

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/FV.1311
1 August 1967

ENGLISH

486

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 14 June 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Miss BROOKS

(Liberia)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: annual report of the Administering Authority (continued)
2. Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory Of the Pacific Islands, 1967 (continued)
3. Examinations of petitions concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
4. Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General
5. Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS:
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (T/1667; T/L.1121) (continued)
REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE
PACIFIC ISLANDS 1967 (T/1658 and Add.1) (continued)
EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
(T/COM.10/L.4, L.5, L.6; T/PET.10/38) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Norwood, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Mr. Kabua and Mr. Salii, Advisers to the Special Representative, took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: Before we resume the general debate, I should like to call the Council's attention to document T/OBS.10/10, Observations of the Administering Authority on a petition Concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands contained in document T/PET.10/38. There is one error in the English version: the date, at the end of page 2, should be 13 June 1967, rather than 3 June 1967.

We shall now proceed with the general debate.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): From the latest report of the administering Power on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; from the discussions in the Trusteeship Council; and from the replies to the questions asked by the Soviet and other delegations of the United States delegation and the United States Special Representative, who presented the report to the Trusteeship Council, we can see that for twenty years, since the United States assumed responsibility for promoting the development of the Territory in order to implement the aims of the Trusteeship System, and undertook -- as provided for in Article 76 (b) of the United Nations Charter -- "to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants" of the Trust Territory, all these provisions -- after twenty years of United States domination -- have remained unfulfilled.

Not only does the administering Power have no plans for the Territory's political development, or for the setting up of a time-table for the granting of independence to that Territory, as called for by the Declaration on the

Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, but it is openly attempting completely to absorb the Territory and turn it into an appendage of the metropolitan country to be used as a basic military strategic zone of United States imperialism in the Far East.

To date, the administering Power has not undertaken any real steps to ensure the transfer of authority in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to its actual owners, the people of Micronesia.

During the discussion of the situation obtaining in the Trust Territory, one may have heard a number of words of praise addressed to the administering Power, particularly in connexion with the creation in the Territory of a so-called legislative body, the Congress of Micronesia. It was even stated that it was practically a step on the path to genuine self-determination. The facts in the documents, however -- which are available to the Trusteeship Council -- show that that is by no means the actual situation, despite the attempt here to depict it as such.

Let us refer to the facts.

In 1965, the Congress of Micronesia was created, and the so-called Constitution of that Territory was introduced. An analysis of the circumstances which preceded the creation of the Congress of Micronesia and the Constitution shows that these steps were thought up and then endorsed, not by the people of the Territory or by their representatives, but by Washington. Therefore, it is by no means by chance that the Congress of Micronesia is deprived of any real sovereign rights.

Complete legislative and executive authority in the Trust Territory is concentrated in the hands of the High Commissioner, who is appointed by the administering Power, and who is immediately subordinate to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

On the basis of article 14 of United States Law No. 2882, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, or the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, is empowered to veto any law which has been adopted by the Congress of Micronesia. At the same time, on the basis of article 4 of the same law, the High Commissioner, with the agreement of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, can declare to be law any bill which the Congress of Micronesia has refused to adopt.

The authority of the High Commissioner extends even to the activities of the local legislative and executive bodies.

Thus the High Commissioner is a sort of little tin god in the Territory. He can make and annul laws; he can appoint and remove officers from their posts; the courts are subordinate to him, as is all other administrative power in the Territory.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

All the really important posts in the Administration, including the fourteen which are occupied by the highest advisers to the High Commissioner, as the High Commissioner himself declared here, continued to be occupied by Americans. The rate at which personnel are trained and at which they are replacing American citizens in key posts in the Administration is slow and is not in accordance with the demands incumbent upon the administering Power as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

In the United States, the old thesis that the Micronesians are not ready yet to manage their own affairs continues to be repeated. This suicidal theory of the colonizers cannot mislead anyone. Even such an official of the United States as the Vice-Chancellor of the East-West Centre, where the people of the Pacific Territories receive their education, declared that he is convinced of the capacity of the Micronesians to play a greater part in self-determination and independence.

This theory of the lack of preparation on the part of the Micronesians obviously pursues certain objectives. It is designed to maintain the domination of the United States in the Trust Territory.

In the United States voices already are being raised in favour of absorbing the Pacific Islands. Speaking in the American Senate, Senator Hiram Fong went so far as to assert that the attachment of the Pacific Islands to the State of Hawaii would be considered the fulfilment on the part of the United States of the agreement on the granting of independence and self-determination to the people of that area. Really, this is shameless cynicism. It is difficult to believe that Senator Fong was not aware of the existence of Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, which emphasizes the particular role to be played by the Security Council in deciding issues relating to Trust Territories, which includes the question of the status of any such Territory.

In Washington, it is obvious that they calculate that, in view of the relative isolation of the Pacific Islands, created by the Americans themselves -- and this is something which was mentioned by Mr. Salii here, a member of the Congress of Micronesia -- uniting this area with the United States would pass unobserved. The references which have been made to the free expression of the will of the Micronesians are designed simply to disguise the de facto annexation

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

of the Trust Territory. What sort of free expression of will can exist on the part of the Micronesians if the Administration controls all the aspects of life in the Territory to which I referred earlier, if the Micronesians do not have an organ of their own capable of defending their rights? We must refer to the fact that the twenty years of so-called enlightening activities on the part of Americans in the Pacific Islands has simply amounted to brow-beating the Micronesians with the thought that they will never be able to stand on their own feet and that they will be lost without the United States.

In this respect, a role is played by the volunteers of the infamous Peace Corps, who have been inundating the Territory by the hundreds recently.

The United States is artificially preventing not only the political but also the economic, social and cultural development of the Trust Territory. In his statement to the Council, Mr. Salii declared that foreign companies occupy a predominant position in the Territory's economy and that these companies are retarding the economic development of the Pacific Islands and are limiting the economic relations of the Trust Territory with other States. This not only limits progress in the Territory, but also reduces the possibility of the local population playing an even greater part in the economic activities of their country.

The entire policy of the administering Power in the economic field is aimed at turning the Territory into an economic appendage of the metropolitan country, at turning it into a source of raw material and other products necessary for the United States and at providing a market for American goods, thus enabling American capital to extract profits from the Territory.

This opinion was voiced by the American writer, Julius Pratt, who said at pages 241-242 of his book, America's Colonial Experiment, that the United States, like other colonial Powers, has found in its colonies a guaranteed market for its own industrial goods and a source of the necessary raw materials: sugar, pineapples, copra, hemp, tobacco and other tropical and sub-tropical products. In accordance with the classical analysis of economic imperialism, the surplus capital of the United States also can be invested in these tropical islands.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

An analysis of the material available to the Council demonstrates that in the economic field the American colonizers are purposely retarding the development of the vital branches of the economy. No use is made in the Territory of the possibilities of developing local industries such as fishing, and so forth. Agriculture is conducted along primitive lines and cannot satisfy the most elementary requirements of the population. Support is given only to those branches of the economy which are significant as exports and as a source of income to the American monopolies. This precisely explains the low level of the economy in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. And as we can see from the conclusions reached by the Visiting Mission -- and this was essentially acknowledged by the representative of the administering Power -- the Territory is undergoing a state of economic stagnation.

In carrying out economic policies, the American authorities base their actions purely on selfish interests. In fact, if anything is done in the Islands in the economic field, it is simply to serve the needs of the Americans themselves and to fulfil objectives of a military and strategic nature.

It is interesting in this connexion that Robert Trumbull, on pages 149-150 of his book, Paradise in Trust, said with regard to the Palau group of islands that the general impression is that the Americans are concentrating mainly on their own interests in the islands and not on the interests of the indigenous population. All that is involved is self-interest. The Americans have concentrated their efforts on improving the standard of living on the island of Koror because Americans live on that island, but they do not engage in any other sort of activity.

A correspondent of The New York Times, on 14 March 1966, writing from the island of Saipan, which is the administrative centre of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, stated that many Saipan residents are critical of the United States because they find it difficult to explain why the United States is doing nothing about the economy of the island.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The difficult economic conditions of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory are accentuated by the fact that the American authorities are expropriating the most fertile land for military and other purposes. As was acknowledged by the Special Representative of the United States, who spoke in the Council, the extent of alienated land taken from the indigenous inhabitants is more than 50 per cent of all the land in the Territory. But on a number of islands the percentage of land alienated from the indigenous inhabitants is considerably higher. We do not know whether the statement of the Special Representative tallies with the facts. For instance, on the Marshall Islands, the indigenous inhabitants hold only 20 per cent of the land.

