, and you said just that. It was not a written proposal but it was a proposal. You proposed that we approve the report, and to that oral proposal we introduced an oral amendment. If it is necessary to check back, obviously we have shorthand records of our meetings, we have a recording of the statements that are being made, and we can postpone the meeting and check all that and tomorrow morning, if necessary, play back the words, and then we will remember the words we have actually pronounced. I remember them quite distinctly, sir.

Thus it seems to us that the proposal was made by you. The proposal was a natural one for the President, to approve a report which was presented. We wish to make an amendment to that proposal and, on the basis of the rules of procedure, we request that this amendment be put to the vote. It seems that the procedural situation is a perfectly clear one, and you, Mr. President, are well aware of the way in which you must now act.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard the remarks just made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I am not going to engage in a discussion of the fine points raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. Even admitting that there is a proposal from the Chair, there is, however -- the Council of course having also heard the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet

(The President)

Union -- a proposal made by the representative of the United States, and in the opinion of the Chair rule 50, paragraph 1 (g), would be applicable to the case. Rule 50 reads as follows:

"The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all draft resolutions or other motions relative to the subject before the meeting:
...

(g) To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely ... "

Therefore, in accordance with the rules of procedure, I shall now --

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, you have now quoted rule 50, I take it. I should like to know who has made a formal proposal to postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely. We are not proposing that. All members of the Council will remember quite clearly that you made a proposal that we approve the report of the Secretary-General. At the last session, as all members of the Trusteeship Council will remember, such a proposal was made by the representative of Australia.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

At this session, the President took it upon himself to introduce such a proposal, and an amendment has been introduced to that proposal. The President himself used the word "proposal", but ours is not a proposal -- it is an amendment to the President's proposal. In accordance with the rules of procedure, with which the President is well acquainted, rule 61 in particular, we request that our amendment be put to the vote. The request is a perfectly clear-cut one, and we therefore ask the President to act in accordance with the rules of procedure. Rule 61 states:

"A proposal to add to or delete from or otherwise revise a part of a draft resolution or a motion shall be considered as an amendment. An amendment shall be voted on first and if it is adopted, the amended resolution or motion shall then be voted on."

On the basis of rule 61, the Soviet delegation requests you, Mr. President, to put our amendment to the vote.

Mr. KIANG (China): I wish I could be of some assistance to you, Mr. President. If I understand the parliamentary situation as it stands now, I think the immediate procedural point at issue is the following. In proposing what has been proposed, the representative of the United States claims priority for his motion. If the President is not in a position to rule on that point, then he should consult the Council whether the proposal of the United States has priority. That matter can very easily be decided by the Council. If the President follows that procedure, and I hope he does, the matter will certainly be facilitated.

The PRESIDENT: I think at this point a closer inspection of the rules of procedure may help us out of the situation which has evolved. I think rule 63 as quoted by the representative of the United States is probably the one -- in my opinion, is certainly the one -- which would help us out of this situation. The members are familiar with this rule. I might as well read it out:

"If two or more draft resolutions or other motions relating to an original proposal are introduced, the President shall first put to the vote the resolution or motion furthest removed in substance from the original proposal. ..."

(The President)

I should think that it is hardly debatable that the proposal made by the representative of the United States is further removed from the subject under consideration. Therefore, I shall ask the Council to adopt the proposal made by the representative of the United States, which is, as the Council has heard, to postpone consideration of the matter before us. If there are no objections ...

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): What the President has just said could bring some representatives out of balance. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding here, but I cannot, in this respect, even blame the interpreters for it. I have listened to the President speak in English. Sometimes we quite unjustifiably accuse the interpreters for being responsible for any discrepancies, but now there is no discrepancy. What the President is proposing, in fact, is something that is completely opposed to what is provided for in the rules of procedure. At first the President quoted rule 63, which states:

"If two or more draft resolutions or other motions relating to an original proposal are introduced, the President shall first put to the vote the resolution or motion furthest removed in substance from the original proposal."

This rule speaks of an original proposal. In other words, the President had in mind his own proposal which he mentioned at the beginning of this meeting. Then in explaining this rule, the President referred to this original proposal as the question before us. This kind of play on the rules of procedure is something that I believe no one would really do and I am quite sure that the President does not intend to interpret rule 63 in such a way.

Also, I do not understand the President's statement to the effect that he proposes that the Council should adopt the proposal of the representative of the United States. Normally, the President puts proposals to the vote or places them before the consideration of the Council. It is the first time I have heard the President of the Trusteeship Council asking the Council to adopt a proposal. Is that an appeal by the President to assist the representative of the United States? I think that the delegation of the United States does not need any such assistance. The delegation of the United States has introduced its

(Mr. Oberemko. USSR)

proposal, and in due course it may be considered by the Council. We are requesting the President to put to the vote, in accordance with rule 61, our amendment to his proposal. In speaking now, the President has admitted that he made such a proposal, and he quoted rule 63 in that connexion. Therefore, I would request that, in order not to delay our proceedings any further, the President simply put our amendment to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: I can accept one remark made by the representative of the Soviet Union, and that refers to the word "adopt". Of course, what I had in mind was to ask the Council to vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States.

