



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY
JUL 17 1961
UN/SA COLLECTION



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1172
14 July 1961

ENGLISH

Twenty-seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 14 July 1961, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

U TIN MAUNG

(Burma)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the
Pacific Islands [4f, 6]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1172 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

61-18030

(37 p.)

STATEMENT BY THE UNDER-SECRETARY

Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary): Mr. President, as you will recollect, and as the members of the Council will recollect, when we discussed the dissemination of information in the Trust and other territories, the question was raised by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the distribution of the Declaration of the General Assembly. I am now in possession of information pertaining to the Declaration and it is as follows:

Copies of the Declaration have been made available to Information Centres and other distribution points as follows:

London (for British overseas territories)	2,000
Paris (for French overseas territories)	2,000
Sydney (for New Guinea, Nauru and Samoa)	2,000
Tanganyika (for East Africa)	2,000
Addis Ababa	1,000
Accra (for Nigeria)	1,000
Bangkok (for South East Asia)	2,000
Washington	500 (in addition to material sent directly to Guam for distribution in the Trust Territory of the Pacific)
Ruanda-Urundi	500

Distribution of the Declaration will be continued throughout the year in addition to the regular supply of other United Nations Information materials.

In addition to this, the Director of the Information Centre at Dar-es-Salaam has been requested to arrange for the translation and printing of the Declaration in Swahili. The Director of the Information Centre in Usumbura has been directed to arrange for translation and printing of Kinyarwanda and Kirundi versions. In a meeting with representatives of OPI, the representative of the Administering Authority for the Pacific Islands has agreed to have translations of the Declaration into Chamorro and Marshallese done through his office. When these translations have been completed, printing of the leaflets will take place in New York.

Copies of the Declaration have been made available to Information Centres and other distribution points as follows:

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We take note of the information that Mr. Protitch, the Under-Secretary, has had the kindness to furnish us with. We understand that this initial dissemination of the text of the Declaration in a rather limited number of copies, and which is made mainly through the Information Centres in the large cities and capitals, should be only a first step.

The Secretariat of the United Nations, in accordance with the decisions of the General Assembly, must take steps in order to disseminate this text more widely throughout all the Territories, and this dissemination should be done in a direct manner.

The Soviet delegation has insisted in other organs, and we continue to insist, on the dissemination of this information to all Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories that have not yet attained independence. But for the time being, and since for the moment we see that this dissemination has been made only to Trust Territories, we consider it necessary to insist on the widest possible dissemination of the text of this Declaration to all Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

AGENDA ITEMS 4f and 6

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS:

- (a) REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1020)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1961 (T/1560; T/L.1025)

U AUNG THANT (Burma) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee): I should like to present the report of the Drafting Committee. The report in question is contained in document T/L.1020. In fact, I have little or nothing to add to what is already stated in this document.

A number of factors have contributed to making the work of the Drafting Committee easier than it normally would have been. As you know, we have the Visiting Mission's report. This report has been received by this Council with very wide general acclaim.

(U Aung Thant, Burma)

You will find that in drafting our recommendations, the Drafting Committee followed very closely the conclusions, observations and recommendations of the Visiting Mission. Nevertheless, had it not been for the spirit of mutual accommodation and co-operation that was very fully displayed by all the members of the Drafting Committee, we would not have found it possible to produce this report in so short time that was available to it.

In our deliberations in the Committee we had the full co-operation of Mr. Nucker, the Special Representative. His participation in the Committee on points of fact was always very helpful.

I think I am sure I speak for all my colleagues on the Committee in saying that the assistance we have received from the Secretariat was entirely satisfactory, and I should like to extend our appreciation and thanks on behalf of the Committee to the Committee Secretary, Mr. Chacko and his colleagues.

With these few words I present the report formally contained in document T/L.1020.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Council I should like to thank the representative of Burma, the Chairman of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for his statement. The conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee are contained in the annex to the report, and in accordance with our usual custom, we shall consider them paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, if you will permit me, I should like at this stage of our debate to make some general observations on the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted to us by the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Soviet delegation is compelled to observe that in these conclusions and recommendations we find in only a very partial and incomplete way any reflection of the positive conclusions and recommendations arrived at by the Visiting Mission which went to the Territory this year. In due time the Soviet delegation had even pointed out that the report of the Visiting Mission itself, which included a series of proposals and observations which should be followed--particularly concerning the economic situation in the Territory -- had some serious defects, since it contained no proposal the object of which would be to apply immediately in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the provisions of the General Assembly resolution concerning the granting of independence to Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. Nothing is said of the need to establish a date on which independence would be granted. The Soviet delegation is compelled to note that in the report of the Drafting Committee there is no recommendation the object of which would be to ensure the immediate application of the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly to this Territory. Therefore, the Soviet delegation will be unable to vote in favour of, and in fact in some cases will vote against, the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee, especially in view of the fact that these conclusions and recommendations contain undeserved applause of the Administering Authority concerning progress of which we have no knowledge here.

The Soviet delegation considers that it would be futile to expect the majority here which is composed of representatives of the Administering Powers to make such proposals, and the manner in which our debates have developed during

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

the present session shows that the colonial Powers act as a bloc and stubbornly oppose any proposal the object of which is to ensure the application of the resolution on the granting of independence. We consider it essential that our viewpoint which we are expressing here appear in the records so that the General Assembly can take cognizance of it and take the appropriate measures.