We should pay special attention to the question of the use of land in the Trust Territory. It is worthy of note that the Special Representative, in explaining his position in regard to land, referred to the fact that formerly the Japanese compelled the indigenous inhabitants to sell them land at very low prices, or appropriated that land without any compensation whatsoever. After that statement by the Special Representative, one would have thought that a statement would follow that the United States, for its part, when it came to the Territory, changed that state of affairs. But such a statement did not come from the representatives of the United States in the Trusteeship Council. On the contrary, when the administration of the island was handed over to the United States, not only did it not eliminate the injustices committed by the previous administrators, but it actually adopted measures in order juridically to consolidate those injustices. United States authorities declared all alienated land to be State-owned land. Moreover, they continued the practice of alienating land. In the first years of the Administration, this was done by direct take-overs. Subsequently, in order to impart to this process the appearance of legitimacy, special legal constructions were devised. The Code of the Trust Territory includes the concept of the right of obligatory alienation. It is stated that the concept of public use includes all use of land determined as public use by the High Commissioner.

In answer to the questions of a number of delegations with regard to what the United States intends to do to eliminate these injustices, the representatives

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

of the United States manoeuvred by referring to the complexity and difficulty of the problem. This technique on the part of the colonialists is not a new one, but it is indicative of the fact that the United States of America does not intend to solve this question in the interests of the indigenous inhabitants.

The United States representative evaded an answer to the question of the Soviet representative with regard to what use was being made of the land alienated from the indigenous inhabitants, and in particular what portion of it was being used for military purposes. We, of course, were not among those naive people who expected a direct answer to our question from the United States representative. Nevertheless, the answer that was given by him is particularly typical. He alleged that the land taken from the indigenous inhabitants was used for the construction of schools and hospitals and for the construction of various types of highways. In listening to the United States representative, one might have the impression that the whole of the Territory of the Pacific Islands was covered with a dense network of schools and hospitals. We were told here that 50 per cent of the alienated land in the Trust Territory is for public use, for the construction of schools and hospitals -- and surely that should be the case. But from the report of the Visiting Mission and from the acknowledgement of the United States representatives themselves, it will be seen that this is far from being the case. In using the Pacific Islands Trust Territory as its economic and military appendage, the United States has completely ignored the needs of the indigenous inhabitants in the social field. This has been recognized not only by the Visiting Mission but also by the United States Press. In this connexion the following appeared in The New York Times on 14 March 1966 regarding conditions in the Pacific Islands Trust Territory:

"American officials explained that the funds assigned by Congress are inadequate to carry out the extensive construction programme and to satisfy the immediate needs for schools and hospitals."

The roads in the Trust Territory are almost invariably in a very bad state, as can be seen from reading the book by R. Trumbull entitled Paradise in Trust. On page 190, we read that the local chief of the island of Yap described the communication situation in the following fashion: "On account of the absence of roads, people die before they can actually be delivered to hospitals."

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

On pages 14 and 15 of R. Trumbull's book, the over-all aspect of the settled areas of the indigenous inhabitants in the Territory is described as follows:

"Filth, lack of sanitation, and squalor in these slums are particularly depressing and do not produce any confidence in the Administering Authority."

We have before us the report of the Visiting Mission which went to the Trust Territory. In this report, we again have evidence regarding the inadequate medical services in the Territory, the unsatisfactory situation with regard to education, the particularly poor condition of the highways and so on. As a matter of fact, these were also admitted by the Special Representative when he spoke in this Council. All this was explained away by inadequacy of funds. The rich country of the United States does not have enough money to allocate so as not to permit such conditions to exist in the Territory under its administration. However, the United States Government which over a period of twenty years did not wish to allocate funds for the construction of schools and hospitals for the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory, could always find money for the construction of military installations on a huge scale in these islands. The United States is using the Pacific Islands extensively as a testing area for its atomic and thermonuclear weapons. It has indicated that more nuclear weapons have been exploded in Micronesia than in the territory of the United States.

In reading the book by the American writer Harold Wiens, Pacific Island Bastion of the United States (Van Nostrand, 1962), we can understand the reason for the active military preparations of the United States in its colonies in the Pacific Ocean. The writer points out in particular that the Air Force base at Kwajalein and the base for launching rocket tests in the Gulf of that largest atoll in the world are of considerable significance. Kwajalein plays a very important role in the Air Force transport system and is an important installation for trans-Pacific flights. In 1961 it became a strategic rocket launching site. The New Yorker magazine, in its issue of 11 June 1966, points out that there are 3,000 Americans in Kwajalein working on the Kwajalein launching platforms from which Nike-Zeus rockets are regularly fired to intercept intercontinental ballistic missiles launched in California. The United States has spent approximately \$1,000 million for the construction of its installations in Kwajalein. The United States is thus spending \$1,000 million for the construction of military installations on a single island. That is what the money is being used for as well as the land which has been taken away from the indigenous inhabitants. In the face of all that, the Americans are unwilling even to make appropriate compensation to the indigenous inhabitants.

We do not wish to go into the details concerning the places where one or two schools are constructed or where some section of a road has been built or where some insignificant measures have been taken to improve sanitary conditions, as is done in the report of the Visiting Mission.

In taking stock of the discussion regarding conditions on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the following conclusions must be drawn. First, although the Pacific Islands have been under the trusteeship of the wealthiest country of the capitalist world, conditions do not exist for genuine political, economic and social progress. Secondly, the United States is not carrying out its obligations under the Charter, and in particular under Article 76 of the Charter, which calls on the Administering Authority to contribute to the political, economic and social progress of the Territory in order to prepare it for self-determination and independence. That is required by the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Administering Authority has not only failed to formulate plans and

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

establish conditions for the attainment of independence and self-government in the Trust Territory, but it does not even intend to do so in the future. Thirdly, the United States continues to pursue a policy in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which is designed to transform that Territory into an economic, military and strategic appendage and to annex it, thereby ignoring all the decisions of the United Nations. Being guided by the military and political doctrine of power in the Pacific, the United States has assigned to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the role of being a bridgehead in the implementation of its aggressive designs to crush the national liberation movements in South East Asia and in its struggle against the people of Viet-Nam. That is the policy which is hampering the implementation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

In these circumstances, the Trusteeship Council must call upon the Administering Authority immediately to implement a concrete and comprehensive development programme for Micronesia so that the people can achieve self-determination and independence. The Congress of Micronesia must be given all the necessary legislative power in the Territory, including the necessary authority to establish executive organs. The Trusteeship Council must call on the Administering Authority unconditionally to implement the recommendations of the General Assembly contained in resolutions 2105 (XX) and 2189 (XXI), in particular the provisions calling for the elimination of military bases in colonial territories and the necessity to refrain from constructing new military bases and from any other activity having as its consequence the alienation of territory from the indigenous inhabitants.

In the economic, social, educational and health fields, the Administering Authority must pass from large-scale promises, which are designed to confuse and deceive the indigenous inhabitants and world public opinion, to practical action. It should proceed to the development of those branches of the economy which would contribute to the speedy development of the economy, which would be in accordance with the interests of the indigenous inhabitants and which would lead to increased employment of the population. The Administering Authority must give the representatives of the indigenous inhabitants more authority in the administration of matters concerning the Territory. It should pay much more attention the

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

improvement of health services and schools in the Territory. The Administering Authority should take measures for the immediate return of all land alienated from the indigenous inhabitants under whatever pretext it may have been done. That land should be returned to the sovereignty of the Micronesians. The Trusteeship Council should also urge the Administering Authority to settle immediately the question of compensating the population for damages done during the Second World War. Those are our comments on the report of the Administering Authority and the proposals of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory.

In conclusion, we should like once again to stress that the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples are fully applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and must be implemented forthwith.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): One hardly knows where to start in commenting on the speech which we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union. I sat here wondering whether or not we had both been sitting in the same room for the last week and listening to the same statements. I am forced to conclude that any resemblance between what I think most members of the Council heard and the statements which have just been made by the representative of the Soviet Union is purely coincidental. One need not comment on some of the points, which are extremely difficult to understand.

In our own opinion, the budget which the United States appropriates for the Trust Territory has to be increasingly expanded. But I am not aware that that budget constitutes a figure of some \$600. I find it interesting that the representative of the Soviet Union saw fit to take the statements of Mr. Salii from the Congress of Micronesia on foreign investments and his comments on the desire or lack of desire for such investments and twist them so that they came out in a form which was completely contrary to what he had said.