(The President)

I would suggest now that if there are no objections, we proceed to a vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States. If there are objections, then I shall consult the Council as to which of the two proposals before the Council has priority.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Mr. President, which are the two proposals you are referring to? Does that include your proposal and the other proposal, that of the representative of the United States? I believe the representative of the Soviet Union does not have a proposal, that what he suggested is in the nature of an amendment to your proposal. It would help if we had a clarification as to whether your proposal is in the field. If it is not in the field, then we have to approach this matter from a different angle.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, we intended to put exactly the same question to you as the one which was put by the representative of India. We would wish to have an answer to that, of course.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Chair has stated his position on the matter, and I think that, having heard the opinions of the members on this matter, it would be quite correct to proceed according to rule 63. Therefore, if there are no objections, we shall proceed to the vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States.

U THANT (Burma): Before we proceed I would like to seek some clarification. Will the representative of the United States be good enough to repeat his proposal.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): My proposal is very short, very simple. It is that the Trusteeship Council decides not to consider, for the duration of its twenty-sixth regular session, any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. I then ask

(Mr. Gerig, United States)

that under the terms of rule 63 this motion be given priority over previous proposals; and that is what I think the Chair should put to the Council, whether my motion has priority.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now ask the Council to take a vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States the text of which he has just recited to the Council.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We unfortunately have not yet heard a reply to the question, a question that is of interest not only to the Soviet delegation but also the delegation of India, as we see it, namely, which proposals you have in mind. Therefore, before anything is put to the vote we would wish to know quite specifically what it is that is being put to the vote.

We have just heard a reference to the proposal of the delegation of the United States which has just been read out. That is a proposal, a proposal as to substance. But there is a proposal on your part as well, Mr. President, which was introduced earlier, and to that proposal there is an amendment of the Soviet delegation. Therefore, we would wish to ask you, Mr. President, to observe the rules of procedure and to put to the vote the proposals in accordance with the rules of procedure. There is our amendment, and therefore that has to be put to the vote first; then we could vote on your proposals together with the amendment of the Soviet Union, which in our view should have been adopted by the Council.

Yes, we would wish to have an answer to the question which has been put to you, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: I think that if we abide by rule 63 of the rules of procedure, the answer to the question is rather irrelevant. We are dealing now with a motion that is further removed from whatever proposal -- whatever the character of the proposal -- came before it, and therefore I shall now put to the vote the proposal made by the representative of the United States.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I regret to have to ask for the floor again on just a procedural matter. I do not want to intervene too often on this point, but when you say that there are two proposals and that one is "further removed", what are the two proposals? Naturally, the members of the Council, before they are called upon to vote, are entitled to know what the proposals are. Does the Chair have a proposal or not? The Chair said some time ago that the Chair did not have a proposal. I want to be absolutely clear on whether, at any stage of our proceedings, we are coming to a vote on a proposal from the Chair. If there is no such proposal, then we have before us the Secretary-General's report on credentials, and we should proceed to take action on that in accordance with our views. But I do feel that clarification is called for, Sir.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I should like also to confess that I am in some sort of quandary regarding this question. I do not understand what we are going to vote on. When you use the term "further removed", certainly it comes to mind that there are amendments and that one amendment is further removed from another; but when it comes to proposals, I cannot understand what is "further removed". If we have two proposals or three proposals, then the Council will decide as to which one is will accord priority. That I can understand; and I believe that the representative of the United States has asked for priority for his proposal, bearing in mind that there were other proposals before the Council, namely, the one by the President and the one by the representative of the Soviet Union.

However, I would like to say here that, from what I have been able to gather so far, the representative of the Soviet Union has made an amendment to a proposal that he thought you made, Mr. President, and which I also understood that you made at the inception of this meeting. For that reason, Sir, I would like to have some sort of clarification. We have been speaking about something as being "further removed" from something else, and so far as I can see, this would refer to amendments, not to proposals. That one proposal should be further removed from another does not seem to me, in this connexion, to be pertinent.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I do not wish to intervene at all except in order to see if some clarification can be introduced. As I understand the situation, particularly after having heard the recent intervention by the representative of the United States, what we have to vote on now is whether or not the United States proposal should have priority over the Soviet motion, which was in the form of an amendment. This is a perfectly proper procedure for the Council to vote on, and I think it would be very desirable from all points of view if the matter could be put to the vote quickly. If I understood correctly, when this has been disposed of, we can then get on to whatever our next item is. This seems to me quite clear.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate the intervention of the United Kingdom representative. That is exactly what I was proposing to do. Since there seems to be no consensus on this, regardless of whether we are confronted with proposals or amendments or other motions, it is a matter of priority. Therefore, I shall leave it to the Council to decide which of the two motions, or proposals, or whatever, has priority, and I shall ask the Council to take a vote on this.