We should like once again to reserve and reaffirm our position, which is this: We consider the declaration of the General Assembly adopted on 14 December 1960 to be fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Administering Authority compelled to apply all the provisions of that declaration within the time-limit established in the declaration itself. We believe that the Administering Authority, after consultation with the indigenous population, should set a date for the immediate granting of independence to the Territory and should formulate and submit to the United Nations a plan for immediate measures whose aim would be to transfer all powers to the indigenous population of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in conformity with the freely expressed will of the population in order that they may enjoy absolute freedom and independence as provided in the declaration of the General Assembly, paragraph 5.

The Soviet delegation notes that paragraphs 44 and 45, which are devoted to the attainment of independence by this Territory, contain no recommendation addressed to the Administering Authority. It is for this reason that we shall vote against paragraph 44. We consider that paragraph 45 is insufficient, since all it does is take note of the statement of the Administering Authority that the essential elements of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence are applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In our view this declaration is fully applicable unconditionally to all Trust Territories including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Naturally, we cannot grant any Administering Authority the right to judge for itself what provisions are applicable or not applicable to this, that or the other Territory. This is a decision taken by the General Assembly and neither the Administering Authority nor the Trusteeship Council has the right to misinterpret that decision.. That is why we state categorically that the Trusteeship Council must apply all the decisions adopted by the General Assembly. The General Assembly clearly stated that that declaration was applicable to

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Trust Territories, Non-Self-Governing Territories, and any other Territory that had not yet achieved independence. Consequently, no exception is admissible. Once again I say that this declaration is fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and should be applied in all its terms to the Territory in question.

The foregoing are the general observations that we consider it essential to make in connexion with the report of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): At this time I shall not express any views on the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union, but when we come to paragraph 44, which I have just read, I am perhaps in agreement with him on more than one point. In other words, it seems to me that paragraphs 44 and 45 are not very clear. For instance, in connexion with New Guinea we approved a more comprehensive and more clearly defined paragraph. Therefore, when we come to paragraph 44 I shall have some suggestions to make which I hope will meet the different views that exist in this Council on this question. I am for the moment trying to draft a paragraph, taking into account the views that we accepted in connexion with the recommendation on objectives in the resolution on New Guinea. Furthermore, we should ascertain the point of view of the Administering Authority in connexion with resolution 1514 (XV). I hope therefore to submit a draft later which will take into account existing conditions in the Territory as well as the views expressed by the Delegations here.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): Since my delegation was a member of the Drafting Committee, I should like to say a few words in answer to some of the criticisms that have been made, and particularly with regard to the last two paragraphs of the draft report.

I think that members of the Council are well aware of the fact that the Drafting Committee was working within a certain framework, a framework which is in a sense established by the views expressed by the majority of the members of the Council. Now, on the basis of those views expressed by the majority of the members of the Council, the Drafting Committee could produce no other recommendations than the ones presented in the draft report. That does not mean that my delegation is fully satisfied with those recommendations. I am certainly prepared to examine any proposal which any delegation here might wish to make for improving the two paragraphs in question in one way or another.

In general, as I have said, the Drafting Committee must work within a certain specific framework -- that is, the framework of the views expressed by the majority of the members of the Trusteeship Council. The Committee drafts its report. It is no fault of the Drafting Committee if certain ideas do not appear clearly in the report. That is probably because those ideas were expressed by, at most, one, two or three members of the Council, or were never expressed at all, during the general debate on the Territory.

There is another comment I should like to make. In my view, the Drafting Committee has abided to the utmost by the recommendations in the Visiting Mission's report, which was submitted to the Council for its consideration and was supported by all members of the Council.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): What I am going to say should not be taken as detracting in any way from the great merit of the work done by the Drafting Committee.

I have just read paragraphs 44 and 45 of the draft report, and I must confess that I share the misgivings of the representative of Bolivia. These paragraphs are not very comprehensive. They do not even take into account, as I believe they should, some of the comments made by the Visiting Mission itself. It should be remembered that the Visiting Mission is a parity body, including

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

equal numbers of Administering and non-Administering Authority members. The Visiting Mission, for example, has noted in its report that even in the field of economic advancement -- not to speak of the field of political advancement -- there is no plan, there are no targets. Now that is one of the items covered by this section of the draft report before us. This point should be brought in here.

Furthermore, I submit that the Trusteeship Council must not be altogether passive in its approach to this matter -- and that would appear to be the approach taken in, for example, the drafting of paragraph 44. We read in the paragraph:

"It notes further that the Administering Authority has fixed a date, which it hopes to advance, for the establishment of a Territorial Legislature".

(T/L.1020, paragraph 44)

We all know that that date is 1965. It may be that it is the Administering Authority's hope that the date will be advanced. But what is the Council's view in this matter? Is the Council content passively to accept this expression of hope, or should it go a little further and recommend that the date should be advanced? That, in fact, has been the view expressed by my delegation and, as I recall it, several other delegations. But this is not reflected in this paragraph of the draft report.

The difficulty with paragraph 45 is of a different nature. It is perfectly all right for any Administering Authority to say that it accepts essential elements of a resolution of the General Assembly. But in this paragraph the Council notes that statement of the Administering Authority and, as a collective body, puts itself in the position of thus associating itself with a picking and choosing of elements of the General Assembly resolution. I therefore submit that this is not a very happy wording. I have a feeling that the wording adopted by the Council in the case of the Trust Territory of New Guinea, for example, was much better. It is my personal opinion that the circumstances in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are no more difficult than, -- indeed, they are not even as difficult as -- the circumstances in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. The difficulties in New Guinea are of a different character; for instance, the most difficult problem there is that of communications. But even in respect of communications the Administration has of necessity to incur a certain

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

expenditure which will be unavoidable from the point of view of administration alone. The people of Micronesia are not primitive in any sense; they are a very civilized people with an organic, an innate, sense of social organization. Therefore, if the Trusteeship Council would not wish to go further than what was said in the case of New Guinea, it should at least adopt a similar wording, to the effect that in the spirit of the General Assembly Declaration stages should be prepared and enunciated for the rapid advancement of this Territory towards the objective.

