



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/EV.1064  
28 April 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND AND SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 28 April 1960, at 10.30 a.m.President:

Mr. VITELLI

(Italy)

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.1064 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.  
It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

## 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.964; T/1511, 1521)(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)

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): As I am going to put questions for the first time to the Special Representative, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express to him the pleasure of my delegation and my personal pleasure at seeing him in our midst again. I need hardly say how much we value his co-operation and assistance in our examination every year of the reports on this Trust Territory, and we again look forward to his usual co-operation and assistance in the discharge of our duties concerning this item.

I am going to put a few questions in the political field at this stage. I know that in one way or another some of these questions have been answered and I crave your indulgence, Sir, and the indulgence of the Special Representative if I appear to be repetitious.

In his opening statement, Mr. Nucker spoke of the adherence of the Administering Authority to the principle of targets and dates for the development of the Trust Territory towards the objectives of the Trusteeship System. This is very gratifying indeed. The report, however, gives no clear indication of any targets or dates in the political field. For example, I have failed to find any reference in the report to any target for the establishment of a Territory-wide legislative council or, for that matter, any target for the complete transformation of the present district congresses from advisory to fully responsible legislative organs of government. I may be mistaken, but this is the impression I got from the report. Could the Special Representative tell us how the Administering Authority applies this principle of fixing targets and dates to development in the political field in the Trust Territory?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There is no specific date established in the opening statement or in the annual report with respect to a territorial-wide congress or the changing of the present advisory group into a territorial-wide congress. The answer, however, has been given in response to several questions that, in my opinion, not less than five years will be required before we can seriously consider self-government or independence. It would be natural to assume that our territorial-wide congress would be in being by that time. I believe it is possible within the next two or three years to have delegates to the territorial-wide conference who are elected by the people.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I should like to follow this question a bit further. I am sure Mr. Nucker recalls the statement made yesterday by one of the petitioners regarding the question of granting legislative responsibility to the district councils. One of the petitioners said that one of the steps which, in his opinion, would be conducive to political development in the Territory and to the speedy attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System would be to grant immediately legislative powers to the district councils. He suggested, in conjunction with that, that a consultant on legislation should be appointed by the Administering Authority to assist these district councils in performing this duty.

I should like to hear Mr. Nucker's opinion on this suggestion. The people themselves are asking for legislative powers. From my knowledge of the Territory, I think they are sufficiently qualified with respect to local matters to handle such questions themselves. For that reason I feel that granting them legislative powers at this stage would not be premature.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): It is my opinion that at this time no district in the Trust Territory is ready for full legislative powers. To have full legislative powers to act on local matters in a district, there must be acceptance of the finance methods and techniques involved in the district. People cannot grow merely by passing laws when others are fully financing the results of the laws so passed. Full legislation, in my opinion, can only follow or go along with the ability to be able to take over in large measure the

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

executive work in the Government as well as judicial work. I do not believe the Marshalls are ready for a large measure of true legislative authority on a local basis at this time.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): A few days ago in answer to a question put by the representative of the United Kingdom, the Special Representative made some reference to the desire of some Micronesians to be lastingly associated with the United States. I would like to know whether he was referring to a particular district or to a particular section of the Micronesians and whether this feeling is growing and is being encouraged by the Administering Authority. I would be very glad to hear the comments of the Special Representative on this point, particularly in view of the fact that he stated this was close to his heart, that he wished to see such a situation eventually materialize.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): When I made the statement, I could see Micronesians in different districts who have talked to me and stated they would like to be associated directly with the United States. My answer was given with the thought of the statement being applicable to all districts. I did not, however, say that I wished to see this materialize. I want to correct that impression. I did say that this, of course, caused me to feel good -- the people expressing their opinions of the United States in such a manner, simply stating that they would like to be associated with us on a permanent basis. To my knowledge, there is no movement or direction on the part of Americans working in the Trust Territory to cause this to happen, which, to me, makes it all the more important. Our staff does not consider its job to be that of promoting the United States and instilling a desire on the part of the Micronesians to live with the United States on a permanent basis. They are constantly told that their job is to aid the Micronesians to raise their standard of living and develop towards self-containment politically, economically and in all ways, to as high a degree as possible. The fact that Micronesians have made these statements when we are not attempting to sell them this idea makes their expressions even the more gratifying.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): My next question also stems from the opening statement of the Special Representative. Speaking about the political development of the Territory, Mr. Nucker stated:

"The fourth annual meeting of the Inter-District Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner took place last November. This body, whose members are elected by representative district congresses, advanced still another step towards the eventual target goal of converting this group into an elected Territorial Advisory Council." (T/PV.1059, p. 26)

I have two questions with regard to that statement. In the first place, I should like to hear from the Special Representative what he means by the phrase "advanced still another step toward the eventual target goal". Could he make that statement a little more explicit? I should like to know in what way this constituted an advance or a step forward. Secondly, I should like to have the Special Representative tell me what the difference would be between the Territorial Advisory Council -- the target goal, so to speak -- and the present Inter-District Advisory Committee. As I see it, there appears to be very little difference. Both of them will be bodies probably elected by the district congresses, and both of them will have only an advisory capacity. I may be wrong, but I would be very grateful to Mr. Nucker if he could elucidate that for me.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): What I referred to when I spoke of advancing "still another step" was the fact that this year, for the first time, the Advisory Committee selected from among its members a group to become the social committee -- I have forgotten the precise title -- and to meet during the year and to report to the Advisory Committee next year the results of its studies of social conditions and to make recommendations to the Advisory Committee. In short, we have taken the step now of preparing committee work for the periods between meetings of the Inter-District Advisory Committee. I fully expect that this next meeting will result in the establishment of a committee for economic study and possibly one on education.