The representative of the Soviet Union did this, although I think that the Council has noted that throughout the Council's meetings the representative of the Soviet Union did not see fit to ask Mr. Salii or his colleague, Mr. Kabua, a single question. Why? Perhaps because he is himself aware that the statements, assertions and conclusions which he has seen fit to make here are not believed at all by these gentlemen from Micronesia.

Let me make some general comments, without going into the series of assertions by the representative of the Soviet Union, about what we have heard during the discussions here on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I think I said the other day that the statements of the High Commissioner and of the United States delegation were statements which could be characterized by the word "candour".

(Mr. McHenry, United States)

We do not deny at all that Micronesia is a developing area. We do not deny at all that, as is true of all developing areas, the demands are increasing, the problems are great and indeed complex. Similarly, we do not deny, and indeed we take some credit for the fact, that the Administering Authority is making a great effort and has succeeded in some measure -- perhaps not enough to satisfy the representative of the Soviet Union -- and indeed not enough to satisfy the United States Government, which has made significant advances in carrying out the obligations which it undertook under the Trusteeship Agreement.

It is not unusual for the representative of the Soviet Union to take, as he did the other day, obvious facts and seek to draw conclusions which we all know to be misleading. No one here has said that the Trust Territory is completely self-governing, and therefore no one here denies that the United States Government and the High Commissioner have a continuing obligation with regard to the Government of that Territory. Indeed, it is our conclusion that the United States would be delinquent in fulfilling its obligations if it did not continue to use its best judgement in carrying out the goals and objectives which I think most members of the Council recognize are the goals and objectives of the United States.

Similarly, we do not really expect the representative of the Soviet Union to accept the Congress of Micronesia, if only because it is a freely elected body, if only because the people of Micronesia are able without any restraint to cast their ballots and decide for themselves whom they want to elect and what programmes they want to follow. I am not surprised that the representative of the Soviet Union is dismayed at a system which operates so openly. In fact, the very openness of the operation and the very candour of the statements made by the Special Representatives are in themselves a refutation of the assertion by the representative of the Soviet Union that an effort is being made by the United States to absorb Micronesia in an unobserved way. The United States Government made clear when it accepted the obligation twenty years ago to develop Micronesia, and it continues to make clear now, that its sole objective in that area is to carry out the obligations which it undertook in the Trusteeship Agreement. Those obligations are clearly formulated.

They are part of no secret agreement. In fact, I would remind the Council that the Trusteeship Agreement was entered into with the positive consent of the Soviet Union.

It does not help this Council to carry out its work if it is bombarded with a series of assertions and statements taken out of context, or very cleverly stated so that they appear to be true. It does not help this Council to hear the representative of the Soviet Union, for example, in his effort to carry out what can be described as a propaganda attack on the United States, speak of nuclear testing in the present tense, not informing the Council what period he was referring to, and completely ignoring the present agreement which bans the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. It does not help the Council and it does not advance the image of the Soviet Union when it tries to proceed in this manner.

I shall not deal with the Soviet representative's long series of assertions. I think it is sufficient to say that the report of the Visiting Mission to Micronesia is before the Council, a report written by representatives of four member countries of this Council. It is not a report which in all instances applauds, and blindly applauds, the programmes of the United States Government in Micronesia.

(Mr. McHenry, United States)

It points out problems, it suggests new approaches to problems, it recognizes the progress which has taken place. I would venture to say that if the representative of the Soviet Union had seen fit to take that report and read it in its entirety, instead of going through it, as I presume he did, fingering pages, looking for criticism, much as some of the public reads some books, he might have come out with a slightly different impression of conditions in that area at the present time.

I will conclude by simply saying this. We have here, with the United States delegation at this session of the Trusteeship Council, two gentlemen who were appointed by their peers to come here and speak for the people of Micronesia. They were elected, as their peers were elected. They will take back with them to Micronesia not only the proceedings of this Council; they will take back with them also their impressions of how this Council operates and the thoroughness with which it does its job. I do not believe -- in fact I am confident -- that they will not take back with them the distorted views of the representative of the Soviet Union. I hope that they will take back with them the fact that it is possible for a society, and indeed for the United Nations, to permit and even welcome statements -- wild statements and assertions -- such as those that we have just heard.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not intend to enter into any detailed polemics with the representative of the United States, but wish to point out only that his answer was but a sort of childish babble. He did not reply to a single fact that I brought out in the Trusteeship Council, much less did he refute any of the facts I set forth here. Supported by no facts or data whatsoever, the representative of the United States instead chose to mention the report of the Visiting Mission to the Territory, saying that if the Soviet representative had read that report properly he would not have reached the conclusions he did reach. But it was precisely on the basis of that report, together with other sources of information, that I came to the conclusions which I stated. Although I do not agree with the conclusions and the very philosophy of the Visiting Mission's report, I quote from a single paragraph in refutation of what the representative of the United States asserts here regarding economic conditions in the Territory. In paragraph 105 of the report entitled

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

(Spoke in English)

"Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1967", document T/1658,

(Continued in Russian)

we read the following:

(Spoke in English)

"In the opinion of the Mission the economy is virtually stagnant."

(Continued in Russian)

That is the general conclusion of the Mission, and it was also acknowledged by the Special Representative of the United States in his statement at this meeting. He said that, while he did not agree with the conclusion of the Visiting Mission that the economic situation in the Territory could be characterized as stagnant, he did nevertheless recognize that, as he himself said, that description was close to the truth. And that is the situation as it actually is.

Further on in the same paragraph 105 of the Visiting Mission's report we read:

(Spoke in English)

"... until recently economic development of the Trust Territory had not been accorded the priority and attention it deserved and had, in fact, been neglected".

(Continued in Russian)

What then is the representative of the United States talking about?

I could go on quoting from this report paragraph by paragraph and I could prove to the representative of the United States that all of his assertions are just so many lies. He said that the Soviet representative was distorting the facts. Actually, though, it is not the Soviet representative who is distorting the facts, but the representative of the United States of America.

In the report, as I pointed out in my statement, there is a great deal of discussion about the plans of the United States for the Territory; the whole report in fact consists of this. The United States has painted a glorious picture of what it intends to do in the future with regard to the economic development of the

Territory, with regard to education, with regard to health, and all that sort of thing. But the facts set forth in this document -- though, as I have said, I disagree with the conclusions and recommendations contained therein -- indicate that in all of these areas there is total stagnation. Meanwhile the United States, the richest country in the world, the country to which, under the Charter, the Trust Territory has been handed over so that, as Administering Authority, it might contribute to its social, economic and political development, is doing nothing whatsoever to carry out those Charter obligations.

So then, if the representative of the United States has any complaints, let him address them not to the Soviet representative, but to those who wrote this report. I simply cited in my statement scores of instances from analyses made by United States researchers who have visited those islands and who have pointed to the pitiful conditions obtaining in them. The United States representative himself today acknowledged these facts. He said that he did not deny that conditions in the Territory are bad and he said that the Territory, after all, is a developing country. What, then, has the United States been doing there for the last twenty years? Until the United Nations, in its resolution of 14 December 1960, adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the United States did not so much as lift a finger to do anything by way of implementing the provisions of the Charter. Yet we are now being told here that the Soviet representative, in his statement, is out of step, that he is not saying what the other representatives have been saying in the Trusteeship Council. But what other representatives?

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The representative of the United States heard the statement made on the subject of Papua and New Guinea by the representative of Liberia, who was not particularly full of praise for the colonialists. But who did praise them? Of course, we heard praise, and I am sure this praise will continue. This praise was voiced by the Australian representative and the New Zealand representative, who will probably speak after me. They sing paeans of praise of the United States for the colonial policy that it is conducting, in this case in particular.

My last comment concerns the statement made by Mr. Salii. I did not distort the sense of his statement. I quoted, virtually verbatim, everything he said. But Mr. Salii did not draw the conclusions to be reached from his own statement. That is quite understandable, because he cannot go any further than he did. He did not draw any conclusions, whereas I, on the basis of his statement, and on the basis of facts and material that I have available to me, went further, and drew the necessary conclusions, which I presented to the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: Since both sides have expressed their views, I would appeal to the representatives not to enter into polemics.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The detailed views of the United States on the questions which this Council has been discussing will be given when the High Commissioner makes his closing statement at the conclusion of this general debate.