I am not at this time submitting any proposals on this matter. I shall await what the representative of Bolivia may have to submit later on. I suggest, however, that this part of the draft report might be left over to the afternoon meeting so that, during the lunch hour, we may consult together on the matter and perhaps arrive at an agreed conclusion.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to vote on the draft report (T/L.1020), paragraph by paragraph.

Are there any comments on paragraph 1?

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I should like to submit some drafting amendments to paragraph 1. With those amendments the paragraph would read as follows:

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

The first amendment is merely a drafting change. The second is necessary, I submit, from the following angle. There is but one theme in the entire report of the Visiting Mission. That theme is that, while nominally things are all right in the Territory -- there is good progress in education; substantial achievements have been made in the field of social development; there has been a substantial laying down of the framework in the economic field, and so forth -- what has been lacking in the Territory has been speed, expedition. If the report is taken as a whole, I think it is clear that that is the central theme. There is an

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

element of urgency which is impressed upon the Council's attention. If the Council does not agree with that sentiment, that is a different matter. But my own feeling is that the Council does agree.

I therefore suggest that the Council should adopt the above-mentioned amendments to the paragraph.

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 3?

Mr. OBIEMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Paragraph 3 contains a reference to the assertion of the Administering Authority to the effect that there are no existing physical illnesses attributable to exposure to radioactive fall-out. My delegation has already had occasion to refer to the results of similar physical examinations which indicated that the reverse is true. In certain paragraphs of a report of one of the medical missions there is a photograph of two children of different ages, indicating quite clearly that the child who was subjected to radiation, although somewhat older than the one to whom he is being compared, lags behind the child not subjected to radiation both in size and in development. There are many facts in the documents which make this clear, but this is not recorded in paragraph 3, which asks us to take on faith the assertions of the Administering Authority. My delegation cannot accept that. It will vote against the first sentence of paragraph 3 as being completely at variance with reality.

As for the concluding sentence of paragraph 3, we should like to point out that the wording is quite inadequate. Concerning the medical investigation of the population of Rongelap five or six years after irradiation, the report of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, which was made available to the Trusteeship Council it is stated that the possibility has been noted of later effects such as shorter life span, premature indications of old age, reduction in the growth rate, etc. Why does this sentence here refer only to the possible development of Leukemia? I think that the relevant passage from the Brookhaven report of the American medical mission which examined the population should be incorporated here. If that text is suitably reflected and included here, then the concluding sentence of paragraph 3 will more properly reflect the actual views of the American medical mission which investigated the situation in that area.

Moreover, paragraph 3 contains no recommendation. It merely expresses the hope that activities connected with such surveys will be conducted in such a manner as to avoid causing constant anxiety and apprehension in the minds of the people. Must this be mentioned? The point is that these people have to be helped.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Material medical assistance must be made available to them, and such tragic occurrences must be prevented forever. The Administering Authority must be forbidden once and for all to carry out any tests of nuclear weapons in the Trust Territory.

The Soviet delegation disagrees with such formulations which take on faith the assertion of the Administering Authority and fail to put forward any concrete recommendations whatever.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Paragraph 3 contains two points. In the first sentence a statement is made about the state of health about the people of the Territory:

(continued in English)

"... a team of experts ... found no existing physical illnesses attributable to exposure to radioactive fall-out and that regular physical examinations will continue in the future ..." (T/L.1020, paragraph 3)

(continued in Spanish)

The next sentence states the following:

"The Council recognizes the need for continued surveys, particularly in the light of the opinion of the team of experts that the next five years will be the critical period for the possible development of leukemia ..."

Thus, in the first part of the paragraph it is stated that no existing physical illnesses are attributable to the fall-out, but in the next sentence it is said that there may be eventual repercussions which must be watched out for.

I do not think that any experts are in a position categorically to give a definite opinion as to the possible consequences of subjection to irradiation from atomic or hydrogen bombs. It is possible that direct somatic effects can in fact be studied. The impact of the radioactive fall-out can be studied over several generations. It is possible that certain disorders are not the result of radioactive origin, but it is also possible that the reverse is true.

I have not been following all the details of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union since he also touched on other aspects of the report of the Visiting Mission. But as we have to act and speak with accuracy, this paragraph would lose its impact and veracity if the burden of the first sentence were

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

eliminated and the second one retained. I do not think that anyone can, in all honesty, give an absolute and definite opinion on the question whether people exposed to radioactive fall-out are or are not in good health and will so remain. This problem is one of the gravest of our generation and I wonder whether the Administering Authority does not think, in this particular case, that it might be possible in paragraph 3 to stick to the point that

"... the next five years will be the critical period for the possible development of leukemia ..."

If we stick to logic, we shall know that the first affirmation in the paragraph does not quite correspond to the second. But I should like to hear the views of other members of the Council on this point.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to invite the views of the other members of the Council.

In the absence of any comments, I assume that the Council is now in a position to vote on paragraph 3.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I think it would be right on the part of the Council to note the statement of the Administering Authority, which is in the first sentence, and my delegation has no objection to that. It is also right on the part of the Council to recognize the need for continued surveys, and what is stated about the possible development of leukemia and so forth. But there is a gap here between these two sentences, which I think should be filled. And the knowledge that this Council may possess on this matter, on which I am going to propose an insertion, is derived from the report of the experts, which was transmitted to the Council members by the representative of the United States.