Mr. CBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The way in which the rules of procedure are being interpreted by the representative of the United Kingdom is something which has no precedent. In no organ of the United Nations has there ever been such a procedure whereby an amendment to a proposal has not been put to the vote before the proposal itself. I realize that it would have been legitimate from the point of view of our rules of procedure for the United States representative to have asked for priority for his proposal over the proposal which was introduced prior to it by the President. Now, however, the representative of the United Kingdom in an attempt to hasten procedure -- presumably he is interested in having this voted on as quickly as possible, and this also not in accordance with the rules of procedure -- is proposing to tell us to choose between the United States and USSR proposals. But the Soviet Union, for its part, has made no proposal. It has suggested an amendment to the proposal introduced by the President. Therefore, I do not think that we should becloud things which are completely clear. Apparently the United Kingdom representative has a position with regard to procedure as well as in relation to the substance of the question, and in voting for or against the United States proposal he will express that position, but the Soviet delegation meanwhile has introduced an amendment, in accordance with the rules of procedure, and has asked that it should be voted upon first, before a vote is taken on the President's proposal, which itself was introduced first. That is why I appeal again to the President to follow the rules of procedure and to put to the vote first the Soviet amendment to his proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now proceed to consult the Council. Will all those members who are in favour of giving priority to the proposal made by the United States so signify by raising their hands?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): On a point of order, Mr. President. When it is said that a certain proposal is to be given priority and that it is going to be voted on first, then we would like to have you state quite clearly priority over what. Why is there such parsimony in your speech? Why are you so terse? Perhaps you could explain the position fully, as a President should do, and not hasten to the voting at a time when the members of the Council are not quite sure what they are voting for or against. That is why, when you speak of putting to the vote the preliminary question of which of two proposals is to be given priority, we request you to explain to us, without any further modesty, what in fact you have in mind. The proposal of the United States you have named as such, but we have not heard from you in relation to which other proposal you intend to put the question of priority.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): On a point of order, Mr. President, I should just like to ask you a question. Is a proposal to amend a motion? In my understanding, it is. If it is, it clearly comes under rule 65, and that would answer the question of the Soviet Union representative.

The PRESIDENT: I think it does, and therefore I shall now proceed to the vote. I repeat, will all those members who are in favour of giving priority to the proposal made by the United States representative so signify by raising their hands?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): On a point of order. I would still wish to see more respect for the rules of procedure. Any representative has the right at least to know what he is being invited to declare himself about. You have referred, Mr. President, specifically to the proposal of the United States representative, and you are asking that we should vote on the question of giving priority to it. We ask,

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

"Priority in relation to what?" What other proposal is there. The representative of India has asked you about that. We are asking about it now. In relation to what other proposal to you intend to give priority to the United States proposal? We still have not had an answer to that question, and I think it would be no more than a manifestation of friendly regard for the delegations of India and the Soviet Union if you answered it. It is a perfectly legitimate question and, as I say, we must know for or against what we are voting.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): Also in the interests of procedure and of clarification, might I, with respect, go back to the origins of this present situation? It would appear to me that there is really only one proposal before the Council, namely, that of the United States delegation, for this reason -- that a suggestion from the Chair does have a special character. It is not precisely a motion moved in the Council. It is tantamount to saying, from the Chair, that the Council should adopt a given report -- in this case the report on credentials -- unless there is objection. On this occasion objection was heard in the form of a proposed amendment to a proposal which was not, to my mind, tantamount to a proposal in the sense of the rules of procedure. Of course, this does raise the question which we have gone into in this Council before, namely, whether the Council is competent to adopt an amendment in effect to a report of the Secretary-General. I think that the Council can either adopt such a report or not adopt it. If certain members of the Council object to the report, either in part or in toto, they are entitled to state their objections. Then the Council would normally proceed to a vote on the adoption of the report if that were called for.

I think that the Council is not competent to consider, in the form of an amendment to the report of the Secretary-General, a particular point of view, for the expression of which there is, of course, ample opportunity. If that analysis is valid, then it follows that in the situation which arose -- namely, objection to the adoption of the report -- a proposal was introduced by the United States in an endeavour to overcome that particular procedural obstacle. I think there is only one proposal before the Council, namely that of the United States, and of course it is for you, Mr. President, to say that the Council should vote upon that.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has just heard the remarks made by the representative of Australia.

Is the Council prepared to vote in the way suggested by the Chair a while ago, namely, to vote in favour of the priority of the proposal made by the representative of the United States? If you are prepared to do so, all those in favour will please signify so.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, if you consider that the statement of the representative of Australia has introduced more clarity into the situation, then how can we simply go on to the vote? The representative of Australia has stated that there is, in fact, only one proposal before us, and now you speak of several proposals and are proposing that we put to the vote the proposal of the United States, namely, that priority be given to the proposal of the United States. The representative of Australia considers that there is only one proposal. Thus, the members of the Council are definitely faced with the need for clarity, and in such cases the President should clarify the position and state how many proposals we have.

It seems to me that the situation is clear. There is a proposal from the President, an amendment to it by the Soviet delegation, and the proposal of the delegation of the United States. Why should we go and becloud a clear day? Why should we vote on a matter which is completely unclear, and ask, rather, for priority without specifying priority with respect to that?

That is why, once again, I request, Mr. President, before you put to the vote any proposal whatsoever, you fully and clearly explain what it is you are putting to the vote. In comparison to what proposal do you wish to give priority to the proposal of the representative of the United States?

Mr. KIANG (China): As I see it now, this is exactly the situation we faced last year and, Mr. President, I think you will recall what the Council decided at that time.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

Having said this, I am in complete agreement with the representative of Australia. In order to overcome this so-called obstacle in the present parliamentary situation, I would suggest the following, as we did last year.

The first thing we should do, if the representative of the Soviet Union insists, is decide whether his amendment is admissible. That was a question which we decided last year, and there is a precedent. Last year we decided such an amendment to a report of the Secretary-General was not admissible. After overcoming that hurdle, we just approved the report of the Secretary-General.

I think that will simplify the matter, and I do hope that the Council will follow that procedure.

The PRESIDENT: I think that several opinions have now been expressed on this particular question.

In the opinion of the Chair, in order to be able to proceed with our business and having considered all the aspects of the situation, it would be definitely advisable to proceed with the vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States, of which the Council is aware. Therefore, if the members are ready, we shall so proceed.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, once again we wish to put to you a perfectly simple, human question, which could be put to you by anyone. Which proposal are you putting to the vote? We ask that it be repeated. Are you putting to the vote the procedural proposal of the United States, to the effect that it be given priority, or the proposal of the delegation of the United States as to its substance -- in other words, the text which has actually been read out by the delegation of the United States?