I must confess that there were no facts to refute in the Soviet statement. It was a statement full of misstatements and generalizations. I do not deny that the Soviet representative went through the Visiting Mission's report. In fact, I acknowledge that he did go through that report. I simply described the way he must have gone through it, taking statements out of context. I would again invite him to read the entire report of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My delegation, in fact, had not intended to intervene at this point, but since the Soviet representative suggested that it would be appropriate if we did, I should just like to deplore the somewhat unparliamentary language which he has just been engaging in. One can understand, of course, that, coming from the country which he comes from, he has little appreciation of the usual parliamentary procedures, but I must deplore this in this body, which does, in fact, endeavour to follow parliamentary procedures.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I just want to make two comments. Firstly, on the statement of the United States representative, who repeated here that I distorted facts: Can anyone show me one place in my statement where the facts were distorted? Did I distort the facts when I said that the Congress of Micronesia does not have any rights whatsoever? The United States representative told us that the Congressmen were elected by the people, but I was not talking about this; I was talking about something quite different. I was talking about the fact that the Congress of Micronesia does not have any rights, and that any law adopted by the Congress of Micronesia has to be confirmed by the High Commissioner; even if that bill has been adopted a second time by a two-thirds majority, it does not become law. For a bill to become law, there has to be permission given by the administering Power. The United States representative was unable to refute the other facts which I adduced.

Regarding the remarks of the representative of New Zealand about parliamentary and unparliamentary language, of course I did not intend to use the parliamentary language used by the representatives of the colonial Powers in this Council when they praise each other to the skies. The United States representative pats Australia on the back and then Australia and the United States praise other countries. I speak about things as they really are, and I believe this is perfectly normal parliamentary language. I did not offend anyone here. I did not intend to say nasty things about anyone; I was simply adducing the facts as they are, facts which cannot be refuted by anyone.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Permit me, Madam President, to commence my statement by thanking you, as Chairman of the Visiting Mission, Mr. Rogers, of Australia, Mr. Basdevant, of France, and Mr. Posnett, of the United Kingdom, for what my delegation considers to be an objective report. We have read it with great care and we find that in many areas it has confirmed our preconceived notions, as it were, of the conditions existing in the Territory. We are very appreciative of this report.

In response to a question put to the delegation of the United States concerning the application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Council was informed that the people of Micronesia were cognizant of their right under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement to request self-determination or independence whenever they so desire. While this may be true, my delegation strongly feels that the Administering Authority should keep this factor ever alive in the minds of the people. Even at the risk of repeating myself, I am going to say that the one and only objective of the Trusteeship System is to stimulate the efforts of the people of the Territory towards self-government.

We find in the Territory held under trusteeship by the United States that the Micronesians have not been given an opportunity to hold the reins of government in any appreciable post. This lack definitely will result in a further delay in the realization of the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) and the Trusteeship Agreement, for when the people choose their new political life, they will need experienced personnel. We urge the Administration to give this factor consideration as a positive policy.

We consider the establishment of the Congress of Micronesia as a worthy step forward. However, we are dissatisfied with the power of veto, which tends to frustrate the Congress whenever it is used. The Micronesians know more than the administering Power can ever know about what they want most for themselves. Therefore, when they legislate according to their needs, we would prefer that the administering Power, if it does not favour any particular legislation, present some compromise rather than apply the veto, which seems to create only unrest and dissatisfaction.

(Mr. Eastman, Liberia)

We feel that the time has come when the Congress of Micronesia should have a voice in the making of the Territorial budget. Perhaps the Administering Authority might disagree about allowing the Congress to appropriate money from the annual grants given by the United States, although on any basis this disagreement could encounter logical rebuttal. But the funds collected in the Territory from taxes, and so on, rightly should be turned over to the Congress for budgetary disbursement. We therefore urge the Administering Authority to give this factor consideration as a positive policy.

The report of the Visiting Mission points out the limited areas of economic growth in the Territory. It singles out copra as the only source of cash income, and even this source has its shortcomings.

The Administering Authority needs to experiment in other areas, such as fishing, the establishment of primary and secondary industries, the promotion of tourist trade, as well as to study the methods utilized by the Japanese in making the economy viable. In the words of the Visiting Mission:

"The first requirement in the Mission's view is to build up the economic infra-structure, particularly in the field of transport, assessing priorities on the basis of potential productive return. Without this infra-structure no substantial progress is possible. Secondly, Micronesia has important resources which are not being utilized to their full productive capacity. Agriculture and fisheries are the main fields in which the Mission sees the possibility for major expansion and this will require expansion of the Government services including improved arrangements for marketing. Thirdly, land is one of Micronesia's major economic assets which cannot at the moment be brought to optimum productivity because of complex difficulties over land tenure in adequate survey and planning services." (T/1658, para. 195)

One need not elaborate on that quotation, which I took from the Visiting Mission's report, because it is so clear and unambiguous. But self-determination can be meaningful only with a sound economy as assurance against eventualities. So we request the administering Power to do more concerning the economy of the Territory and to give careful thought to the Mission's recommendations.

There is urgent need, as the Mission stated, for land reforms in the Territory. Land that was confiscated by the Japanese should be returned to its rightful, legitimate owners and should not be the property of the Government. The Administration needs to set in motion plans for a workable system of land tenure. The first step, I would venture to say, should be the return of land to various individuals or groups, and, secondly, payments to individuals or groups for land presently utilized for governmental purposes.

My delegation is concerned about the health situation in the Territory. We know what the WHO report stated about conditions in the Territory. Therefore, it was with regret that we noted in the Visiting Mission's report that conditions mentioned in the WHO's report still exist. We feel that careful consideration was not given to the WHO recommendations. Since funds are available, we expect bigger and better facilities and the replacement of worn-out and outdated equipment.

Lastly, in the matter of health, we agree with the Mission's report that there are no plans covering "professional training, medical, paramedical and health personnel, hospital facilities and equipment, preventive medicine and environmental sanitation" (T/1658, para. 56). Plans in the above-mentioned categories need immediate consideration and we again urge the Administration to consider the recommendation of the Visiting Mission.

My delegation is inclined to agree with the recommendation of the Visiting Mission that steps should be taken to review general matters of fiscal organization on all levels of Territory Government. The Micronesian, for his own sake, should be taught to contribute to the expense of government, if for no other reason than to decrease his dependency on the Administering Authority. I say this because, as all members of the Council are aware, a government can thrive only from the contributions it receives from its nationals; and, since Micronesia is on its way to self-determination or independence, it is high time that they appreciate the burden of government by contributing directly to it.

Turning to the subject of United States nationals employed in the Territory, we feel that they, too, should meet tax responsibilities, as they are required to do in the case of Guam. If the Territory is where they make their living, they should be required to make financial contribution to its perpetuation.

Every year since our election to the Council, you, Madam President, have stressed the importance of payment of war claims to Micronesians. We agree with the importance you have assigned to this aspect of Micronesian life, because we feel it is their rightful due. The team set up by the

administering Power stated that a sizable number of unpaid and unadjudicated claims exist. The administering Power should have been the first to solve those long overdue claims, thus placing itself in a better position to insist that the Japanese meet their obligation to the Micronesian people. We request the administering Power to meet those claims with the minimum delay.

Finally, let me express the wish of my delegation that the Administering Authority heed the recommendations made both by my delegation and by the Visiting Mission and, thereby, accelerate the day when the people of Micronesia will emerge as a free and independent people.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom): I should like to preface my delegation's observations by a comment of a more general nature on the examination of matters concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which has so far taken place in this Council.

The various meetings in which we have all taken part, addressing questions to the Administering Authority and to the Special Representative and his advisers, have been distinguished by the very candid and very forthright contributions made by the Special Representative, Mr. Norwood, and also by the representatives of the Congress of Micronesia.

Mr. Norwood made no attempt to conceal shortcomings, and no attempt to evade matters where he thought United States policy could be revised to the advantage of the Trust Territory.

Congressman Salii was equally frank and direct in saying what he thought of the situation and in drawing attention impartially to matters where he had criticism or praise for the policies of the Administering Authority.

The common factor in all these contributions to our work, and all their answers, was that they showed determination, and not resignation; they looked forward, rather than backward; and they were constructive, rather than complacent.

My delegation greatly values the spirit in which those contributions were made, and would wish to place on record its appreciation for the high degree of co-operation which has been afforded to this Council by its distinguished visitors.