Subject to such modification as the members may present, this sentence should be as follows: At the end of the first sentence, ending with "impact on the people" -- "on the other hand, it is conscious that there is a recurring incidence of certain diseases among the exposed population, and the team of experts considers that these diseases are among those which might occur as a result of exposure to radioactive fall-out".

The PRESIDENT: The Council has just heard the proposed addition made by the representative of India, which is in the form of an amendment. I suppose other members of the Council have jotted down the words that he proposed to amend, that will come after the following words in the first sentence: "psychological impact on the people".

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We should like to ask a question of the representative of the United States. Does he agree to that amendment of the representative of India? Does he regard it as correct? Does he regard it as being in keeping with the true state of affairs?

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): It is difficult to comment this particular amendment because there is nothing in the exact terminology here that I can take exception to, but I have an uncomfortable feeling that the sentence leaves an impression that is not accurate. I must say that I think the Council will get into some difficulty if at this late stage there is any

attempt to summarize the conclusions contained in a scientific report of several dozen pages which is full of qualifications made necessary by the nature of a strictly accurate scientific report.

This particular sentence in a way states something which would be true of any population anywhere, where there had been even the most minute fall-out from radioactive explosions, and that is true of all parts of the earth, as I understand it. In other words, this sentence literally could apply to the inhabitants of the City of New York and if that is so I do not know what it adds to the phrasing of the report. The implication, however, is that in spite of the negative findings of the team of doctors that made these reports, that there is more to the situation. The unbalance -- if this is a formal proposal -- I would be inclined to oppose. I would prefer, however, if it were possible to have more time on this, with the thought that perhaps some wording could be arranged that would not contain the same implication. I wonder if it might be possible to defer the consideration of this paragraph to a later stage.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The last statement of the representative of the United States makes it clear that he insists on the retention of the statement which is at variance with reality, and which is contained at the beginning of paragraph 3. Not only does he insist on that, but he objects to the proposal of India that the Council should note the relevant passages from the report of the American Medical Mission which carried out that inquiry. The representative of the United States apparently abides by the principle that the operation was successful, but the patient died.

There are no diseases, we are told, but people are sick, and photographs of the sick people are even supplied. We feel that the amendment of the delegation of India is in fact mutually exclusive with and is, in fact, a negation of the statement in the first sentence. We believe that the first part of the first sentence should be dropped. The facts should be given as given in the report, and there should be a reference to the serious possibility within the next five years of the development of such hideous diseases as leukemia, cancer of the blood, and the possibility of other radiation consequences such as premature old age,

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

shorter life-span, and so forth. There is a large number of implications which the American specialists refer to. How can the Trusteeship Council and the representative of the United States close their eyes to the fact that American specialists and no one else reported about this?

We feel that it is quite inadmissible to state that the Council expresses the hope that these surveys will be conducted in such a manner as to avoid causing anxiety of any sort. But these people are not guinea pigs. It is not their fault that in the past the Administering Authority illegally used the Trust Territories in order to carry out nuclear tests.

At the end of the paragraph, as a minimum manifestation of fairness and justice, it is necessary for the Council to recommend to the Administering Authority to extend to the people who have suffered all the necessary medical and material aid.

When we pass on to more general passages and sections on this matter, we think that the Council should draw the attention of the Administering Authority that it is inadmissible that the Trust Territory should be used for carrying out any nuclear tests explosions whatever.

The Trusteeship Council must not countenance having the Trust Territory used ever again for the purpose of test explosions of nuclear weapons.

With regard to paragraph 3, the minimum requirements of justice would call for the approval of the proposal of the representative of India. The facts given in the report of the Visiting Mission and in the survey made by American specialists must be noted by the Council and a specific recommendation must be included by the Council to the effect that the Administering Authority should extend to the people who have suffered all necessary medical and material assistance.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States): If it is desired to take a vote now on this proposal, my delegation will not oppose it. We will simply abstain. However, I should like to have it stated for the record that, so far as I am aware -- and I believe this is correct, subject to correction by the representative of India -- there is no indication in the report of the medical experts that the diseases referred to have any greater incidence among the exposed population on Rongelap than they do among the population of Rongelap that was not exposed to fall-out. That is an indication of why I think the implications of this sentence are unfortunate.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the original suggestion made by the United States delegation to the effect that we should try to formulate this paragraph later on the basis of the suggestion made by the representative of India, in order to find a paragraph that will satisfy both the Administering Authority and the Council, is a constructive solution that we should accept. I do not interpret the motion put forward by the representative of the United States as it is interpreted by the representative of the Soviet Union.

It is very important for us in this case to have the consent of the Administering Authority on the basis of valid reasons and arguments which should be discussed openly and frankly in this Council.

I did forget to say one thing. In paragraph 199 of its report the Visiting Mission stated: "The Mission does not consider itself competent to pass judgement on matters concerning the effects of radiation and radioactive contamination and the extent to which such effects persist in the island".

This position taken by the Visiting Mission, which is a legal position, should, I think, be the position taken by the Council as well.