It seems to me that that is an elementary request on the part of any delegation, to which the President can accede quite simply.

What do you intend to put to the vote? If you wish to put to the vote the proposal of the United States as to substance -- in other words, the text that was read out by the delegation of the United States -- then it seems to us that you,

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

as the President, who is observing and is the custodian of the rules of procedure, cannot put the proposal as to substance to the vote first.

Why? The answer is simply because prior to that another proposal was introduced, and that is the first one. That proposal was made by you, Mr. President, and to that proposal there is our amendment. Therefore, we wish to know quite clearly what it is you are putting to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now ask the Council if the members are ready to vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States. I shall ask the representative of the United States to read it out again for the benefit of the members.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): The motion of the United States is that:

"The Trusteeship Council decides not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth regular 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."

I ask, under rule 63, that this motion be given priority over any other motion, including a motion to amend by the representative of the USSR.

The PRESIDENT: Will the members in favour of the proposal made by the representative of the United States --

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is not clear to us why you as the President do not wish to say which proposal it is meant that we should vote for or against at this point. The representative of the United States is introducing two proposals. One is a proposal on substance -- and the text was read out to that effect -- and another proposal is a procedural one. He asks that his substantive proposal be given priority, and you, Mr. President, for utterly incomprehensible reasons, considering that the question of priority has already been disposed of, now wish to put to the vote the proposal of the United States as to its substance.

To us such a procedure is completely incomprehensible and we call for clarification. We have no other official person who could provide us with clarification but the President, and that is why we constantly appeal to you, Mr. President. I think that this request is not such an exaggerated one.

The PRESIDENT: I had asked the Council to take a vote on the proposal made by the representative of the United States. The proposal of the representative of the United States is composed of two parts, a substantive one and a procedural one. I will now ask the Council to express its opinion, through a vote, on the proposal made by the representative of the United States.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am still not losing hope that we will after all be abiding by the rules of procedure. The representative of the United States is asking the Council to give priority to his proposal, and there is a proposal as to substance. If you wish to lump all that in the vote, Mr. President, or only the substantive proposal, then why, beforehand, do you consider that the question of priority has already been disposed of? We have not yet decided what to vote on and which proposal to vote on first and you already want to put to the vote the question of the substantive part. The situation is completely clear. Our positions as to substance might be different, but the procedure here is a single one. It has been laid down in the rules of procedure. There is one proposal, and then there is another proposal. Therefore, Mr. President, if you wish to put to the vote the proposal of the representative of the United States, you must put to the vote the request of the United States to give the United States proposal as to substance priority. What can be clearer than that?

Therefore, please state the position. I could even prompt a text for you if you have any difficulty whatsoever, for some reason or another, and I think that the Secretariat could assist in this matter. I see that the consultations are quite lively there and I am quite sure that the Secretary of the Council could be of assistance in formulating a proposal, in specific terms, as it should be expressed by the President.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): It seems to me that the situation should be entirely clear. My first request is a procedural request to decide on the question of priority. Those who do not want to give it priority will vote against it, quite naturally. So that all I ask in the first instance is priority for my motion, and then, however that is decided, Mr. President, you will put the substantive part of my motion next. It is perfectly clear. The Council can decide by voting for or against the question of priority.

The PRESIDENT: I may not have been clear, but that was exactly what I have been trying to do all this time. I have been trying to ask the Council to decide on whether it was ready to vote on the United States proposal. If the Council is ready, I shall ask the members to vote.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, the question which we are discussing is an important one and that is why I request that you state quite clearly which proposal you are putting to the vote. The representative of the United States calls for priority and you are saying that I wish to vote to decide on whether or not the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of the United States. Of course we are ready to vote. But on what proposal? After all, the Soviet delegation is not trying to avoid voting. But what is the proposal that you want to put to the vote?

The representative of the United States, it seems to me, has quite clearly explained his proposal, and I agree entirely with the procedural aspect of his explanation, although as to substance we have diametrically opposed positions. But the representative of the United States has introduced a proposal substantively, and he has introduced a procedural proposal to give priority to his substantive proposal. Let us vote on that proposal of the United States to give priority to the United States substantive proposal ahead of the other substantive proposal introduced at the beginning of our meeting by the President. If that is so, then I would request the Secretariat to jot down on a piece of paper the full text of just that proposal, and the President could then read that text out to us and then we would know exactly what proposal we are voting on.

The PRESIDENT: All I can say is that I am glad that the representative of the Soviet Union has come around to the point I was trying to make several times. What I asked the Council to take a vote on was a matter of priority, whether we were going to vote on taking the proposal made by the representative of the United States, and if this is so, if the Council is ready to vote on the priority for the proposal of the United States, then we shall proceed.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I think you said that you agreed with the text, at least with that statement which was made here by the Soviet delegation and the statement which was made here by the delegation of the United States. I wish to request the Secretary of the Council, if you agree with this text, to please read such a text out. Now you are speaking of priorities for the proposal of the representative of the United States, and you are not completing your sentence. As soon as you reach that point, you seem to have an exhaustion in your supply of energy. As compared to what proposal? As compared to what? If you speak of priorities, then, presumably, there is not one but at least two or three proposals, and so on.