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

Indeed, much as my delegation welcomed the opportunities which occurred for questioning members of the Congress of Micronesia, who are here to assist us particularly on matters concerning public opinion in the Trust Territory, we think in retrospect that we should perhaps have liked to hear even more from them of their own views. I hope in the course of this statement to refer to one or two matters on which possibly Senator Kabua and Congressman Salii may perhaps have something to say at the end of this debate.

In reading the conclusions and recommendations of this Council adopted at last year's meetings, it is possible to observe that the Trusteeship Council was conscious of the imbalance in the progress that had been achieved. The Council noted the political progress that started with the transfer of legislative authority from the High Commissioner to the Congress of Micronesia, while economic production in the Territory had so far increased relatively little. The Council recorded its belief that unbalanced economic and social development could produce serious repercussions in political development.

This year we have the benefit of a first-hand report by a Visiting Mission of this Council. One of the most significant threads which runs through it is again an impression of uneven progress, particularly in the field of economic development. My delegation feels strengthened in this observation by the knowledge that the Mission was accompanied by an economic adviser, whose presence was undoubtedly of great assistance to the Mission, particularly since the Nathan report had just been published and needed expert assessment.

In passing, perhaps I may mention here that it seems to my delegation that the attachment of such experts to Visiting Missions in cases where a particular problem is assuming special importance in the Territory can be of the utmost help to this Council in assisting it to reach well-informed conclusions on the subjects with which it has to deal.

I said that progress was perhaps marked by unevenness. The highest achievements so far attained seem to be clearly in the field of education. I suggest that this is partly because work in this area started first and partly, no doubt, because of the high value which the United States Government has always placed on the right of every man to basic education.

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

We cannot but express our admiration for the tremendous effort and determination and the good will which has gone into the educational programme in the Trust Territory. Of necessity, it has been designed to achieve quick results; and it is possible to observe the side effects of the techniques applied to that end. But the criticisms which are made in the report of the Visiting Mission, which are intended to be constructive criticisms, have not been lost upon the Administering Authority.

We particularly welcome the statement by the Special Representative that more emphasis is going to be placed on vocational courses in the existing high schools, that at least one polytechnic high school is going to be established and that an over-all evaluation of the system by the Stanford Research Institute is being undertaken. This seems to my delegation a good example of the healthy attitude of the Administration, in refusing to be complacent about its very substantial achievements and in looking always to further improvement.

I would only add in this respect that there is obvious disadvantage, indeed danger, in giving students who are not proceeding beyond high school work, to quote the words of the Visiting Mission, "a distaste for manual work and prejudice him against such occupations as agriculture and fishing, which are essential to the future development of the Territory". (T/1658, para. 82)

This is a problem which is easier to diagnose than to cure, and we respect the obvious concern and determination of the Administration to improve this situation.

Similarly, turning now to the field of public health, the High Commissioner has frankly acknowledged the difficulties and the need for further improvement before it can be said that the Administration has fully achieved the goal set out by the late President Kennedy: namely, to bring health services at least up to the minimal acceptable standards of a United States community. My delegation has always felt that this was a generous and humane position to adopt, as in practice it must prove a challenging goal, which would take some time to reach, given the conditions of the Trust Territory, where the population is dispersed among many small islands scattered across large areas of the Pacific Ocean.

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

In replying to a question by the representative of Australia, the Special Representative explained to us that a "flying doctor" service on the model widely adopted in Australia could hardly be set up because of the difficulties in landing amphibious planes on many of the inhabited atolls. Clearly, it would never be possible to assign doctors and nurses to every single, small inhabited atoll.

My delegation believes that the answer may be found in placing greater stress upon preventive medicine and sanitation, as set out in paragraphs 45 to 47 of the report of the Visiting Mission.

My delegation also greatly welcomes the announcement made by Mr. Norwood that a new director of public health has been appointed, particularly since he obviously enjoys a most valuable background for his future field of activities and his new post. We hope that his tenure will be fruitful, and we shall look forward to hearing next year of further progress in this field.

Last year this Council commented on the lack of progress in the economic field. This year again the Visiting Mission described the economy in frank and candid terms. We welcome the recognition by the High Commissioner that economic development must now be given urgent attention. We believe that, as required by the Trusteeship Agreement, this development must take place in a manner which promotes the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants.

May I say here, in passing, that my delegation was puzzled, to say the least, by the attempt of the Soviet representative at an earlier stage in our proceedings to draw a contrast with the kind of economic exploitation in the Territory which was practised by the former Japanese Government before the war.

My delegation asked the Special Representative two particular questions relevant to these economic issues to which we feel great importance attaches. I think it perhaps desirable to emphasize them again.

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

In the first place, the Special Representative was asked whether he could give any breakdown of the new funds which are likely to be made available by the United States Congress, namely, \$7.5 million for this year and \$17.5 million for next year. The object of this question was to see whether most of this money would be allocated to development in the economic sector.

The report of the Visiting Mission has of course been made available only comparatively recently to the Administration and the relevant legislation by the United States Congress has only lately been signed into law. So it is understandable that a specific and more detailed breakdown is not yet available. Nevertheless, we received from the High Commissioner some interesting examples of possible uses to which these appropriations may be devoted and, in his opening statement, he showed a keen awareness of the basic importance of building up the essential economic infrastructure. In particular, the Special Representative clearly acknowledges the need to improve transport systems on the islands and between the islands. His views on this question seem to be entirely in line with those of the Visiting Mission, whose comment on shipping made in paragraph 162 of its report was specifically referred to in his opening statement. My delegation considers that these requirements in the area of communications and transport should be accorded special attention among the many and important competing claims on the additional funds which have been so generously provided by the Administering Authority.

The second point which was made by the Special Representative and to which again my delegation attaches great importance is the need for improved extension services, especially in the field of agriculture. At paragraph 123 of the Visiting Mission's report, the Mission stressed that it regarded this matter of extension services as one of the highest priority. My delegation believes that this is undisputed.

I would like to turn now to certain matters concerning the Nathan report. This report contained three recommendations which have been found to be possibly controversial. They concern land alienation, the import of foreign labour into the Trust Territory and the attraction of outside capital. These are all sensitive matters on which the Visiting Mission felt called upon to express reservations. The Special Representative has himself made it clear that he

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

shares these reservations and therefore it is not necessary for me to dilate on them except to say that the United Kingdom delegation is satisfied that the cautious approach of the Administering Authority on these subjects and its awareness of their social and wider implications are fully in accord with its responsibilities towards the inhabitants of the Trust Territory.

I would like to refer here to a point made by the representative of the USSR when he alleged the alienation of 50 per cent of the land from the people of Micronesia and demanded its return -- I quote his words as I heard them in the interpretation: "returned to the sovereignty of Micronesia." If the interpretation into English of the remarks of the representative is correct, I think that he may be under a misapprehension because, as my delegation understands the position, it is in fact in the name of the Government of Micronesia that title to these public lands is held. They are lands held publicly in trust for and for the benefit of the people of Micronesia. As we have been informed by the Special Representative, there is indeed a specific law forbidding the alienation of land titles to non-Micronesians.

My delegation also found it hard to understand the allegations of land being alienated to what were described as foreign monopolies. If we look at pages 64 and 65 of the annual report submitted by the Administering Authority, we see a list of all private companies operating in the Territory with assets in excess of \$50,000. There are a total of some thirty private companies or corporations in this category and of those thirty only four firms are shown to be of non-Micronesian ownership. One of them, the Micronesian Development Corporation, is restricted to a twenty-year lease, and in this case there is provision for Micronesian participation. We understand that the other company of United States ownership, the Van Camp Company, has a five-year lease with options on both sides to renew. In either case, the rents from these leases are paid in as revenues of the Government of the Trust Territory and are used for the people of the Territory.

Reverting to the observations of the Visiting Mission on the question of availability of capital, my delegation is glad to note that the Mission was relatively sanguine about the scope for generating further capital from within the Trust Territory. The Mission seemed confident that the prospects for economic development were substantial and that, given suitable stimulation

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

and suitable encouragement, the economy of the Trust Territory could, within a few years, be revitalized.

One of the particular suggestions made by the Visiting Mission was the setting up of a development corporation with a much wider orbit of operation, a much more positive role to play than the existing Economic Development Loan Board. The Special Representative did not reply in very specific terms to a point on this subject raised in a question by the representative of France. Perhaps he may feel that more time is needed to consider this proposal in all its implications. From experience in other developing areas in which the United Kingdom has had involvement, my delegation feels that such a corporation might well provide a helpful stimulus to the economy and serve as a catalyst for the many sources of capital and technical expertise which need to be tapped both from inside and outside Micronesia.