In connexion with the suggestion made by the representative of India, which in principle has not been rejected by the representative of the United States, this suggestion might give us the basis for a compromise formula because the Drafting Committee has studied a technical report and the Visiting Mission deliberately said that it did not feel competent to pass judgement on this question. In other words, the reasons, and here I assume the responsibility of taking this initiative, is very simple. May I reaffirm my point of view. I do not think that there are any experts whose views can be fully and completely accepted on this question of radiation. Neither do I think that in this tragic field of human knowledge there is any one capable of saying whether the effects of radiation have disappeared or not. I am not casting any doubt on the knowledge that the experts who studied this problem obviously have. I am in no position to argue the validity of what they say in their report. The representative of the Soviet Union first mentioned these reports, which furthermore are available to the public at large and he introduced this discussion to the Council.

I would have preferred the Drafting Committee to follow the line taken by the Visiting Mission, but at the same time I understand that all the necessary elements for the assessment of this question can be brought before the Council, and that is the reason why we are discussing this problem here now.

To save time, if the United States delegation is prepared to accept, as apparently as it was initially, I think, the idea of studying this question together with the representative of India, in order to devise a formula that will meet at least the views of the majority of the members of the Council, it might give us a recommendation that will be fully valid.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): It has become necessary for me to explain why I proposed this amendment. I am not concerned with an event of the past. It was an unfortunate and unhappy event that took place, and therefore what we are concerned with now are certain aftermaths and certain consequences of that event to the people. I have no intention of pressing this amendment to the vote instantaneously.

I should be glad to discuss the wording with the representative of the United States or any other representative who wishes to study this matter. But an insertion to this effect, in my view, is necessary because the Council cannot simply take note of an assertion that there are no physical aftereffects of exposure to radioactivity. If that were the case, then all this noise that we hear in all parts of the world about the necessity of banning explosions and of banning tests, banning atomic weapons, would not be right or necessary; obviously there are some effects of exposure.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

The team of experts has itself treated this matter with due caution. It has listed certain diseases which are likely to occur as a result of exposure. Among these are diseases which occur in the Territory in the exposed population, because it is that population which is subjected to careful testing and careful studies, more particular studies than the general population of the island.

If the first part is therefore to be included, the second part with something along those lines should also be included to restore the perspective of the matter. Because I believe that the assertion and the Council's acceptance of such an assertion that there are no defects is likely to give rise to a certain amount of complacency in dealing with this matter and in attending to the needs of the Rongalapese population. That is why I consider it absolutely necessary to insert something which will restore a proper balance and a proper perspective to this matter. Apart from that, I have no other intention in proposing this.

The representative of Bolivia has said that the Mission took a proper legal view of this matter, with which I agree. It stated it was not competent to do this. When the Mission drafted its report or when the Mission was in the Trust Territory Headquarters in Guam, it did not have access to these reports. These reports were later brought to the attention of the Council. I think that while the Committee was perfectly right in taking note of the statement of the Administering Authority based on the observations and findings of the team of experts, it is also proper, now that we are seized of the report, that the other part of it should also be brought into the picture.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the proposal of the United States representative to defer consideration of paragraph 3 until an agreed text is available and can be considered by the Council, I shall consider that to be the view of the Council.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider paragraph 4.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We propose a drafting change in paragraph 4. Instead of the words "expresses the hope that the Administering Authority will take speedy action", we propose the following:

(continued in English)

"recommends that the Administering Authority should take speedy action".

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): What is dealt with in this paragraph is only one aspect of the matter as brought to the attention of the Council by the Visiting Mission. An important paragraph in this chapter of the Visiting Mission's report is paragraph 201 which, if you will permit me, I shall read out to the Council because members may not have copies of this report at this stage.

"The Mission wishes to impress the necessity of stationing on the island of qualified and competent health personnel who will be able to administer adequately to the health needs of the community and assist in their education in health matters. Such personnel should maintain proper records concerning health matters and should report fully to the District Director of Health. The health of the people of Rongelap must remain a special responsibility and preoccupation of the medical authorities of the Trust Territory Government. As a means of breaking down the psychological and physical isolation of the people of Rongelap, the frequency of field trips should be considerably increased; and their requirements in education, in agricultural rehabilitation and community development should be given special attention, bearing in mind the desirability of bringing into the island suitable personnel from other parts of the Territory." (T/1560, page 91)

One finds nothing along those general lines in this report, and I should like to add a sentence at the end of the paragraph in question: "The Council recommends that improved facilities of medical attention and care and other necessary assistance should be provided to the Rongalapese by the Administering Authority as recommended in paragraph 201 of the Visiting Mission's Report."

The PRESIDENT: There are two proposals. The first proposal has been introduced by the representative of the Soviet Union and the second one by the representative of India. I believe the words have been noted by all the members of the Council. Is there any objection to the insertion of these amendments in paragraph 4?

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I have no objection to the proposed amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union, but since you asked the question with regard to both proposals, I find myself in some difficulty with regard to the amendment proposed by the representative of India. I should like to call his attention to the fact that in paragraph 2 of the report, which has already been adopted, the Council "commends to the Administering Authority the suggestions made by the Visiting Mission" with regard to the entire question of rehabilitation of the Rongalapese. It would seem to me that, as the Drafting Committee obviously intended, that should cover the matter. I wonder whether at this stage the Council wants to get into these very specific questions with specific recommendations.

I have particular difficulty with only one phrase in paragraph 201 which has been referred to. Everything in that paragraph I think is desirable, but a favourable vote on that recommendation by my delegation would be impossible for me at this stage because that paragraph calls for a substantial increase particularly in the frequency of field trips. As the representative of India well knows, these field trips which are undertaken by ships of considerable size are organized on a basis which depends on the number of ships. They are constantly at work. Unless the number of ships is increased, the frequency of field trips to one area cannot be increased without cutting down somewhere else in the Territory. Therefore, a flat approval of this recommendation by my delegation would be difficult at this time because it would represent a commitment, as it were, by the Government of the United States to step up the whole level of field trips in the Territory, and this, in view of the nature of our governmental structure, which requires the approval of the Congress for additional expenditures, I would not be in a position to do at this stage. Therefore, on the basis of that particular problem, I would have to abstain on that portion of the paragraph if it were amended as proposed.