Now, as to the second part of the question: It is anticipated that within several years the delegates to the Inter-District Advisory Committee will be elected directly in their districts by the people in the districts. At the



(Mr. Nucker,  
Special Representative)

present time, the delegates are selected by Congressmen, who have been elected. I envisage that in a few years men will run for these offices -- and the Inter-District Advisory Committee will change its name at that time -- just as they now run for Congress in their local districts.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): My last question concerns municipalities. I think it is possible that the Special Representative has already answered this question, but I hope I will be forgiven if I put it again. The Administering Authority has a plan to charter ten municipalities each year -- I think that is the statement that was made -- and this year the Administering Authority chartered double that number, or twenty municipalities. All I wish to know is this: Is there any general plan regarding the chartering of municipalities? Does the Administering Authority have a fixed over-all number of municipalities which it is trying to apportion over the years, chartering ten of them each year or, if possible, more than that -- or does it depend on the circumstances, so that, whenever conditions demand the chartering of a certain municipality, that municipality will be chartered? If the latter is the case, then I see no justification for the fixing of the number of ten or any other number.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): That is a good question. First, I want to say that the word "plan" could in this instance be a substitute for the word "hope", and that, instead of "ten a year", one should understand "an average of ten a year". We have no specific plan to pick certain municipalities each year and say: "This is your year, because we want to meet the goal of ten which we have told others about".

We have 102 municipalities in the Trust Territory. Considering our rate of development, I believe that we can average ten a year and do justice to the intent of the chartering programme, namely to cause the people to know the benefits of a chartered municipality rather than the unorganized municipality operation of today. But in no event will we charter a municipality until after a period of education has been finished and the people of the municipality, as a result of that educational process, then ask to be chartered.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In reply to several questions asked of the Special Representative, he mentioned a period of at least five years. We should like to determine whether we understood his reply correctly. Does the Special Representative believe that this period of five years will permit the attainment of the goal set by the Charter of the United Nations -- that is, autonomy or self-government -- or is another goal envisaged, of a more limited scope?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I have never used the phrase "five years" in terms of a finite time when the Trust Territory will be able to meet the goals of the Trusteeship Agreement. I have used that in terms of a step which I think will ultimately result -- and I do not know; it may be five years more -- in reaching the goals of this Council. I have used the term "five years" in reference particularly to the establishment of a Territory-wide Congress, more than I have used it in any other connotation.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): From the calculations of the Special Representative and in accordance with his opinion, another five years will be required to have a Territory-wide Congress with full powers before we reach the goals of the Charter. Thus, we will have to envisage a period of ten years altogether. Do I understand the question correctly?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): In consideration of what I consider the major goal of this Council, namely, to have people able to run and capable of running their own affairs in a manner beneficial to the people, I would assume that ten years is a much closer figure than five years, as suggested.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Special Representative has expressed his opinion concerning the period necessary for the Territory to reach the goals of the Charter. We should like to clarify this now. What does the Administering Authority envisage under the expression "the major goal" for this Territory? I will explain my question by a reference to the yearly report of the Administering Authority. In Appendix B, on page 159, it is stated that the objective in including these Pacific islands in the international Trusteeship system is the achievement of autonomy or independence. We agree completely with this statement, inasmuch as it corresponds to the goals of the Charter. However, on the same page it is stated that the policy of the Department of the Interior of the United States is to further the evolution of the people towards self-government. Only this term, "self-government", is used here. Is this an error in printing, or did the Administering Authority decide in advance that the goal for this Territory is self-government and not independence?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I would call attention to page 15 of the annual report, under the heading "Political Advancement", the first sentence:

"It is the policy of the Trust Territory Government to foster and encourage political advancement toward a goal of self-government or independence which evolves through the will, the needs, and the desires of the inhabitants of the Territory."

I believe that should answer the question just asked.



Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I cannot agree that that is a reply to our question. If the first sentence on page 15 is quoted as a reply, this only justifies the raising of our question. On page 159 it is stated that the goal is "self-government or independence"; on page 15 it is stated:

"It is the policy of the Trust Territory Government to foster and encourage political advancement toward a goal of self-government or independence ...".

We agree with this statement. We also agree with the statement on page 159, where the objectives are also stated as self-government or independence. But on this same page 159, under the heading "Policies, Political Advancement", we find the sentence which gave rise to our question, to which we have not received an answer. I quote this sentence:

"The policy of the Department of the Interior is to encourage the political advancement of the people of the Trust Territory toward a goal of self-government."

Thus, on page 15 the policy of the Administering Authority in the Territory encourages the attainment of the goal of self-government or independence, whereas the policy of the Department of the Interior differs from this goal, judging by the annual report; the latter policy speaks only of self-government. We would like to know whether this is a misprint of the authors of this report or whether this in reality is the policy of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I am satisfied that at the time the policy referred to was written the author of the statement of that policy did not have in mind the questions which would arise by reason of having left out the word "independence" following "self-government". It is our opinion that after the Micronesians have arrived at the stage of self-government, they then can decide on independence.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

I assure the members of the Council that the non-inclusion of the word "independence" in the policy statement was not, in my opinion, a purposeful non-inclusion of that word, but rather an indication of the thought that self-government would come first, and then the selection of independence would follow.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): My next question is directed not to the Special Representative, but to the representative of the United States. It is as follows. When does the Administering Authority intend to fulfil its recommendations that the Trust Territory come under one civil administration and that the administration be transferred from Guam to the Territory itself?

I know that this question is outside the competence of the Special Representative, in spite of certain remarks we heard made by him; but the direct decision depends on the Government of the United States, the Government of the Administering Authority, and therefore we would address this question to the representative of the United States.

Mr. GERIG (United States): This particular point has already been commented on at this session of the Council, and in previous sessions of the Council reasons and explanations were given as to why it seems to the Administering Authority at the present time more suitable to have the headquarters of the Territory in Guam. I think the Administering Authority has never taken the position that those headquarters, at the appropriate time, could not and should not be removed to another place. However, at the present time the Administering Authority has no reason for deciding that the headquarters should be in another place than where it is at present. As I say, that possibility is certainly not excluded, and a number of factors -- taking into account the situation in the Territory as a whole, and where might be the most convenient and suitable place to establish headquarters within the geographical area of the Trust Territory -- will be borne in mind, and a decision will undoubtedly be made when the circumstances permit.