Therefore, as we see it, the Secretary of the Council could put the thing down in the following way. One proposal has come before the Council from the President, and this was amended by the Soviet delegation. After that a substantive proposal was introduced by the delegation of the United States, and in addition to that the delegation of the United States introduced a procedural proposal to the effect that the Trusteeship Council give priority to the proposal of the United States in its substantive part -- therefore in relation to the previous proposal which was advanced by the President. Now the President asks the Council to make its views known on which of the proposals it should give priority, out of these two proposals. More specifically, the request of the United States is that the Trusteeship Council give priority to the substantive United States proposal as compared with the proposal which was introduced by the President.

It seems that the matter is quite clear. You, of course, Mr. President, are able to formulate this far better, but once again I request that you complete your thoughts and indicate what is the second proposal that is under consideration. If there is only one proposal, as the representative of Australia sees it, then how can we explain -- at least for the few people in the gallery -- the voting of the Council? There is only one proposal, and we are deciding a question of priority, that is, which proposal we are to give priority to. After all, we must know the limit, even for interpretations of this kind of the rules of procedure.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that we should really bring to an end this procedural debate, which does not touch upon the substance of the subject, which is in any case outside the province of the Council. I might put a question to the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union. The priority requested by the representative of the United States could be subject to amendment by the Soviet Union, and then we could vote on both proposals. May I ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether his amendment is directed to the United States proposal or to the original proposal made by the President? It seems to me that this would facilitate our debate substantially.

The PRESIDENT: Will all those in favour of giving priority to the proposal of the United States over the amendment presented by the representative of the Soviet Union to my proposal so signify by raising their hands?

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, if you wish to compare something, you must compare comparables. We introduced an amendment, and the delegation of the United States introduced a proposal. Our amendment refers to your proposal. Therefore, how can we now raise a question of priority as to what we are going to vote on first? If two amendments to your proposal had been advanced, then it would have been quite appropriate to decide the question of which of the two amendments we were going to vote on first. The procedure is completely clear. If the Council by a majority of votes decides to vote on the United States proposal as to substance first, then your proposal and our amendment will have to be voted on afterwards. If the Council decides that we must vote on your proposal first, then before voting on your proposal it must put to the vote our amendment. The procedure is quite clear.

Therefore, we wish to state that we have not introduced any proposals. We simply introduced an amendment to your proposal. When you put to the vote this whole matter, we would request that you state quite clearly that you have in mind your own proposal. In your last statement you did recognize that such a proposal had actually been made by you; you actually referred to your own proposal.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): The position is quite clear. We have to have regard to the United States proposal, and I distinctly heard the representative of the United States say that what he was now asking for a vote on was that his proposal, his substantive motion, should have priority over any other motion, including the Soviet amendment. This is what the representative of the United States asked for. I really think that we are gilding the lily; indeed, I think that is a too favourable phrase for what we are doing. It is quite clear what we are asked to vote on: whether the United States proposal should have priority over any other proposal, including the Soviet amendment.

There is only one way of settling this and that is by putting it to the vote. I seem to remember suggesting that about three quarters of an hour ago, and I should like to repeat my suggestion.

The PRESIDENT: I think the position is quite clear. I shall again ask members of the Council in favour of giving priority to the proposal made by the representative of the United States to so signify by raising their hands.

I give the floor to the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): May I explain my vote beforehand, Sir, since you seem intent on putting this proposal to the vote?

The PRESIDENT: I think that the vote had already started.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): It had not.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid so. I think that the representative of India will have an opportunity for an explanation of vote. We shall resume the voting. All those in favour of giving priority to the proposal of the United States will so signify by raising their hands.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): On a point of order. I think we have reached agreement here, and this was confirmed by the representative of the United Kingdom, that you would read out fully the text of the proposal that is being put to the vote. When the representative of the United States speaks, he completes his thought. When the representative of the United Kingdom speaks, he says that everything is quite clear, and that it was all quite clear to him three quarters of an hour ago, and he completes his thought. We ask that you, Mr. President, bring your thought to its logical conclusion also, namely, that you read out the full text of the proposal. I do not see why the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council has not so far been able to prepare such a text for the assistance of the President.

Therefore, we address ourselves once again to you with an appeal to state specifically that very clear situation that now obtains in the Council, at least in the spirit in which it was stated by the representative of the United States or the representative of the United Kingdom.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate the point of the representative of the Soviet Union. I shall repeat what I said. All those members in favour of giving priority to the proposal of the United States over the amendment of the Soviet Union to my proposal will so signify by raising their hands.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Apparently the best method now would be for the representative of the United States to give a written text of his proposal to you, Mr. President, because, for reasons which we cannot understand, you constantly formulate the proposal of the representative of the United States not in the way in which it was formulated by the representative of the United States. Therefore we appeal to the delegation of the United States to give a written text to you, Mr. President, so that you may read out that text to us.

The PRESIDENT: I shall read out the proposal presented by the representative of the United States:

"The delegation of the United States requests priority in the vote under rule 63 of its proposal over the proposal of the President and the motion of the USSR."

Is the Council prepared to vote?

Mr. RASGOIRA (India): I should like to explain our position in this matter. With due respect to the representative of the United States, who has put forward this proposal before the Council, I am sorry to have to state that this seems to us to be putting the cart before the horse. If the Council takes a decision on this proposal and then on the substantive proposal, it would be tantamount to prejudging the action that the Council might take on the Secretary-General's report, because this proposal relates in fact to one part of the credentials report. I presume it is intended so to relate. If it does, then by voting in favour of priority for this proposal and by voting subsequently on the substantive aspect of this proposal, what we are in fact doing is setting aside the report of the Secretary-General on credentials and, at the same time, taking a substantive decision on one aspect of it.