(Mr. Bingham, United States)

Throughout this report the Drafting Committee has adopted what seems to me to be the very wise procedure of commending the Visiting Mission's recommendations to the attention of the Administering Authority. In every such case we are prepared to vote in favour. But in this case, if the Indian amendment were adopted, we should be involved in a commitment for substantial additional expenditure. We should therefore have to abstain from the vote.

I want to be sure that my comments are not interpreted to mean that we are in any way critical of these recommendations or do not agree with them in principle. However, for the reasons I have stated, it would be very difficult for us to vote in favour of the amendment in question.

In the light of what is already contained in paragraph 2 of the Drafting Committee's report, I wonder whether the representative of India wishes to press his amendment.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): While I fully appreciate the United States representative's hesitancy about supporting a proposal which will obviously commit his Government to some increased expenditure on certain items, it is, if I may say so, one of the functions of the Trusteeship Council to commit Administering Authorities to increased expenditure. For that reason, I do not think that the Council should hesitate about adopting a recommendation which will, so to speak, commit the Administering Authority to increased expenditure.

I would add that the considerations which the United States representative has just put forward, while valid, are the same considerations as were put forward to the Visiting Mission. Despite those considerations, the Visiting Mission considered it necessary, in view of all the prevailing circumstances, to make these very specific recommendations.

Hence, I think that this paragraph contains material which should be specifically approved by the Trusteeship Council, and I do feel that the amendment should be put to the vote.

The general recommendation in paragraph 2 is of a different character. If necessary, the point of view reflected by the United States representative could be

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

accommodated to some extent by adding the word "especially" at the end of the amendment; in other words, the phrase would read: "especially as recommended in paragraph 201 of the Visiting Mission's report". That will separate the recommendation of this paragraph from the general body of the section.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the amendment of the representative of India to paragraph 4.

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

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): As paragraph 4 now stands, the first two sentences are the sentences of the Drafting Committee's report, with the amendment of the Soviet Union; the Council has just voted, by the adoption of the Indian amendment, to add a third sentence to the paragraph. I would request the President to have a separate vote on the first two sentences and on the third sentence of the paragraph.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): It seems to me that the United States representative's aim is to record his affirmative vote on the first two sentences of paragraph 4. He should therefore be given the opportunity of a separate vote on those two sentences. But I submit that a second vote on the Indian amendment which has just been adopted is not necessary; the vote on that amendment is already on record. Therefore, after the vote on the first two sentences of the paragraph, as requested by the United States representative, there should be a vote on the paragraph as a whole, including the Indian amendment.

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

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

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 5?

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Here the Drafting Committee, for some reason unknown to me, has stopped short of what the Visiting Mission has stated, and I do not recall any objection being taken to any part of the Visiting Mission's recommendation in this case. Therefore, I suggest the following modification of this paragraph:

"The Council notes the statement of" --
instead of "made by" --

"the Administering Authority" --
delete the words "to the Visiting Mission and to the Council" --

"that it has no plans to resume nuclear or thermonuclear tests in the Territory, and earnestly hopes that no nuclear or thermonuclear tests will be carried out in the future."

These are exactly the words of the report.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is our feeling that paragraph 5 should incorporate a categorical demand addressed to the Administering Authority never in future to carry out any nuclear or thermonuclear tests in the Trust Territory, on the ground that the Administering Authority has no right to use the Trust Territory for such purposes.

As regards the addition proposed by the representative of India, we feel that this would be the minimum that the Trusteeship Council should do in this respect, and we shall therefore support that addition proposed by the representative of India and contained in paragraph 202 of the report of the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Council Secretary to read out the amendment proposed by the representative of India.

Mr. COTTRELL (Secretary of the Council): Paragraph 5 as amended by the representative of India would read as follows:

(Mr. Cottrell)

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

The PRESIDENT: In the absence of any objection to the amendment proposed by the representative of India, I take it that paragraph 5 is adopted.

Paragraph 5 as amended was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 6 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I should merely like to state, not by way of objection, but to have it on record, that this paragraph includes the words "without further delay". While we are in accord with this paragraph and with the recommendations stated, I would not want it to be understood that we can give absolute assurance that there will not be some delays. Every effort will be made to prevent delays, but, in the nature of the problem, which is a complicated one, and requires the completion of a survey which is now under way, while every effort will be made by the Administering Authority to avoid further delay, I do not feel that we can give absolute assurance that there will be no delays in this matter.

The PRESIDENT: Does anyone wish to make any comments on paragraph 7?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We would request that the individual points in this paragraph should be voted upon because the Soviet delegation cannot vote in favour of paragraph 7. We shall abstain.

I should like also to take this opportunity to request a separate vote on the first sentence of paragraph 8. We intend to vote in favour of that. We would request also a separate vote on the remainder of paragraph 8, which the Soviet delegation will vote against because we believe that the year 1965 for the establishment of a territorial legislature is a completely arbitrary date. It is our opinion that such a legislative body must be established without delay and certainly should not be postponed until 1965.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): In paragraph 7, I suggest the insertion of the words "and equal" between the word "full" and the word "members".

The PRESIDENT: There being no objection to the amendment proposed by the representative of India, we shall vote on paragraph 7 as so amended.