I now advert to the question of political and constitutional development. It was no inconsiderable achievement within a relatively short span of time for the Congress of Micronesia to have been set up and to have started its work with such promise and effect.

My delegation would like to associate itself with the tribute paid by the Visiting Mission to all the Senators and Assemblymen of the Congress whose endeavours have made that possible. Like the Mission, we believe that what has been attained so far reflects credit on all concerned.

It would be idle to pretend that future progress and future development will be easier than what has already been achieved. For example, there remain the difficulties of the role of the Congress in regard to public finance and the budget. We do not presume to offer advice to the Administration, which has shown only too clearly that it recognizes that budgetary control by the Legislature is an important and, indeed, an essential feature of the democratic system and that some improved arrangement must be worked out. The suggestions made by the High Commissioner are admirable as far as they go. But no one, I am sure, is better aware than he is that they do not provide the full or the final answer.

Similarly, there is the difficult problem of taxation. The Visiting Mission has made some proposals here which are interesting but which the Administering Authority will not yet have had time fully to consider. However, it is clear from what the High Commissioner said in his opening statement and from his answers to questions that some radical revision of the tax system and the imposition of a personal tax are not necessarily to be excluded. We are told in paragraph 48 of the report of the Visiting Mission that standards of living in Micronesia compare favourably with those in many developing countries. Poverty is rare except on a few of the outer islands. Yet, despite that observation, only about 5 per cent of the Territory's budget is at present financed by local taxation. As much as 95 per cent is coming from the United States taxpayers. In this situation, I think we should all welcome -- and I should hope that the leaders of Micronesia themselves would welcome -- a system under which all people who can afford to do so make some real contribution to their country's finances and under which overseas residents living in Micronesia make their own contribution to the Territory from which their living is derived.

One of the most difficult problems confronting the Administering Authority, one to which our attention was also drawn by the representative of France, is to devise ways of leading Micronesians into the higher echelons of the executive, where they can be given responsibility for the formation of policy and for the administration of departments of Government. My Government can claim to have had over the years some varied experience with this problem, but we are far from suggesting that we enjoy a monopoly of wisdom or that methods which have been applied with some success in other parts of the world are necessarily applicable to the special circumstances of Micronesia. Indeed, the only sure conclusion which seems possible to draw is the value of direct experience in government, experience gained over as long a period as circumstances reasonably allow for those who sooner or later are destined to run their own affairs. In the view of my delegation, this adds urgency to the need for Micronesians to gain experience at the Cabinet level as soon as practicable.

In answer to questions on that subject, the Special Representative mentioned an arrangement by which Micronesian civil servants attend Cabinet meetings and take full part in the discussions. That is welcome. I know that the High Commissioner will not mind my saying that the experience of a civil servant attending a Cabinet meeting is different from the experience of a full member of the Cabinet who has to take on his own shoulders responsibility for decisions reached and, if necessary, to justify them publicly, as well as to implement them in practice.

The Visiting Mission has suggested one possible way in which Micronesians can be brought in at Cabinet level without disturbing civil service seniority or promotions. Appointing Cabinet members on a political basis would not involve a permanent promotion or permanent assignment, and would give the Chief Executive a wide freedom of choice in his selections. There may well be other arrangements or adaptations which would be equally effective or more convenient. No doubt the Administration and the Congress of Micronesia will be giving thought to this to see whether the next constitutional developments can take account of this problem. One thing seems certain: it should be tackled as an essential part of the preparations for the people to decide their own political future.

Here I should like to refer to the progress made in the field of local government. This is an area which the United Kingdom Government has always regarded as being of basic importance in developing among the people in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories a real understanding of their responsibilities and a proper sense of their mutual interdependence, as well as providing a field for politicians to gain essential experience in the working of the democratic system of government. We welcome the attention which the Administration is continuing to give this field. It is a field which has particular importance in Micronesia, where the wide dispersion of island communities often leaves the local government at the municipal and district level to provide the island peoples their only first-hand contact with a knowledge of government.

My delegation noted that during the course of questions put to our visitors, little emphasis, except on the part of the representative of New Zealand, was placed on the future political status of the Territory. Of course, it is understandable that when confronted with a Territory comprising so many widely dispersed communities, one should hesitate before contemplating the creation of a State with all the characteristics which that denotes. My own Government has had parallel experience in extended groups of islands in the Pacific with problems which are not dissimilar. It may be true to say that among those of us concerned with these questions at the United Nations, there is a discernible tendency to consider these areas too much in stereotyped terms of separate political units and to give them too little attention in terms of their need for special consideration and perhaps for some kind of special status. My delegation believes that there is a need for deeper thinking and study of these island communities to see how it is possible for them to achieve greater political responsibility, recognizing, as we must, that in terms of population, the human resources of the Territory correspond numerically to those of a county or of a parish in larger countries, and to consider at the same time how their economic development can be sustained in the face of the immense geographic difficulties. There are problems of scale here which should not be overlooked. Certainly we can think of no developed country better qualified to help towards such solutions than the United States.

But for the people themselves, the lesson of interdependence seems to my delegation every bit as important as the lesson of independence. This is a lesson which in this age all countries, large and small, have to learn.

For a Territory such as Micronesia, the requirement is for a practical rather than a stereotyped solution. What is needed, my delegation would submit, is for Micronesians to be given the opportunity and help which they need to develop their own self-reliance and a willingness to accept responsibility for their own decisions. My delegation has read with interest the views and reactions of Micronesians in relation to their aspirations for the future of the Territory which are reported in paragraph 317 of the report of the Visiting Mission.

We were particularly impressed by what Congressman Sal i had to say about this when he stated that if the Micronesians had the right to make a decision about their future, they should also have the right to determine the time when to make that decision. My delegation respects that view and can understand the apparent reluctance found by the Mission, and reported by it, among Micronesians to decide their own future before they think they are ready to do so. We do not wish to rush them but, on the other hand, they, for their part, must realize that they have obligations and responsibilities in the world at large which cannot be left for all time to the Administration and to the help provided in such generous measure by the United States. My delegation hopes that when Mr. Kabua and Mr. Salii return, they will explain this to the Congress and people of Micronesia.

My delegation would like the people to know how seriously we in this Council regard the problems that face them, how carefully we have considered their wishes and interests and how glad we are to have been able to discuss these problems with their elected representatives.

Mr. Norwood, Special Representative, and Mr. Salii and Mr. Kabua, Advisers, withdrew.

OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF
TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1664)

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, the Soviet delegation wishes to state that the Mission of the USSR to the United Nations has informed the Secretary-General of the fact that the Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow, named in memory of Patrice Lumumba, has offered the representatives of the Island of Saipan a scholarship and has issued an invitation to a student to come to that University. I think he will be the first student from that Territory -- if he is permitted to go to the Soviet Union -- to study in the Soviet Union.

In connexion with the fact that one of the principal arguments of administering Powers that constantly obstructs the implementation of United Nations decisions concerning the immediate granting of independence to all colonial peoples, including the people of the Trust Territories, there is a reference to the lack of preparation on the part of these people for total self-government and independence. The Soviet delegation therefore wishes to draw special attention in the Trusteeship Council to the report of the Secretary-General regarding the granting to the people of Trust Territories the possibility of obtaining education and professional training. (T/1664) It will be seen from the report that there are possibilities for a programme of education and professional training, which have been created on the basis of resolutions 557 (VI) and 753 (VIII) of the General Assembly, which have not been utilized and have not been utilized for a number of years due to the fault of the administering Powers which are responsible for the trusteeship of the Pacific Islands of Papua, New Guinea and Nauru. It is clear that this deliberate course followed by the Administering Authorities to block the indigenous inhabitants from obtaining education under these funds is the general policy of the colonial Powers which, attempting to limit education by indigenous inhabitants in all possible ways, seek to block the intellectual development of peoples of Trust Territories as a whole and to utilize that backwardness in their own interests, for the purpose of maintaining their dominion over the Trust Territories.

We have just concluded a general discussion on the conditions in the Trust Territory of Papua and New Guinea, during the course of which it became apparent that the overwhelming majority of the population of the Territory continued to remain illiterate. A large percentage of the school-age children are not in school and only two indigenous inhabitants have received higher education.