Therefore, my delegation has objection to this entire procedure and the entire manner in which we have proceeded on this question this morning. I recall that at the twenty-fifth session we were able to dispose of this matter in the course of fifteen minutes. At any rate, since the President decided that this will be put to the vote, I thought it proper for me to explain our position.

I should like to add that in the circumstances my delegation will be constrained to vote against the motion for priority and to vote against the proposal, should it come to the vote subsequently.

The PRESIDENT: We will now proceed to the vote. Will all those in favour of the priority of the American proposal signify so by raising their hands?

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

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I hope you will forgive me for my insistence, but I believe we agreed that you would read out the text in full as presented by the representative of the United States; in other words, to state, "I shall put to the vote the following proposal", and then to read out the full text of the proposal.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal has been read out two or three times by the representative of the United States, but it is quite proper that I should read it out once again:

"The Trusteeship Council decides not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth regular 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."

As the Council is aware, we are now voting on the priority of this proposal, and I therefore again request the members to signify ...

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

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had thought that the President was going to read out the text of the United States proposal on the procedural aspect of this matter in the form in which it was presented by the delegation of the United States. The President has once again read out the substantive part of the United States proposal. This is a perfectly clear situation but we still cannot get down to the voting because the President, for one reason or another, refuses to read out the text of the procedural proposal of the representative of the United States.

The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of the Soviet Union to choose his words; I did not refuse. I read it a while ago and I am going to read it again now. I actually read it out before calling on the representative of India. At any rate, I shall read it out again:

(The President)

"The United States delegation requests priority in the vote under rule 63 of its proposal" -- the one which I just read out -- "over the proposal of the President and the motion of the USSR." We shall now proceed to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 4.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the substantive part of the proposal made by the representative of the United States, and I shall read it out again:

"The Trusteeship Council decides not to consider for the duration of its twenty-sixth regular 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.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the Secretary-General's report which is before the Council.

I recognize the representative of Burma.

U THANT (Burma): Before we come to the vote on the Secretary-General's report on credentials, I would like, on behalf of my delegation, to state our position on this particular question. Of course, as is well known, the position of my delegation has been made very clear on all previous occasions whenever the question of the credentials of the Chinese delegation has come up for discussion, in the United Nations General Assembly as well as in all subsidiary organs of the United Nations: that the Government of the Union of Burma recognizes only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Therefore, in the view of my delegation, the credentials of the Republic of China are not valid.

Of course, my delegation will vote for the adoption of the Secretary-General's report on credentials. But this should not be construed as acceptance of all the implications in the report; and that is why we voted against the proposal for priority moved by the representative of the United States and against the substantive proposal of the United States also.

With this reservation, my delegation will vote for the adoption of the report of the Secretary-General.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The credentials of a member of this Council, of a representative in this Council or in other organs of the United Nations, are issued individually by the Government concerned. The rules of procedure also speak of credentials not of the collectivity of the Council, but of members. Rule 17, for example, states:

"Pending the decision on the credentials of a representative" -- I would underline "a representative" -- on the Trusteeship Council, such representative shall be seated provisionally ...".

It follows from all this that any member of the Council is perfectly competent to seek a separate vote under an appropriate rule of procedure on the credentials of a particular representative. Such a request would be perfectly legitimate, and in our view, should be granted.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

We regret that the procedures the Council has adopted this morning have been intended to defeat any such proposition or any such request. Nevertheless, the Council is now about to vote on the credentials as a whole, and my delegation will vote for the report as a whole. However, I should like to explain that the Government of India, which I have the honour to represent, recognizes only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the Government of China, and we consider that that Government alone is competent to accredit representatives to the Trusteeship Council, as indeed to the other organs of the United Nations and the General Assembly as well. Our vote, therefore, in favour of the report as a whole is to be taken subject to this reservation.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I should like also to offer a brief explanation of our position regarding the question of credentials.

When the report of the Secretary-General on credentials is submitted to be voted upon by the Council, my delegation will certainly vote in the affirmative on that report as a whole. However, I would like to make the position of our delegation quite clear with regard to the credentials of one member, namely, the credentials regarding the representation of China.

My delegation has already stated its views on this question on various occasions, and I shall briefly reiterate those views. The Government of the United Arab Republic recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and has always steadfastly adhered to the view that it is only that Government which is legitimately entitled to be represented in the organs of the United Nations. For that reason, my delegation, although it will cast its affirmative vote in favour of this report, would like to state its reservation regarding this point.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since the Trusteeship Council decided, by a majority, to vote first on the United States proposal, and then, by that same majority, adopted that proposal, there now remains your proposal, Mr. President, to the effect that we should approve the report of the Secretary-General on credentials.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

The Soviet delegation would wish to state now that it is not at all in agreement with the procedure which was followed by the majority in the Council. We wish to declare ourselves against this, as referred to by the representative of India, namely, that the majority of the Council, using their mechanical majority, are impeding the separate voting on the credentials of one of the persons mentioned in this report. With this reservation in mind, the Soviet delegation, in voting on the report of the Secretary-General as a whole, will abstain from voting on that report, since in that report the credentials are mentioned of private individuals who do not represent China but who claim to do so, and who unlawfully occupy the seat of China here. For that reason, the Soviet delegation will vote against recognition of the credentials of these individuals, and in the vote on the report as a whole we shall abstain.