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

The PRESIDENT: In connexion with paragraph 8 I shall put to the vote first the first sentence.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): What is meant by "universal suffrage"? Does it mean that every man, woman and child should vote, or is universal adult suffrage intended here? If that is the intention, the word "adult" should be inserted between "universal" and "suffrage" and the word "greatly" between the words "be" and "accelerated".

Miss TENZER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have no objection. I simply wish to point out to the Secretariat that, as far as the French translation is concerned, this addition is unnecessary. In French, "universal suffrage" has a well known and obvious definition. "Universal suffrage" is always used and it is not necessary in French to say that it is for adults.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): In English "universal suffrage" has a fairly well understood meaning. Adults, in legal phraseology, are usually people of the age of 21 years, whereas in some systems of franchise people of 18 years of age vote. I think that that is so in some parts of the Pacific Islands. However, I have no objection to this phrase as long as it is understood that it is not restrictive and that people who are legally minors could still vote if they were in accordance with the ordinary regulations.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I do not believe there is an international law on minority and majority. I am aware that there are different ages for voting qualifications in the Trust Territories in different districts, but the Trust Territory Administration can always adopt a resolution on law to define every person above the age of eighteen as an adult.

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

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am not very happy with the last sentence of this paragraph -- "The Council considers that the Administering Authority should, in the meantime ..." -- "in the meantime", that is between now and 1965. I think there is some slight suggestion here that perhaps there is no great urgency about this matter, and while the Administering Authority may struggle with its own target in the meantime, between now and 1965, election procedures should be introduced. May I suggest -- I am not quite sure of my own words -- something like this: "The Council recommends that the Administering Authority should at the earliest possible time introduce popular elections as the basis for the appointment of members of this Committee". I am not quite clear what "in the meantime" means. There is too much latitude implied. Sometime before 1965, they should start working, but as to when this work ends there is no indication. Hence the proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask the Council Secretary to read the proposed amendment of India.

The SECRETARY: The last sentence of paragraph 8 would now read: "The Council recommends that the Administering Authority should at the earliest possible time introduce popular elections for the appointment of members to the Advisory Committee".

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of India agree to what has just been read by the Council Secretary?

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Yes sir.

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

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

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 9?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We proposed voting on individual paragraphs. The Soviet delegation would like to state it will abstain on paragraphs 9, 10 and 11. So if there are no observations from other members of the Council, and if you feel that that will expedite the work, it may well be that these three paragraphs may be voted on together.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I have no objection to paragraphs 9 and 10 being voted on together, but I have something on paragraph 11.

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

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on paragraph 11?

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I think there is need for slight rewording of the first part of this. It states "noting the solid foundations". How can you note solid foundations? You can feel them. I hope the Drafting Committee felt these foundations. At any rate, what is the need to state "the solid foundations"? Do we expect that the United States, the Administering Authority, would lay anything else but solid foundations? What is important is that foundations have been laid for advance. I therefore suggest the following modification: "Considering that foundations for political development have been laid at the local and district level, and bearing in mind the pressing need" -- I insert the word "pressing" -- "to further promote Territorial consciousness and a sense of national identity in the Territory as a whole, the Council recommends ...".

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): We have no objection to that amendment but we are very unhappy about the disappearance of the word "solid". I think that it was a nice word and we do not know why it should go out.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of India insist on this amendment? It is clear that the representative of the United States has said that "solid" is a very beautiful word and should be maintained.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): As regards this word "solid" I submit that it is solid but not beautiful. As I said, my reason for this is not doubting the solidity of these foundations. As I said, I do not expect that they would lay foundations other than solid foundations. The foundations are well laid. What we want to say here is that preparatory work has been done at the district and local government level and that the whole process should be further strengthened now.

I therefore maintain my amendment, not because of any suspicion of the excellent work done by the Administering Authority. I agree with that and appreciate it, but it is my dislike of the word "solid".

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I wish to ask if the representative of India would agree to put in the words "well laid". I think we might barter "solid" for "well laid".

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I was going to make the same suggestion.

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

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): As regards paragraph 12, in the third line the word "helped" should be "helps", in the fourth line "was" should be "is". In the last sentence which begins: "The Council considers this to be a matter of," and the words "the utmost", so that the sentence would read:

"The Council considers this to be a matter of the utmost urgency and importance".

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We support the amendments moved by the representative of India.

I should like to suggest a drafting change in the last two lines. In the last sentence instead of the words "expresses the hope" we suggest that we should say "that this decision will be implemented without delay." We should say: "and recommends that this decision should be implemented without delay".

The PRESIDENT: Does the Chair understand that there is no objection to the amendments proposed by India and to the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union?

Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): I would just remark in passing that the representative of India dislikes adjectives but apparently likes adverbs. I would have seen no necessity to embroider the words "urgency and importance"; they would mean what they say. But I certainly would not object to the change that he proposes.

Paragraph 12, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): As regards paragraph 13, we shall not press for a vote on parts of this paragraph but we should like to signify our agreement with the conclusions of the Visiting Missions in the first sentence of that paragraph, while we are unable to concur in the conclusions that are found at the end of the paragraph. If that last part is put to the vote separately, the Soviet delegation would abstain, and we will abstain on paragraph 13 as a whole.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): May I suggest some modification to this paragraph too? In my view, it should read as follows:

"The Council, recalling its previous recommendations concerning the need to locate the headquarters within the Territory, endorses the views of the 1961 Visiting Mission and draws them to the attention of the Administering Authority. It considers that a decision on a site should be made as soon as possible and the necessary steps undertaken to transfer the headquarters there". Then the following sentence would simply delete the words "become familiar with possible sites and thereby".