The situation with regard to education in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is equally bleak. What is being done -- and this is very little -- in the Territory to organize education is terribly backward and does not correspond at all to the genuine needs of the people of those Territories. At the same time, as will be seen from the report under consideration, the Administering Authorities are hampering the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories in their attempts to take advantage of the United Nations educational programme. This confirms once again the correctness of the statement that the colonial authorities are deliberately and artificially trying to hold back the development of education in Trust Territories.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I suppose that the best example of what our colleague from the United States said a while ago about the distortions by our Soviet colleague that we heard here today has just been given by him on this subject. The picture he has painted is completely distorted in every way. He said, for example, that the policy of the Administering Authorities is to limit education in every possible way. That was equivalent to a statement he made in one of the tirades to which he treated us after the general debate, the statement that Australia, as an Administering Authority, was closing the door to education to the people of the Trust Territory -- this despite the fact of the existence of a new university, regarding which full information had been placed before this Trusteeship Council and which was directly in accordance with the keen and active encouragement of the United Nations.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

The Soviet representative talks about refusal by the Administering Authority to avail itself of United Nations assistance in the field of education. He either did not hear, did not consider, or, for his own purposes of distortion, chose to disregard completely the detailed information that had been placed before him during the debate on the Trust Territory of New Guinea by the Special Representative, regarding the extensive and fruitful co-operation between UNESCO and other specialized agencies and the Trust Territory, in relation to the university there, in relation to the teachers' colleges there, and in relation to education generally.

He also chooses to disregard the facts which I pointed out last year when this same subject was being considered, facts which are recorded on page 94 of the official records of the thirty-third session of the Trusteeship Council, 1286th meeting, in these words:

"Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that he wished to correct a misapprehension on the part of the Soviet Union representative," -- I change the word now from "misapprehension" to "deliberate distortion" -- "who said that the Administering Authorities were preventing students in the Trust Territories from studying abroad. He had before him a list of forty-two students from the Territory of Papua and New Guinea who had studied overseas in recent years, in the United Kingdom, the United States, India, New Zealand, Hawaii, Switzerland, Iran, the Netherlands, Nigeria, etc. It was primarily through the specialized agencies of the United Nations family that those opportunities had been offered them."

In the information placed before this Council by my delegation in what we call the supplementary report to our report on the Trust Territory of New Guinea for 1965-1966, to bring up to date the information contained in the annual report, this information is found on page 13:

"A total of 271 officers undertook tours of duty overseas. Of this total, 225 visited Australia and 46 went to other countries. Forty local officers completed training outside the Territory and 15 of these travelled beyond Australia.

"Included in the total of overseas training were 70 attendances at professional conferences, ten at courses sponsored by United Nations agencies and nine by the South Pacific Commission."

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

All of the information under the relevant headings which was placed so painstakingly before this Council with regard to education and educational facilities and opportunities is a refutation of the implications and misstatements in what our colleague from the Soviet Union has just said.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have asked to speak simply for the record, because, as the Council well knows, every year my delegation has urged the Administering Authorities to take advantage of offers from Member States and allow people under their administration to reap the benefits of these offers by furthering their education. It is no secret that illiteracy is rampant in most of the Territories. We do know that in the Territories under Australian administration there are two university graduates. I am not sure how many there are in the United States Trust Territories, but I am sure the number would be just as astoundingly small.

My delegation must therefore ask the Administering Authority to explain why it is that when offers come from Member States for free tuition, room and board and round-trip passage for students to study at the university level -- and university graduates are badly needed indeed in these Territories -- students are not permitted to take advantage of those offers. I do admit that quite a few students have gone abroad to study, but they have not studied at the university level. This is my concern, whether their studies will lead to degrees and better enable them to manage their own affairs. I am not concerned with how many have attended conferences or how many have left the Territory. What concerns me is why students have not been given the opportunity to study at the university level, especially when they are qualified to do so.

Again, and to terminate my statement, my delegation urges the Administering Authority to permit students within its Territory to avail themselves of the opportunity to study at the university level.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): I would like to reply to the representative of the Soviet Union by rejecting as totally unfounded the statements made by him regarding the policy of the United States in connexion with the fellowships for students of Micronesia. In the first place, I should like to point

(Mrs. Anderson, United States)

out that during the last ten-year period somewhat more than forty Micronesian students have studied abroad under United Nations fellowships, and that during the past year alone five Micronesian students have been studying abroad under United Nations fellowships.

As has been done in previous years by the representatives of the United States, I wish to reaffirm that it is the policy of the United States, as the Administering Authority, to allow to the Micronesians the freedom to decide for themselves where they wish to study when there are scholarship opportunities available and when such scholarship possibilities are desired by the Micronesians. And I might add too, if such scholarships are practicable for the Micronesians; for I think there is no doubt and all of us understand that for a Micronesian to go, for instance, to the Soviet Union to study would be a huge undertaking indeed. It would require, in the first place, a prolonged period of language training. There is absolutely no similarity between Russian and the Micronesian languages, or, I might say, between English and the Micronesian languages; and English is the major second language spoken in Micronesia. It is thus very difficult for a student to go to study in the Soviet Union, or to any of the countries of Eastern Europe, a few of which have offered fellowships which simply have not been attractive or appealing to the Micronesians. With all due respect and appreciation for the scholarship offers concerned, I can certainly understand why this might be. It is indeed rather difficult to undertake the learning of a totally new language, which in itself would require some years of study.

I would also point out that while there are some scholarships offered by various Member States of the United Nations, some of them provide only tuition; they do not offer to cover the transportation, which is a very sizable economic consideration, and not all of them offer to cover room and board and living expenses.

So that many factors are taken into account by the Micronesian students; and I would simply reaffirm that it is and will continue to be the definite policy of the United States that the Micronesians themselves are free to accept those scholarships which they find most suitable, most practicable and most desirable for themselves.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): How many times now have we been witnesses of the fact that whenever the Soviet delegation makes a statement in this Council regarding the situation in the Trust Territories, and adduces facts, immediately the representatives of the colonial Powers try to refute what has been said by the Soviet representative, stating that he has distorted reality and so on. But facts are facts, and the facts show something quite different. How do their tongues obey them when they try to refute these facts?

For example, the Australian representative has just said that I am distorting the actual situation. In what way am I distorting the situation, I should like to ask him. Eighty per cent of the population in Papua and New Guinea are illiterate, and during the ten years of Australian domination of the Territory, only two people have graduated from the higher educational institutions. Two thirds of the children of school age are not being educated. Yet we are told that we distort the facts. When we continue and say that the opportunities which are being offered by the educational programme, which offers fellowships to indigenous students, are not being used, we are told by the Australian and the United States representatives that we are distorting facts.

How can this be refuted, since we have before us document T/1664, the report of the Secretary-General. I shall read out paragraph 3 of this report in English, because I do not have the Russian translation of this document.

(Spoke in English)

"As stated in previous reports, in the past the great majority of applications for scholarships under the programme came from students in former Trust Territories in Africa. No scholarships were ever granted to students from the Territories which at present remain under the Trusteeship System: the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands."

(T/1664, paragraph 3)

(Continued in Russian)

No scholarships, not a single one.

(Spoke in English)

"During the period covered by the present report, one application for a scholarship to study in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was received by the Secretariat from an inhabitant of the Mariana Islands. In accordance with the established procedure, this application was forwarded to the offering State concerned." (Ibid.)

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

(Continued in Russian)

The highest educational institution has decided in favour of this application. They look us straight in the eyes and say that the Soviet representative is distorting the facts, but this is a report of the Secretary-General. In other words, the statement that the Soviet representative is distorting facts in this Council cannot be correct, otherwise the Secretary-General is also apparently telling untruths.

In the circumstances, we have this document before us. How, then, can we believe them when there are no official documents and thousands of arguments can be adduced, and we are told that the Soviet representative is distorting facts. But we have referred to facts and figures which are contained in documents, and not a single fact which was adduced in my statement was not backed up by reliable sources. But the Australian representative says that the Soviet representative is distorting facts and distorting the situation in the Territory. How can we then have any discussion in this Council? I have said, and I continue to say, that this Council has turned into a body of colonizers. They are the masters in this house, and they continue to dictate their own wishes in this organ. The Trusteeship Council has turned into a body which conceals all the actions being taken by the administering Powers in these Territories, and they want us to believe what they wish us to believe, when the facts refute all that they say. I do not think it is possible to derive any sense from the discussions in this Council. Let them answer this particular point in the report of the Secretary-General.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I do not attach to that section in the report of the Secretary-General the same importance that my colleague from the Soviet Union attaches to it. I do not deny that what is stated there is so, but this is one infinitesimal fragment of an educational effort which is required and which is being put into effect, one infinitesimal and very debatable fragment.