(Mr. Gerig, United States)

I do not believe I can give a more concrete answer than that. We do not actually feel that there is any inconsistency in having the headquarters where they are at the present time, any inconsistency with the obligations undertaken by the Administering Authority for the government of the Territory.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We would like to know in a more detailed way when the Administering Authority is planning to fulfil these recommendations.

We must note a certain contradiction in the position taken by the Administering Authority. On the one hand, the Administering Authority does not deny foundation for the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council and states that at the appropriate time the Administering Authority has the intention of removing the headquarters of the Territory into the geographical territory of the Trust Territory. At the same time, the representative of the United States questions, or seems to question, this recommendation of the Trusteeship Council, that there is no inconsistency in the present arrangement and that this arrangement could be kept.

If the representative of the Administering Authority cannot tell us even the approximate duration of the present arrangement, we will now ask the following question: Will there be any consultations with the population of the Trust Territory concerning concrete measures towards the attainment of self-government or independence?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): This is a normal way of life in the Trust Territory. There are constant discussions, meetings with various groups, in which discussion is held as to rate of growth, ability to take over; so that my answer is that there is, and will continue to be, consultations in this regard.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We would like, again, to draw your attention to the fact that at the present session of the Trusteeship Council the representatives of the local inhabitants of the Marshall Islands have expressed a certain plan of concrete measures which they consider necessary in order to implement the goals of the Trusteeship. They have expressed seven points of their plan, and we would like to know the Administering Authority's attitude toward this programme. Does the Administering Authority agree with this plan, and does it have the intention of implementing it?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): Most of the items suggested in this plan, as submitted by the petitioners at the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, are items which we have been working with constantly, to wit: shipping; development of legislation; the problem of moving into the district; the suggestion that they have a legislative consultant, that followed a previous statement by the petitioners which would indicate that maybe they have too much consulting at the present time, when they suggested that the District Administrator tried to tell them what to have on their agenda. These are all problems we work with constantly, and I am in general accord with what was said.

I have no major discrepancy in thinking because there has been repeated that which we have constantly been talking about within the districts.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As to the first point of this plan, the petitioners stated that they would like the District Congress to have legislative powers purely on local questions. Other representatives in the Council have referred to this point. I would like to note that at the twenty-fourth session of the Trusteeship Council we expressed the hope that in the near future the powers of District Congresses would be broadened. We would like to know what has been done in this respect and what is planned in this regard during the current year.

This question is appropriate because we have heard here the opinion of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. They have evaluated the activity of this District Congress, and they called this activity a big joke, taking into account the lack of any powers possessed by these Congresses. Therefore, we would like to know what has been done and what is planned to be done in the <sup>current year</sup> year future.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): Naturally, I cannot thoroughly agree with the statement that the local Congress has no powers. They do not have full powers. Congressmen from other districts would not make the same statements that the petitioners made. I am certain of this. I do not think one can draw a wide conclusion based on a narrow remark.



(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

Our Congresses now have the authority of law by reason of resolutions passed which, if not acted upon within a period of time, become law.

I propose to continue working with the congressmen, so that at each level of the district operation we can hasten the time when broader powers will be given. I have no plan in mind for the immediate year from now with respect to any particular broadening or changing of congressional powers.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The following question concerns the present condition of health of those inhabitants, in particular, of Rongelap, who have suffered from radioactivity radiation as a consequence of the explosion of nuclear devices organized by the authorities of the United States on the Territory.

We have heard the statement of the petitioners that, in accordance with their information, as a result of this irradiation twelve people died. The Special Representative, in his remarks, did not agree with this figure and brought up other figures. However, he did not deny the death cases as a result of irradiation.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Therefore, we would like to know whether there were death cases other than those that were registered, cases that would indicate a worsening in the health condition of the population of the Trust Territory. This is a very important question because we heard the Administering Authority say many times that the danger period was over, that regular medical examinations are no longer necessary. That was stated in the annual reports of the Administering Authority. On the other hand, we know of these facts which refer to the very bad and dangerous consequences of these experiments in the Trust Territory. Could the Special Representative reply to this question, which is of interest, I believe, to all the members of the Trusteeship Council?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I should like to reply to this question if for no other reason than to clarify in the questioner's mind what I did say rather than what he has taken my words to mean. First, I did not say that the people at Rongelap had died by reason of irradiation, the fall-out. Secondly, I did say that of the 84 people who suffered from that fall-out, only 4 have died since the fall-out. If the representative of the Soviet Union will read my reply, he will see that I went on to say that one of those persons died of cancer, that two of those persons died by reason of illness they were known to have before the fall-out, and that the fourth one died of chickenpox. I thought that this was a very conclusive answer.

I am quite surprised to hear that I am given credit for saying that people died by reason of irradiation. I did not say that.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that it is not necessary for one to be a big specialist. This knowledge is popular knowledge and the Special Representative knows that cancer is the illness from which, in the majority of cases, people who have suffered from irradiation die. It can also be leukemia, the cancer of the blood. It can be sarcoma. All these illnesses are caused by irradiation. A man can also die from pneumonia and one could conclude that this is not a result of irradiation. However, we know that irradiation does cause pneumonia.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Therefore, when the Special Representative stated that one inhabitant who died as a consequence of cancer, we understand that this is a consequence of important doses of irradiation to which some inhabitants were subjected. I do not think that the Special Representative will deny such a link between the two phenomena, or at least he will not attempt to deny it. We are not quoting the opinion of the Special Representative, but we would like to know the opinion of the specialist who submitted his report to the Special Representative. I think that the situation is not as favourable as the Special Representative is attempting to prove. We have heard the statements of the petitioners here, and their anxiety can be explained only by psychological reasons.

Mr. MUCKER (Special Representative): It is my understanding, based on what I have been told by the specialists and the doctors, that none of the four deaths could be attributed to irradiation. To get into the realm of the effects of irradiation on these individuals, in terms of degree of injury done, would be getting into a discussion that I think each of us had best stay away from. I am accepting that information which was given to me by the doctors and the scientists who have worked with the people.