Miss TENZIER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have something also to say on the last suggestion of our colleague from India. I believe that the last part of the sentence is an explanation which is useful to the reader. One might wonder, in the light of the preceding language, why it was that an Advisory Committee would meet in the various districts. What has that got to do with the choice of locations, and so on? I believe that the last part of the sentence serves a useful purpose and I should prefer that it be kept unless the other members of the Council are opposed to it.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I do not believe this to be a problem of unfamiliarity on the part of the members of the Advisory Committee with the possible sites. I wish to say that during the Mission's visit to the Territory I personally met practically all members of the Advisory Committee, not the Committee as a whole, but individually, in various districts. All these members are familiar with the sites. They know there is a site in Truk, they know there is a possible site in Palau, they know what facilities exist in the Marshalls. It is therefore not a question of familiarizing these gentlemen with the topography of the various possible sites. What is intended here is that the political support of the people should be obtained for a decision which may be taken by the Administering Authority. Essentially it is an administrative decision which has to be taken by the Administering Authority. I believe the representative of Bolivia is of the same view. Therefore, I think these words serve no purpose, and my objection to them is of a personal character because I do not think there is any unfamiliarity or that familiarity has to be now developed with regard to the possible site. These gentlemen are not topographical experts, they are not designers, they will not be able to advise the Administering Authority that on such and such a slope a house can be built, and so on. There are two or three sites in the Territory, everybody is familiar with them, and the question is of associating them in the decision. The question is one of enabling them to discuss this matter and take a decision or assist the Administering Authority in taking a decision.

Miss TENZER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In the light of what our colleague from India has just said, I think I may properly ask a question of the representative of the Administering Authority, because the reference here is, after all, to a statement of the Administering Authority which it is not incumbent on us to alter, or else, of course, the whole sentence should be changed. The Visiting Mission as such or the Trusteeship Council as such would have to express its views. What is done here is the reporting on a decision of the Administering Authority and the views of the Administering Authority. What is said here must be reasonably in keeping with what the views of the Administering Authority actually are. I would therefore ask our colleague from the United States to give his views on the question.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I apologize to the representative of Belgium for speaking before the representative of the Administering Authority to whom she has addressed a specific question. The representative of India has a very clear-cut view on the possibility of siting the capital of the Territory. I should like to remind the members of the Council that in previous sessions -- and undoubtedly the members of the Drafting Committee must have borne this in mind -- the Council held the view or believed that the selection of a site for the headquarters was something that had to be decided by the population; that this would be a political decision by the population. At that time I held the view that the location of capitals is not a people's decision but rather an administrative decision. Capitals are there but there is no democratic decision on the basis of which the people are consulted in order that they may decide whether this, that or the other location is to be chosen. However mature a people may be, the problem in itself still remains complex, and in a territory as heterogeneous as this one there may be inclinations in one sector of the population in favour of one or another location. This is perfectly logical and natural. On this score I fully agree with what the representative of India said, because, after all, my views are not so different from his. The population has no topographical knowledge; naturally, this is a technical decision; transport problems, problems of geographical distance, and so on, come into play. Frankly, I do not see how the population can make a decision like this. As I listened to his amendment I was under the impression that he was

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

stressing the possibility that the representatives of the people could decide this question jointly with the Administering Authority. I admit that the views of the representative of India are very valid, but I am afraid I do not share his optimism that the people or their local representative should make a final decision on this question, since it is such a complex problem. For this reason I very much regret at this time that I am in disagreement with him. I am not against the text or the wording that appears in the report. It seems to me that it fully reflects the situation and the conditions as they exist. I apologize to my colleague from India because I do not agree with him this time.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): To answer the question of the representative of Belgium, it is true that in our view it would be helpful for the members of the Inter-District Advisory Committee to visit the various island centres and district centres so as to become familiar with them. If I understood the representative of India correctly, he indicated that he thought the members of the Committee were already familiar with the various possible islands that might be headquarters. My information is that that is not the case; that, for example, a representative from the Palau district might very well have never been in the Marshalls or in Truk. It is precisely for this reason that it is desirable for them to meet in various places so that they can become familiar with the characteristics of those places, not in a technical or engineering sense, but in a general sense. Therefore, the wording of this second sentence seems entirely appropriate to us.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Of course, it is a statement of the Administering Authority. But that does not restrain me from pointing to the flaws in the statement, or the flaws in the intent of the statement.

I therefore propose the following amendment: the replacement of the word "would" in the phrase "the Headquarters should and would be located" by the word "will". I also propose that a separate vote should be taken on the phrase "It notes that the Administering Authority fully agrees that ultimately the Headquarters should and will" -- this is on the assumption that my amendment is acceptable -- "be located within the Territory"; a separate vote on the words "become familiar with possible sites and thereby"; and, finally, a separate vote on the part of the sentence beginning with the words "and that it plans" and ending with the words "the capital of the Trust Territory".

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Secretary of the Council to read out the amendments and proposals.

The SECRETARY: As amended, the first part of the paragraph would read as follows:

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

A separate vote has been requested on the part of the paragraph beginning with the words "It notes that the Administering Authority" and ending with the words "within the Territory"; on the words "become familiar with possible sites and

(The Secretary)

thereby"; and on the phrase beginning with the words "and that it plans" and ending with the words "for the capital of the Trust Territory".

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to the vote on paragraph 13.

The first two sentences, as amended, were adopted unanimously.

The words "It notes that the Administering Authority fully agrees that ultimately the Headquarters should and will be located within the Territory" were adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

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

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

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

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.