Our colleague from the Soviet Union has been very sensitive this morning to suggestions that he distorts facts. There are many ways of distorting facts, and one way at which he is an adept is in doing precisely what our colleague from the United States pointed out this morning, that is, fingering three documents and taking out an isolated fact and building a case around it. That is the way in which he continually distorts facts.

The PRESIDENT: Since there are no more speakers on this item, I should like to suggest that the Council take note of the report of the Secretary-General and draw the attention of the Administering Authority to the observations made by the members of the Council during the discussion of this report.

It was so decided.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL
TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM IN TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1665)

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation presented its views on this question in the course of the discussion of this item in this body, and I do not intend to repeat what I said at the 1310th meeting.. I merely wish to stress one fact, namely, that the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union should be reflected in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly and, in particular, that the Office of Public Information should be made aware of the proposals the Soviet delegation has introduced on this subject.

The PRESIDENT: The statement of the Soviet representative will be taken into consideration.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have a question concerning the 1,600 publications in English of the various documents that were sent to the Information Centre in Port Moresby. I was wondering whether the Secretary of the Committee could inform me whether those various publications included general Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI).

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): Before I can give a definitive answer to the representative of Liberia, I must consult the Office of Public Information. However, I am sure that all resolutions adopted by the General Assembly pertaining to the Trust Territories are usually forwarded and distributed by the Office concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Although the question was not directed to me, I can perhaps help our colleague from Liberia. Copies of resolution 2227 (XXI) have been distributed in Papua and New Guinea.

Having said that, I should also like to take the opportunity of inviting attention to two facts which I think are of particular importance in relation to Papua and New Guinea under this heading.

One is that the library of the University of Papua and New Guinea has now been officially designated a depository library of the United Nations. Previously, the public library at Port Moresby, since 1948, had acted in a similar capacity. The change has been made because it was felt in principle that the university, as a seat of learning, is the best place for storing and making available for access the United Nations documents. That applies particularly, of course, to university students and their desire to be as fully informed as possible on matters relating to the United Nations. But the library is not, of course, restricted to university students; it is open to, and all its facilities freely made available to, all members of the general public and to anybody who may be interested.

Secondly, I should simply like to inform this Council that the Director of the United Nations Information Centre in Port Moresby has now personally visited and travelled through, at great length and in great detail, all eighteen districts of the Territory. During the course

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

of that travelling, he visited Local Government Councils, schools, institutions of all kinds; he met and addressed representative groups of the people. Thus not only through his office activities, but in his own person, he has projected the information media of the United Nations to the people of Papua and New Guinea.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation will await the search which the Secretary has promised to initiate in order to give us the information we requested.

But, briefly, I am concerned about paragraph 23 of this report (T/1665) because it seems to my delegation that the Information Centre at Port Moresby has left the matter of dissemination of information almost exclusively to such newspapers as the notorious South Pacific Post and the New Guinea Talk-Talk, in which many words and phrases cannot be expressed because of the limitations of the language. We think it was the primary objective of the United Nations to establish that Centre in Port Moresby so that it could directly handle the dissemination of information. We would request, if it has not been done in the past, that the gentleman in charge of the Centre should make available all possible information to the people of Papua and New Guinea and other Territories -- but, since he is in Port Moresby, particularly to the people of Papua and New Guinea -- so that they may know their rights and be cognizant of what is said here and of what is done in their behalf, and not be left exclusively, as I said, to such newspapers as the South Pacific Post or the New Guinea Talk-Talk, etc.

Mr. MCCARTHY (Australia): I do not understand how our colleague from Liberia draws the conclusions which he has just expressed from the report of the Secretary-General in relation to the activities of the Director of the Information Centre at Port Moresby, who has been most active on behalf of the United Nations in disseminating information regarding the United Nations through all available media in the Territory, including, as I have just said, his own person, his own voice, his own presence, in and throughout every district in the whole of the Territory.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

Furthermore, I would remind the representative of Liberia that the record of the South Pacific Post has never, through the years, been one of close friendship for the Administering Authority; and the voice of the South Pacific Post, in criticism of the Administering Authority and its policies at various points, has never been a silent one.

I have brought here with me today sample copies of items of information which are issued directly, in the manner suggested by the representative of Liberia, by the Director of the Information Centre at Port Moresby. These are selected at random, there being too many to bring down as a whole. They are issued continually by that Information Centre, on its own initiative, and entirely as a result of the information received directly from the United Nations.

I have before me Press Release No. 66/7, of 17 January 1966. The first heading is "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples". It reads:

"The United Nations General Assembly, on 14 December 1960, at the 947th plenary meeting, adopted resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples."

The text of that resolution is set out again for all to read.

Press Release No. 66/8 sets out the text of resolution 1541 (XV).

Press Release No. 66/2, of 4 January 1966, is headed: "General Assembly calls on Australia to fix an early date for the independence of New Guinea and Papua", and then proceeds:

"In a resolution recommended by its Fourth Committee, the General Assembly of the United Nations", etc.

It then spells out in detail exactly what happened at the United Nations.

Another release, reviewing the United Nations activities in 1966, runs into six or eight or ten pages and covers the whole field of United Nations activities, from disarmament to colonialism, Chinese representation, apartheid, South West Africa, the United Nations Development Programme, and the like.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

I do suggest that the observations just made by the representative of Liberia have been based on an insufficient reading and/or erroneous interpretation of the report of the Secretary-General, and the facts set out in that report, and an insufficient appreciation of the work being done not only by the United Nations Information Centre in Port Moresby, but by many other agencies, including the Administration, in relation to the United Nations.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): At this session of the Council the delegation of Australia has assumed the role of lecturing Liberia on what should or should not say and the manner in which it should say it, and so forth. I merely asked the Bureau whether resolution 2227 (XXI) was also transmitted to the Information Centre in Port Moresby. I also spoke about the credibility of the South Pacific Post.

I cannot understand why the representative of Australia accuses me of insufficient reading when I am simply trying to gather information. His strong defence of the South Pacific Post is precisely the reason why I say that the dissemination of information should not be left exclusively to that organ, but should be the responsibility of the Centre which was established by the United Nations.

I do not want any other Visiting Mission to encounter the alarming fact that people in Papua and New Guinea have never heard of the declaration concerning the liberation of colonial peoples and countries. I do not want the people any longer not to know what the word "independence" means.

The Council will recall that the last Visiting Mission to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea severely criticised the Centre because it felt that the Centre was lagging in its activities there and was not properly bringing the information which we thought to be pertinent to the attention of the inhabitants of the Territory.

I simply wanted my delegation to be informed -- and Mr. Rifai has been kind enough to promise to do this -- whether the people of Papua and New Guinea know that we have requested Australia to fix an early date for independence, thereby liberating them.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I think that, if there is any question of people being lectured in this Council, it is not a question of Australia lecturing the representative of Liberia; it is a question of the representative of Liberia lecturing Australia -- and lecturing it on the basis of insufficient knowledge.

I did not defend the South Pacific Post. I have no defence to offer for the South Pacific Post nor any other private press organ. What I did say, Mr. Eastman, was that the South Pacific Post had for years been vocal in its criticism where it felt inclined to be so critical of the Administration and its policies. An examination of the South Pacific Post, which has been quoted here frequently by the representative of the Soviet Union, will, I think, bear that statement out.

I did say also that the Secretary-General's report did not carry any impression that the whole work of the United Nations Centre in Port Moresby depended on the co-operation of the South Pacific Post, which I have twice understood to be the purport of the remarks offered by the representative of Liberia. I did suggest that a careful reading of the report of the Secretary-General would show that all available media were being used in the Territory to disseminate information about the United Nations, even to the striking of a special stamps by the Administration on United Nations Day.

I did point out -- and I have no particular reason for defending this officer of the United Nations or any particular reason to attack him -- that the Director of the Centre, in his own person, and with his own experience, and through his own presence, and through wide and difficult travelling throughout the Territory, had familiarized himself with every district of the Territory and made contact with significant groups of people in all of those districts.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say to the representative of Liberia that his statement will be brought to the attention of the Office of Public Information.

I would suggest that the Council take note of the Secretary-General's report and draw the attention of the Administering Authorities to the observations that have been made by members of the Council during the discussion on this report.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.