This conversation at the present time reminds me of the large problem in the world today regarding the cause of lung cancer: cigarettes. Around this table there are men who have given up smoking because of what they have read. There are those of us who either do not believe what we read or do not have the will to give up smoking. I cannot argue the point. I do not know enough about it. I have no further remarks to make concerning the four people of the original eighty-four who were victims of the fall-out and who have died since that fall-out.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not suggest that the Special Representative should embark upon a scientific discussion inasmuch as I personally would not be able to participate in such a decision. I do not know whether the Special Representative is qualified, but I am certainly not qualified as regards this question. That is why we are raising the question, because the Special Representative was in contact with doctors and specialists. What we heard from the Special Representative was only a repetition of what he heard from the specialists and doctors. I did not think

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

that this information originated from him. But in general we were interested in the condition of health of those inhabitants who were victims of a fall-out.

Let us assume that nobody died of the results of this fall-out. But the petitioners told us that many inhabitants who had suffered from this irradiation are experiencing a permanent condition of tiredness. In many cases their eyesight has failed, and in many cases some other symptoms were apparent which are frequently to be noted in such cases. This information is in accordance with a very authoritative source, the report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. I think that the Special Representative followed our advice of last year, at the twenty-fourth session of the Council, and familiarized himself with this report.

The scientists of twenty-four countries came to certain conclusions and if one reads this report, it is difficult to argue some points.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

There are certain facts which are well established in science, and these facts can be accepted as basic and well-founded. Therefore, we would like to know whether the American scientists have noted cases in which the health of the inhabitants worsened, or was this only a remark made by the petitioners?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): As is well known to this Council, American scientists and American doctors have over the years since the fall-out maintained a close check on the people of Rongelap. It is quite true that the information I gave the Council is the information which was given to me with regard to these deaths. I do not wish, as Special Representative, to argue or to appear to be disagreeing with the statements made by the petitioners. There are reasons why the petitioners would make such statements. I do not expect the petitioners to paint a pretty picture of conditions. I would expect the petitioners to state their opinions and their beliefs because there is at the present time, as I believe the representative of the Soviet Union knows, a suit which has been filed with regard to the Rongelap people. I do not think this Council -- and I am satisfied that the Special Representative is not -- is qualified to create an area of prejudice by prediscussion of what is now in a suit stage. I have no more to offer on this subject.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On page 145 of the annual report of the Administering Authority it is stated that the Administering Authority had reconsidered its plan for an organic law for the Territory. The Special Representative said the same thing in his introductory remarks. We would like to receive some additional information on this. Who is working on this organic law? Are there only American legal experts working on this, or are the local inhabitants represented as well?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): That is one reason why we will not have an organic act ready for Congress in 1960, as we had previously hoped. Until recently, we have not been able to work with Micronesian lawyers. We have gathered information from Micronesians about their thoughts and desires, and we have given that information to officials in the Department of the Interior who



(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

have been working on the organic act. The organic act should, as I have said previously, contain in large measure the desires of the Micronesians and should be an instrument which would permit a government to meet these needs. In direct response to the question, there is no committee formed of Micronesian and American lawyers or otherwise now devoted to developing an organic act. There is an exchange of information.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think that the Special Representative will agree with me that the needs of the Micronesians could best be reflected in this organic act if they themselves participated directly in the group which will be entrusted with elaborating the act.

On page 145 of the annual report it is stated that the Administration is planning to replace two American Assistant Administrators with qualified Micronesians by 1964, that is, in four years. I would like to know if there are any plans to entrust the positions of District Administrators to qualified Micronesians, and how much time would be required to fill these posts with qualified Micronesians.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The purpose of having Micronesians in Assistant District Administrators' posts is simply to enable us to get Micronesians qualified to become District Administrators. I definitely look into the future and see us having Micronesian District Administrators in five, six or seven years from now.

Mr. MOBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On pages 193 to 195 of the annual report there is a list of the American staff in the Administration of the Territory. If we have counted correctly, 273 Americans hold positions there. We would like to know what is the amount of the salaries paid to these American employees and officials. Is this a part of the figure of \$1,195,000 which is shown on one of the pages of the report, or is this amount shown in another section of the budget of the Territory?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative); It would be necessary for me to briefly review again the numerous schedules contained in the back of this report in order to answer specifically the question asked by the Soviet representative. There are 273 positions in the Trust Territory to be filled by United States personnel. At the present time there are, I think, 240 Americans on the job. Their salaries would total approximately \$1,250,000. I do not know on which page is the figure mentioned by the Soviet representative, but I think that is what it represents.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): There is one particular matter which caused me some surprise last year; it has been raised again this year, and I must say it has caused me some anxiety this time. Last year I asked a question of the Special Representative and I referred him to appendix B on page 149 of the annual report that we had before us, where it was stated:

"The policy of the Department of the Interior is to encourage the political advancement of the people of the Trust Territory toward a goal of self-government."

I pointed out that at page 11 of the same report, the report that we had before us last year, it was also stated:

"The Trust Territory Government in the year under review continued as its basic policy the encouragement of political advancement toward a goal of self-government which evolves through the will, the needs, and the desires of the inhabitants of the Territory."

I drew the High Commissioner's attention to Article 76 b of the Charter, which states that it is the purpose of trusteeship to promote the development of the inhabitants of Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. The comment of the High Commissioner to this question was as follows:

"That there is an omission of the word 'independence' is granted.

It was not a purposeful omission." (T/FV.995, page 4-5)

When the representative of the Soviet Union raised the same question this morning with regard to what is said on page 159 in the words:

"The policy of the Department of the Interior is to encourage the political advancement of the people of the Trust Territory toward a goal of self-government."

the High Commissioner's answer was exactly the same as his answer last year, that the omission was not purposeful. An omission once is an omission; once it is pointed out and it is there again, then it seems to assume some purpose. I hope that is not the case. I should like to believe that is not the case. Therefore I should like the representative of the United States and the High Commissioner to give this Council and my delegation an assurance that, even for the second time, this omission has been without any purpose and that they will draw the attention of the Department of the Interior to this omission and take the necessary steps to remove it and to remove thereby any cause for anxiety that we or other delegations around this table might feel.