Before voting on the proposal to approve the report of the Secretary-General, Mr. President, the Soviet delegation requests that you put to a separate vote the credentials of those private individuals mentioned under the heading "China" in the Secretary-General's report. We shall vote against approval of these credentials, as being unlawful.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): In view of the last request made by the representative of the USSR I feel it necessary to invoke rule 60 of the rules of procedure and to make a motion thereunder. In the Secretary-General's report the credentials of all the representatives in the Trusteeship Council were found to be in order. Therefore this Council should, logically, vote on the report as a whole. In the view of the United States delegation it is unnecessary and inappropriate to vote separately on parts of the credentials report. Accordingly, I request that the proposal of the USSR representative be put to a vote in accordance with the provisions of rule 60. My delegation will vote against that proposal for a separate vote on the credentials of each representative.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard the proposal just made by the United States representative. He cited rule 60 of the rules of procedure, which reads:

"Parts of a report, draft resolution, other motion or amendment may be voted on separately at the request of a representative and subject to the will of the Trusteeship Council. The proposal shall then be voted on as a whole."

The Council has heard also the proposal made by the Soviet Union representative that the Secretary-General's report should be voted on in parts. Since objection has now been raised to that proposal, obviously the Council must take action in this connexion, and therefore I ask the Council to vote on whether a separate vote has to be taken or not on the Soviet Union proposal. All those in favour of a separate vote will please so signify by raising their hands.

The result of the vote was 4 in favour and 10 against.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal has been rejected by ten votes to four. We shall now proceed to vote on the Secretary-General's report (T/1520) as a whole.

The report was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 3f

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
(T/L.934; T/1511) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nucker, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Political advancement (continued)

U THANT (Burma): Before beginning my questions in this field, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to extend a very warm welcome to the Special Representative of the Administering Authority, Mr. Nucker. I am sure that his contribution to the success of the discussions in this Council will be as significant as in the past.

My first question relates to the subject of discussions at the annual conference. I suppose that, as usual, the annual conference of the Micronesian leaders met during the year under review. I would be glad to know from the Special Representative what specific subjects of interest were discussed at that meeting and what decisions, if any, were arrived at. If I remember correctly, the Special Representative said last year, during the twenty-fourth session of this Council, that the issue of shifting the headquarters from Guam and of placing the entire Territory under a single civilian authority would be one of the subjects of discussion at the conference. I should like to know if he could tell us whether this matter was in fact discussed at the conference.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The matter was discussed with the delegates at the Inter-District Conference. There was no strong desire on the part of any of the delegates with respect to the moving of headquarters to the districts at this time. It was brought out that as the district congresses and local leaders developed, the decision as to where and when headquarters should come into the Trust Territory would best be made at a later date rather than at the present time.

So far as the discussion with regard to one agency of the United States Government having administration responsibility over all of the Trust Territory rather than the two now having such responsibilities, the delegates from Saipan had no particular thought of the desire for a change from Navy to Interior. They were more mindful of the possible future, which would point the words "integration with Guam", and discussed this matter.

So far as the other delegates in the remaining districts under the Department of Interior, they felt that this matter more properly belonged with the Saipanese group for a decision.

To sum up, there was no great interest in the Government coming into the Trust Territory at this time because it was thought they should wait until more knowledge was at hand, and there was no strong desire with regard to one administrator of all rather than the two.

U THANT (Burma): I have noted in the next to last paragraph on page 20 of the annual report a statement that the Inter-District Advisory Committee is one of the preliminary steps toward the eventual development of an elected Territorial Advisory Council.

As far as the name goes, the elected Territorial Council does not seem to signify any great advantage over the present Inter-District Advisory Committee. Could the Special Representative kindly enlighten us as to what functions and powers are envisaged for this Committee in its eventual and ultimate form, as distinct from those now held by the Inter-District Advisory Council?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): At the present time the Inter-District Advisory Council consists of two members from each district, who have been elected by the Local District Congress. Each of the local district congressmen have been elected by the members in the community.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

I look forward to the Inter-District Advisory Committee expanding into, as it were, an Inter-District Congress made up of people elected directly by the voters in their home districts, thus creating a Central Congress which would deal with the problems of all the districts and those problems which are inter-related between districts, thereby leaving to the Local District Congresses those matters relating to the particular district. I believe I could draw an easier understood parallel by stating that we would have a body, as we have our United States Congress, having over-all authority as far as law making is concerned for the United States. The District Congresses then would become comparable to our State Senates, legislative bodies. This is where we are striving to go.

There was some discussion this time as to the possibility within the next two years of having the people in each district elect the representative to the Inter-District Congress or moving in the direction of expansion.

U THANT (Burma): My next question relates to the conduct of the Inter-District Advisory Committee meetings. My delegation, of course, attaches very great importance to its operations.

I was wondering if the Special Representative could tell us if the proceedings of these committee meetings are recorded and, if so, whether they are made known to the people of Micronesia in some way or another.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The records of the meetings are recorded. They are distributed to each district. There they are translated into that particular district language and distributed to the leaders and to the local congressmen in the district. In addition, each delegation upon its return home, reports to its Congress and its leaders. There is wide distribution not only of the written word but the impression the congressmen take back home with them.

U THANT (Burma): My next question relates to the civil service.

On page 27 of the annual report, conditions of employment and training programmes are described in some detail. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the Micronesian Title and Pay Plan provides equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, race, nationality, religion or class.