(Mr. Rasgotra. India)

Policy is not a piecemeal thing. Policy is planning over a long period, planning in this context with a view to the future of the Territory, and policy must therefore be in conformity with what is laid down in the Charter. That is the basic policy, and any policy that is framed in this regard by the Administering Authority has to be in conformity with that. I should like to have some comments on this aspect of the matter.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I can only again call attention to the first sentence on page 15 of the annual report for 1959, in which the word "independence" is used. The policy statement was written several years ago, and, quite frankly, I did not request during the year that the Department of the Interior change that policy statement so as to include the word "independence". This was an oversight on my part. When our office prepared this report and submitted it to the Department of the Interior, which in turn submitted it to the State Department, which in turn printed it and submitted it to this group, we had included the word "independence" in the report this year on page 15. I can assure the representative of India that the statements made last year and this year with respect to independence both hold. I am sorry that the policy statement was not changed.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am most grateful to the Special Representative for his assurance. I did indeed take due note of what is stated on page 15 of the annual report. What is stated there is this: "It is the policy of the Trust Territory Government ...". On page 159 the policy mentioned is the policy of the Department of the Interior. We are concerned basically with the policy of the Administering Authority. The policy of the Trust Territory Government is at a lower level than the policy of the Administering Authority in this matter because the primary responsibility is that of the Administering Authority. But I am glad to have that assurance and I hope this position will be rectified.

My second question is also one that I asked last year but I should like to ask again. The High Commissioner has given some answers, and if I am repeating this question it is with a desire to seek some further clarification in this matter.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

The question is that of the administrative headquarters of the Territory being located outside the Territory. This question, as you are aware, has also exercised our interest in the past and continues to do so now. I have been looking at the Trusteeship Agreement, and I wonder under which provision of the Agreement or under which provision of the Charter an Administering Authority can really administer a Trust Territory from outside the Trust Territory. In this case the administration flows not even from the Territory of the administering State itself but from a Non-Self-Governing Territory and therefore it is, in our view, doubly objectionable, if I may use that word. The answer given by the Special Representative is that this is not a matter to be decided in haste and that the people have to be consulted. But is that really the position? Why does the Special Representative say that? When the administrative headquarters were located in Guam, were the people consulted?

Our position in the matter is that it is one of the rights of the people of the Territory to be governed from within its own boundaries, because the objective laid down for them is independence, and once they attain independence they will have to govern themselves from within their boundaries. They cannot go to Guam then. We do not know what the status of Guam then will be. Last year we recommended in our text in the general debate that the Administering Authority should take some active steps in the matter but we have had no inkling this year as to what active steps are contemplated for this purpose. I should like to solicit the representative of the Administering Authority and the Special Representative to throw some light on the matter. What are the difficulties they have in this matter? From the map I see that there are many atolls and islands within the boundaries of the Territory which are larger than Guam, and the problem probably is not physical. If there are other aspects to it, we should like to be seized of those.



Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I have in past years given detailed replies to why we are in Guam: the central location of Guam, the shipping facilities, the air facilities, the communications facilities. I have repeatedly said that to move into the Trust Territory at this time would be a move occasioned by an American desire and not by an attempt to meet a Micronesian need or expressed desire as to where we should be or where their government could do them the most good. It would seem somewhat contradictory to me to move the headquarters into a district only to find ourselves wishing a few years from now that we had the headquarters elsewhere because that is where the Micronesians want it. It would seem to me unmindful of the United States interests to solicit and acquire large sums of money to build a headquarters which the Micronesians, when they are ready to take over, could not support and maybe would not want.

There is the philosophy which creates this discussion every year in the Council that the seat of the governed should be within the area governed. I remind the Council that originally the seat of the Trust Territory government was in Honolulu. In 1954 it was moved to Guam in order to be closer and to be able better to service the area. It is being said that, to satisfy this philosophy, we ought to move into the Trust Territory. On the other hand, we are constantly reminded that these people must be self-governing, that they should be given more power of decision, that it should be their government. I maintain that the eventual government of the Trust Territory of Micronesia will not be a government comparable to that which we, the Americans, are now exercising. Their needs will be different and their location will probably be different. I sincerely believe that at the right time the Micronesians will have their government within Micronesia. I want to emphasize it will be their government and their headquarters, and not our installation.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am sorry to have to say that I cannot agree with much of what the Special Representative has said. It is not a question of philosophy. We are not raising this question year after year on philosophical or metaphysical grounds. It is a question of practical necessity. Guam may be

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

central to two or three districts of the Territory, but there is not a place in or around the territorial boundary which could be farther away, for example, from the Marshall Islands. Yesterday or the day before we heard a Marshall Islander, a man no less than the President of the District Council himself, state, as one of the seven steps which in his view should be taken to lead the people to self-government and independence, moving the High Commissioner's headquarters into the Trust Territory. It is obvious to me from this that, if not in other districts, at least in the Marshall Islands there is a sentiment that the headquarters are comparatively inaccessible to the people of that district. If this map is not very far from reality, that is probably the largest district in terms of numbers of atolls and probable population of all the seven or eight districts in the Territory.

I want to disabuse the mind of anyone who has the feeling that we take this question on philosophical grounds. There are particular considerations. A capital brings into a Territory a great deal of activity of all kinds. It furnishes opportunities of training of various kinds; it creates commercial opportunities; all kinds of benefits flow from the existence of a capital. With the capital outside the Territory, we feel that the people are deprived of all those benefits and to that extent also the development of the Territory itself is hindered or delayed.

We shall be the first to admit that when the Pacific Islanders become independent, they most probably will not be able to maintain a headquarters on as large a scale as does the American Administration. But what is the idea? Is it the idea that when they become independent their first task should be to create a headquarters and to erect buildings for a capital? If ultimately it has to be done by them, I think it would be much wiser for the Administering Authority now to make a beginning and assist the people in that way.

On the other hand, is the Administering Authority prepared to take this Council into its confidence as to its plans with regard to Guam? Is it considering the incorporation or integration of Guam into the Territory?

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

Because the other opposite position we cannot accept, that the Saipan District or a part of the Territory should be integrated with Guam and should thereby become a colonial possession. All kinds of legal complications arise. What are the plans or projects in view with regard to this matter?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I think the representative of India is answering his own questions. The matter of Guam, the matter of Saipan, is but a facet of the total problem. I can hasten to assure the representative of India that our country does not want to acquire land and is not anxious to be known as a colonial Power. In fact, our whole philosophy is pointed in the other direction. The differences in attitudes of the Micronesians today points to the need to go slowly on this question of the establishment of headquarters. It is true that we could develop in any given district and at great expense facilities needed, but it is my opinion that we should not do so until time and the desires of the Micronesians have tended to settle the direction in which they themselves want to go. At the present moment, Palau has advanced to the point where arguments could be made for placing a headquarters in Palau, which is farther away from Majuro than Guam.

(Mr. Nucker,  
Special Representative)

I therefore know of no way to answer the problem affirmatively today because there are many questions yet to be answered in terms of the Territory and its final goal. This is one reason that I do not want to move too fast. I would have no objection to living in Truk or Ponape or one of the other districts. Quite often, I think life would be easier: there would be fewer telephone calls and fewer people visiting us, if you will pardon me.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The difficulty arises from the fact -- I think it is very much a fact now, and the High Commissioner has himself stated it -- that this position is giving rise to some separatist tendencies. Last year, I brought to the Council's attention what was said to be the known desire of the people of Rota in favour of integration with Guam. This year, we have been told by the Special Representative that the people of Saipan District favour, on the one hand, integration with Guam and, on the other, association with the United States. There is nothing to cause alarm, but the fact is that if this position continues -- that is to say, this position with regard to the desire of a section of the population for integration with Guam -- then it is likely that at the same time a different tendency may arise, say, in the Marshall Islands or in the Ponape District or in the Truk District or elsewhere, and what we will be faced with in this way, at one stage or another, will be the problem of a virtual cutting up of the Trust Territory, which, in our interpretation of the Trusteeship Agreement and the Trusteeship provisions of the Charter, is unthinkable. The Assembly has had considerable debates on this matter. We do not want to see a situation arise which will lead to a division of the Territory, which will lead to some suggestion -- from whatever quarter -- that the Territory should cease to be an integral identity. If the High Commissioner could assure us that the Administration is conscious of this problem, that this is not likely to arise and that, if it does tend to arise, the Administration will do its utmost to rectify the position, for the time being I should be satisfied, but without prejudice to our position on this question of the capital, because we do feel, despite all that is said, that the administrative headquarters should -- for these and for various other reasons which I do not feel the necessity of stating here -- be brought somewhere within the Territory.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I know of no thinking in our Government at any level which would indicate that the Administering Authority has any intention of trying to separate the areas or develop units of government or, in fact, do anything other than attempt to create a self-governing unit which would contain all of Micronesia. If there were such plans in the Government, I certainly should know about them, and that, in turn, would cause my approach to the administration of the area to be completely different from what it now is, namely, to bring the people together, to get them to know each other and develop a centralized form of government.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I should now like to go on to the field of civil service, and I would draw the attention of the Special Representative to the tables on pages 193 to 197 of the report. The Special Representative said, in the course of one of his answers to the representative of the Soviet Union, that 273 positions are earmarked for American personnel and that 240 of these 273 are occupied by such personnel. But here we have some listings of positions occupied by non-indigenous employees, classified by sex, position and grade, as of 30 June 1959, and the totals of these tables run to the figure of 371. I wonder whether this is all United States personnel. The figures are 98 on page 194, 129 on page 195, 115 on page 197, and 29 for Saipan District, which all adds up to 371. Are all these 371 persons American personnel, or is there some other category of non-indigenous personnel? If there is, what category of personnel is this?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I do want to correct an impression I may have left when I gave the figure of 240. I had not included in the 240 the American personnel working on Saipan, so the figure would be larger than 240.

The tables referred to do not, to the best of my knowledge, include any others than Americans.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I should like to pursue that question a little further. On page 208 of the report, there is a breakdown of the budget, and, under "General administration", the total expenditure shown is \$1,195,608. I know that the representative of the Soviet Union asked this question, but I am interested in knowing what portion of this amount -- of about \$1,200,000 -- is expended on indigenous personnel. The High Commissioner said that the expenditure on American staff -- and I believe that is included here, because this table refers to High Commissioner's office, judiciary, property and supply, budget and fiscal, and district administration, in which the top posts are occupied by American personnel -- he mentioned the figure of \$1,250,000. Now, there is some discrepancy somewhere. Either there is no indigenous personnel in this part of the administration, or the amount paid out to them in salaries, etc., must be very, very small. Now, several questions arise therefrom. One is how many of the graded senior posts are occupied by indigenous personnel on a permanent basis.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There should be a schedule here showing the number of Micronesians on the payroll. At the present time there are over 1,800. Page 208 includes the figures for payment of both Micronesians and Americans and all other costs of the Government during the course of the year. That first figure -- \$1,195,608 for general administration -- is not representative of the amount paid to Americans. It is representative of the amount required to carry on the activities listed.



(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

Americans are working throughout the activities listed on that page, as are Micronesians. It is -- and I would be pleased to provide the information -- my recollection that we would have about \$1 million Micronesian payroll and slightly over, or just around, \$1 million American payroll in the Trust Territory.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): There are two categories of grades, I can see from these listings. There is the GS grade, and then there is something for the Micronesians called the B grade -- B-1, B-2, B-3. What I would like to find out is whether Micronesians can qualify for appointment to GS grades, and, if they can, do they receive the same salary as do the American personnel, or is there discrimination sanctioned by executive order or law in the matter of wage or salary payments, as between non-indigenous and indigenous personnel?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There is a difference in the wages paid to the Micronesians and the wages paid to the Americans. There is, in our opinion, no discrimination. We are using Micronesians where we can and as we can, and we are paying them in terms of their area's economy. Americans are brought out only when they are needed to fill specific posts, and it is natural that the American be paid according to the American economy which he left behind him when he came out there. So that we do have two pay plans: one for the civil service employee -- the non-indigenous worker, or whatever phrase one wants to use -- and another for the compensation of Micronesians. They are not the same.