(U Thant, Burma)

I would be grateful if the Special Representative could tell us if there are in existence labour organizations formed along similar lines with other labour organizations in other countries and Territories? Of course, I note in the latter part of the report that there are no labour organizations or unions as such, but I was wondering whether there were organizations or unions in the civil service.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There are no organized labour unions or organized labour groups in the sense of the word used at this table: organized union.

There are credit unions of Micronesian employees, and there are groupings of Micronesian employees in each district, but they cannot be considered in terms of an organized labour union or civil service union of any type.

U THANT (Burma): During the course of the administration of the Trust Territory by the Administering Authority have any Micronesian civil servants or group of civil servants expressed any desire to organize themselves?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There have been no expressed desires to organize. And I might anticipate by stating that at this time our Administration would have no objections to such an expression and, in fact, I believe would help them organize so that they could have a group of their own, if this was their desire.

U THANT (Burma): My delegation notes with satisfaction that during the year under review, additional Micronesians moved into positions formerly held by American staff members. That information appears on page 28 of the annual report. We also understand that this was done by direct replacement in some instances and in others by reorganization to distribute the duties among an enlarged Micronesian staff. Instances are also cited in the report of some qualified Micronesians taking over responsible posts from Americans.

I feel that with a view to giving a more complete and clearer picture in future reports of the Trust Territory, statistics of Micronesians taking over responsible posts from Americans should be given in a sort of tabular form. For instance, comparative statistics for, say, the last three years, showing more and more Micronesians holding responsible posts would be a source of gratification to the Council. I would be glad to hear the views of the Special Representative.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I thank the representative of Burma for that suggestion. I would like to include such a schedule because I am proud of what has happened there. I am sorry that we did not include it in this year's report.

U THANT (Burma): I am very grateful to the Special Representative for his very helpful answer. I observe on page 30 of the report that there are no political organizations or parties organized for purely political purposes. The world would surely be in a very happier position if all other countries could emulate the Micronesians in this respect. My question is the following: Is the Special Representative aware of any move on the part of the Micronesians, either at the Inter-District Advisory Committee or through some other forum, to form some sort of a political organization?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): No, sir, I am not aware of any such move at the present time. In Ponape we have had the first semblance of people joining together for political reasons, but not in the sense of a political party. There, when men are running for congress, there is more of what in our country we call "electioneering" done than in any other district. The candidate's friends will go out and talk for him, but they do not talk along political lines. They

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

talk along the lines of the qualities of the candidates and their desire to have one or another.

Micronesia, so far as the inter-district conference level is concerned has not suggested the developing of political parties. We still have some distance to go, before there is the natural concept of one party vis-à-vis another party or other parties throughout Micronesia. The people are still primarily interested in their district problems and have not suggested even the developing of political parties.

U THANT (Burma): I have noted in the report that preliminary plans for the production of a book on the Territory for use in schools have been initiated and that actual preparation is slated to commence after the close of the fiscal year 1959. Could the Special Representative kindly tell the Council the approximate time when the book will be ready for use in schools?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): At the present time I think that three or four chapters of that book have been finished. Just before leaving Guam I talked to the author and he stated that the book should be finished by 1 January 1961, for distribution.

U THANT (Burma): The last Visiting Mission to the Territory very strongly recommended that the Administering Authority give its consideration to combining the Rota and Saipan Districts. I would like to know whether the Administering Authority has considered this question seriously during the year under review, and if so, what are the results? I would also like to know whether the people of Rota and the people of Saipan have expressed themselves in any manner on this issue, one way or the other.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): In fact this problem is currently under discussion. It has been considered quite seriously for the past three or four months. This is the problem of combining Rota and Saipan under one district. There has been no decision made at the present time. The people of Rota, in my opinion, would favour -- and those with whom I have talked have expressed the desire -- being the same as Saipan, being a part of Saipan. Of course, there are those who disagree, the dissidents, but I believe that the majority of opinion is in favour.

(Mr. Nucker, Special
Representative)

As far as Saipan is concerned, I have heard of no reason by the Saipanese that would offer an objection to the two coming together. As I say, there is no decision at this time, but the problem certainly is currently under very deep consideration.

U THANT (Burma): My last question relates to the prescription of the minimum age. Of course, it will be recalled that the Trusteeship Council, at its twenty-fourth session, noted that in the Palau district the minimum voting age continued to be 21 years, as against 18 years in other districts, and it expressed the hope that the Administering Authority would take the necessary steps to achieve voting uniformity with other areas of the Territory. The Special Representative, in the course of the statement which he made yesterday, also observed that in line with recommendations made by the Council, attention has been given to the standardization of the voting age. The Palau Congress currently has the question of a reduction in voting age in their district under consideration.

(U Thant, Burma)

On page 145 of the report it is stated:

"The Administering Authority, while in agreement on the advantages of a uniform system in the qualifications of voters, again stresses its belief that such uniformity should come from a desire of the people themselves and not be imposed by the Administration."

Am I correct in my understanding that in all other districts the minimum voting age of eighteen years for congressional elections was prescribed voluntarily by the districts concerned and not imposed by the Administering Authority?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): That is correct. The age of eighteen years has come from each district with the exception of Palau. The Palau people made quite a decision when they agreed to the age of twenty-one, because in their past society a man received very little recognition until he had reached the age of twenty-six. The past session of the Palau Congress in November discussed this problem of possibly now dropping it from twenty-one to eighteen and it held the problem over for the session of the Palau Congress which meets in April. I understand that the question now is in committee in the current Palau Congress.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.