As I have said many times, as we can, we are replacing Americans with Micronesians.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Are there any instances where an American and a Micronesian are doing equal jobs, of equal importance or value, but receiving different salaries? I ask this question because this Council on several occasions in the past has recommended that in all Trust Territories -- I do recall the Council saying that in the case of Tanganyika -- there should be equal pay for equal jobs.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

Of course, we understand that if you take an employee and send him overseas, away from his home, you pay him an overseas compensation allowance, or something of that character; that is understood. But what we want to ascertain is whether in this Territory the principle of equal pay for equal work is observed as between Micronesian and American employees.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): There is no comparison, because if a Micronesian can do the American's job, we send the American home. We are not creating two classes of workers, each doing the same work but one getting a higher rate of pay than the other.

As evidence of what I am saying, let me point out that about three months ago it was decided that our Micronesian communicators now could handle a communications station in each of the Districts. They could not do the repair work, but they could manage and they could send and receive messages and so on. So we appointed a Micronesian as District Director of Communications in each District. In one week's time I eliminated about four or five Americans; I sent them notices and they went home.

Now, it is true, following the line of thinking of the representative of India, that as the Micronesian approached the point where he took over, for a period of time he probably was doing equal work with that of the American but was not getting equal pay. But when he had established that he could do the work, we sent the American home.

We do not have a condition existing in Micronesia which, in my opinion, leads to the problem we are discussing, the matter of equal pay for equal work. We just do not have it.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Continuing with the question of salaries, on page 201 there is a table showing salaries paid to Micronesian employees of the Judiciary Department in 1959, and we find here that the Presiding Judge of the District Court in the Marshalls got \$45 for each pay period. First of all,

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

I do not know what "pay period" means. The Presiding District Judge in Palau got \$50; in Ponape, \$30 and in Rota, \$3, per day of sitting. The Presiding District Judge in Truk got \$33 per pay period; in Yap, \$17; and in Saipan, \$2,596.50.

What is the reason for this enormous discrepancy between Saipan, on the one hand, and the remaining six Districts on the other? I presume that the Presiding Judge in Saipan is also a Micronesian because that is what the table seems to indicate. The difference is enormous.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The Presiding Judge of Saipan is sitting constantly; the other judges are not. There is an equivalence in the salaries. The pay period, I think, in most of these instances runs for a month, so that the highest one you mentioned would produce only about \$600 for a Micronesian judge elsewhere than at Saipan.

Again, this points up the differences among the districts in level of development, the number of court cases and the quantity of the work performed. In addition, Saipan has a higher wage-scale than we have in the other Districts, because of its proximity to Guam, among other things.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): This question of proximity to Guam is very interesting. Rota, I think, is very close to Guam, is it not? It is just next door. In fact, Saipan is about two blocks further up, as it were, and the salary of the judge in Rota is \$3 per day. Even if you calculate that on an annual basis it comes to only about \$1,000 per annum, whereas the salary of the Saipan judge is \$2,596, or roughly \$2,600, which is two-and-a-half times as much as is paid in Rota. There is some serious discrepancy here, and I really should like to be able to understand the reasons for it. It is not merely a question of proximity to Guam, because Rota, as I say, is the closest in location to Guam.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): Rota has a population of about 900. Saipan has a population of roughly 6,000. Guam, as the Council knows, is administered by the Navy. There is very much more urban development in Saipan than in Rota. I have now found the table of salaries paid to Micronesian employees of the Judiciary Department in 1959, and I find that I was wrong a moment ago. The pay period is in fact two weeks, so that there is not the discrepancy in the major districts which there would appear to be if one took the period to be a month. For instance, the Palau judge, at \$50 a day, is being paid at the rate of over \$1,000 a year, and I wanted to correct my previous statement by pointing out that the pay period is two weeks.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Am I to understand, then, that the Naval Administration of a part of the Territory -- namely, the Saipan district -- as a rule pays higher salaries to its Micronesian employees than does the Civil Administration of the Territory? Is that the case as a rule?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): That is true at Saipan. The Navy does pay a higher wage than we pay in the other districts.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Does that not tend to create hard feelings with regard to the administration of the country? Is there no co-ordination in this matter between the Naval Administration and the Civil Administration? One of the results of this kind of dual policy could be to attract people from the Marshall Islands and all other districts to the Saipan district to seek employment. Does it not affect the employment policy of the Civil Administration somehow?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): It has not had that effect of attracting the Micronesians from all the other districts to Saipan. The Visiting Mission of last year saw Saipan and it saw the other districts. I think it recognized the differences between the cost of living in the Saipan district and that in the other areas, and the differences in life generally. We have had no major problems occasioned by the higher wages paid in Saipan by the Navy.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): That brings me to the Visiting Mission's recommendation of last year. I have not the text with me, but I believe that the Mission recommended that steps should be taken, and taken urgently, to remove this anomaly whereby a part of the Territory is administered by the Department of the Navy and another -- the larger -- part by the Department of the Interior. We should like to know -- particularly as we had followed up this recommendation or suggestion by the Visiting Mission last year -- what the Administration has done in this connexion during the year that has gone by. It is well known that our view is that the Territory should be administered as a whole, and in fact neither in the Trusteeship Agreement nor elsewhere is there any provision for a dual administration of the Territory by two different authorities in two different ways. And there is quite a difference, it seems, not only in the pattern of salaries but also in the pattern of administration of the two parts of the Territory.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I can only repeat that the Administering Authority has this particular problem under discussion at the present time. The decision will need to be made by the United States Government, not by the High Commissioner. As I say, the problem is under serious consideration, but I do not know what the outcome will be. There are reasons why the United States Government has the Navy running Saipan and the Department of the Interior running the balance of the Territory. Those reasons will need to change, and I am satisfied that when they change the United States Government will have no objection to the Department of the Interior's administering Saipan, but at the present time I can give no definite answer.

Mr. RASCOTEA (India): I agree that this is not strictly the province of the Special Representative, but I wonder whether the representative of the United States would like to comment? The point really is that under the Trusteeship Agreement this Territory is designated as a strategic territory. That is quite all right, and certain rights flow from that fact to the Administering Authority, but I do not think that the Assembly or the people of the Pacific islands bargained for military administration instead of civil administration. That is essentially the point, and if there are some discussions going on, or if the matter is under consideration, we would very much wish that the United States representative might inform the Council.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): I do not think that I can add anything to what the Special Representative has said. The whole subject is under consideration, and it would be impossible for me or the Special Representative at this point to say what the outcome of that consideration might be. There are well-known reasons why the administration is carried on at the present time as it is, but I would add this. The undertaking towards the United Nations under the Agreement is the undertaking, in effect, of the Executive Department of the Government as a whole, and, let us say, the head of the Government may ask one official or he may ask two different officials to carry out the responsibility. Thus, the undertaking is to carry out certain responsibilities. We may have differing views on the efficiency of employing



(Mr. Gerig, United States)

two different departments instead of one. That is undoubtedly a debatable question, but I think that the obligations undertaken by the Government are being faithfully carried out. Whether they are being carried out by one method or another is a matter of interest, but it is not necessarily a method which is inconsistent with the undertaking.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I did not at any time suggest that the obligations undertaken by the Administering Authority are not being carried out. They are being carried out. We are very much aware of that.

The point I was trying to raise was that this system of administration -- I do not know how political scientists would define it -- in two parts, dual administration, is something very unusual. It is very unusual in independent countries. It is most unusual so far as Trust Territories are concerned. In some direct way, I think it reflects on the entity of the Trust Territory. Therefore, we feel that it would be more desirable and it would be in greater conformity -- in fact, that alone would be in conformity -- with the Trusteeship Agreement if this Trust Territory were to be administered as one unit by one authority. The authority, of course, ultimately is the Administering Authority itself, but its representation in the Territory should not be split.

At the moment I do not understand where the co-ordination takes place because two different departments are responsible for the administration of two different parts of the Territory. However, since the representative of the United States is not in a position to give any information with respect to this point, at this stage I shall not pursue it further.

There are one or two questions I would like to ask with respect to the Inter-District Advisory Committee. Many questions have been asked and the position is pretty clear as to that. However, more information might be helpful.

Could the High Commissioner give us some indication as to the kind of matters the Inter-District Advisory Committee has passed which the High Commissioner has accepted, and other matters in which its recommendations have not been accepted by the High Commissioner or have been vetoed by him.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): We have, through the Inter-District Conference, discussed and decided on changes in the executive order covering riparian rights. The resolution that the High Commissioner take active measures to bring in a bank was followed through, and I think we will have a banking institution in Truk. The Inter-District Conference recommended that we set aside a certain number of scholarships for vocational purposes and a certain number for agricultural purposes, the balance to be in the general fields. We did this.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

The Conference decided that they would create the Sub-committee on Social Affairs, which has been discussed around the Council. They discussed the new PICS curriculum and school year, and certain changes were made in consonance with their desires.

They made an interesting request, which I have not mentioned before, and which I think indicates a degree of growth. They asked that all district orders, or policy statements of the district by the High Commissioner having to do with the district, be submitted to their local congress or holdover committee for discussion before being placed in effect. I agreed to do this and so instructed each District Administrator.

Now, there were several others. We discussed credit unions, and so on.

I do not know offhand of any resolutions made that I rejected at this Inter-District Conference. By the process of discussion, recommendations which were put on the floor by the various delegations were eliminated and never reached the resolution stage. But I know of no resolutions at this particular conference, just finished, that I vetoed.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): That is a rather encouraging picture, sir. As the High Commissioner himself indicates, this advisory body has shown a considerable interest in the affairs of the Territory and it has displayed a great deal of mature judgement in the matters it has handled. Therefore, I feel that the High Commissioner is, perhaps, unduly pessimistic about the targets in this matter. I should like to believe that he is an optimistic gentleman.

We hope that steps will be taken by the High Commissioner to augment the powers of this advisory conference or advisory body before too long because that is the only way these people can really acquire the training and skill necessary for the drafting, preparation and passing of legislation.

An excellent feature of this aspect of the Territory's development is the creation of a holdover committee. I understand this will be in the nature of a standing committee which will look after the business of the Advisory Council over the year. In the course of our debate we will make some suggestions with regard to this matter. But I should like to find out whether this holdover committee is regarded as competent, is invited or can take the initiative to advise the High Commissioner on various matters pertaining to the administration of the Territory during the course of the year.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I think that the committee is competent. I would like to see the committee stay within the field of social affairs this year and broaden out next year.

The PRESIDENT: I think we could adjourn now. I would take the liberty at this time of making two suggestions. I would suggest that the members kindly be here at three o'clock promptly, and I take the liberty of suggesting that they should also contain their questions within such time-limits as would enable us, if not this afternoon at least tomorrow, to start with the general debate. But of course we can see how the meeting goes this afternoon. I am only mentioning this because today is Thursday and our schedule is quite heavy.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Mr. President, I do not know what time-limits you have in mind, but did you take the Council into your confidence regarding any time-limit? I was not aware of any.

The PRESIDENT: I will answer the question of the representative of India by saying that I was referring to no specific time-limits. It is within the responsibility and judgement of each member to contain his questions as to number and length, shall we say, within reasonable time-limits. In other words, let me put it in this way: that the members should always keep in mind that we are short of time. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Mr. President, I hope that I did not convey the impression to you that we are not keeping that in mind in presenting our questions.

The PRESIDENT: I was not making any personal reference. I was simply doing what I think it is my duty to do, to remind the Council that we are really running behind time.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.